

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING

524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD

FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINUTES

DATE: JULY 12, 2012

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 7:08 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 R. Matzke, Scott P. Minaudo, Mark H. Purkey, and Attorney Steve Moulton

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHER INDIVIDUALS PRESENT: Seventy-six (76) other individuals

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: MINAUDO MOVED, seconded by Purkey to approve the Agenda with the additional items listed under "New Business": letter 1-h, *Approval of the Budget*, and letter 1-i, *Ditching of Potter Road*.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 7

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES: PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Matzke to postpone the approval of the Minutes from June 14, 2012.

DISCUSSION:

Trustee Minaudo felt that all of his responses were not in the minutes as he wanted. The Clerk wanted to know if Trustee Minaudo wanted the response word for word. The Clerk will check into the situation.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 7

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

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

ACTION OF THE MOTION

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- 1. Repair of Frances Road: Elms Road to McKinley Road east of the Flint River and Seymour Road to Nichols Road west of the Flint River.**

SUPERVISOR PECK requested to take the issue off the Agenda permanently. The price of the repair for Frances Road has to be split between Montrose Township and Flushing Township because both townships share the road; the price has been increased considerably which takes away from Flushing Township having the ability to afford at this time.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1-a. Second Reading of an ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND RESTATE SECTIONS 17-1 THROUGH 17-5 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING THE IMPOUNDMENT OF VEHICLES AND THE PROCEDURES FOR THE RELEASE OF SAME**

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Matzke to approve an ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND RESTATE SECTIONS 17-1 THROUGH 17-5 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING THE IMPOUNDMENT OF VEHICLES AND THE PROCEDURES FOR THE RELEASE OF SAME.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 7
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried.

- 1-b. Resolution – Possible Action to Place Millage on the November 2012 Ballot (Flushing Area Senior Center)**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

SUPERVISOR PECK inquired from Attorney Steve Moulton (Attorney Moulton) as to what would happen if down the road the Senior Center disbanded or went broke and the Center could not afford to pay the bills they had, would the government organizations sponsoring the Center be responsible for more finances than what the millage would be. Attorney Moulton stated “No”, the township is committed to one (1) mil if the voters approve the dollar proposal to assess a one (1) mil levy.

Attorney Moulton stated the proposed facility would be located on land that the City of Flushing will sell at its acquisition cost to an entity to be created that would be comprised of four (4) units: Flushing Township, Clayton Township, the City of Flushing, and the Flushing Area Senior Citizens organization would come together and create an authoritorium for some type of non-profit corporation. A fair amount of time would have to be put into putting the contract or governing documents of the organization. It was felt that before a lot of time and money was put into the issue, it was felt to not put the “cart before the horse”. Clayton Township is holding their Board of Trustees Meeting at the same time as Flushing Township and will be making the same decision; the City of Flushing will be having their Council meeting next week.

The issue at hand is, if the Board approves, to submit to the electors of each of the three (3) governmental entities a request for a one (1) mil levy to exist for ten (10) years. The ballot language would make the success of Flushing Township’s proposal contingent upon the success of the proposals submitted to the City of Flushing and Clayton Township. For the funding to work, all three (3) entities have to agree to the one (1) mil levy. If the issue goes to all three (3) of the electorate bodies and any one of the three bodies fails to pass the levy or it doesn’t get that far, the proposal will not go forward. It is contingent on all three (3) of the governmental entities passing the one (1) mil levy that will be submitted at the November General Election.

There is a push to get the issue on the November Ballot because: 1) the proposal ties McLaren to a ten (10) year lease that would generate just under \$1,000,000 in rental income over a period of ten (10) years; 2) the issue is being formulated under a recently

new act recently passed by the Snyder Administration (Partnership Act) that came into effect in December and can only be submitted to the voters on an even year General Election. If the issue don't go to the voters in November 2012, it can't go before the voters for another two (2) years. To be placed on the November 2012 ballot, the ballot language has to be into the Genesee County Elections Commission by the first part of August. A lot of work has been done in a short time to put the information together in an organized format so that everyone has a clear understanding of what we are hoping to accomplish.

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Matzke that the board approve the proposed ballot proposal asking the electors to vote on a one (1) mil request for a period of ten (10) years to be in existence from the years 2013 through 2022, the proceeds to be used in the construction of the Senior Citizens and Wellness Center. The ballot proposal would be contingent on being passed by the electors of Flushing Township, the electors of Clayton Township, and the electors for the City of Flushing.

DISCUSSION:

1. **GARDNER:** at this time taking into account Flushing's unfunded pension debt and infrastructure, and the general state of the economy not only in Flint, Genesee County, Michigan, and our Country as a whole, doesn't feel this is the best time to place the issue on the ballot and he will vote against the issue.
2. **PURKEY:** has concerns: 1) Attorney Moulton stated anything over one (1) mil, the Township would not be responsible for but what would happen with construction overruns; 2) haven't really seen a budget or even a projected budget on the center; Revenues - \$200,000 coming from a Genesee County Grant and Flushing Area Senior Foundation donations and other miscellaneous fees which are operational costs; any of the grant money can "dry" up and when it does, there isn't any money for operations; the interlocal authority would only levy the amount of money required to meet debt service; were told the funds would be used for building construction; concerned about building the building and then not have the money to operate it; 3) the interlocal agreement would create a governing body that would involve citizens from all three (3) communities and would entirely own and govern the center – worried about the fact that elected officials won't have oversight over money that is taxpayer money; some of the issues need to be worked out before the issue goes on the ballot; there may not be enough money for operating cost due to the proposed larger structure.
3. **NOECKER:** (inquired from Attorney Moulton) that anything over and above the 1 mill Flushing Township would not be liable?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM ATTORNEY MOULTON:

Attorney Moulton explained that only 1 mill would be levied. Dennis Bow, Finance Manager for the City of Flushing, laid out the figures for the three (3) governmental entities as to what they would generate and there were concerns. Two (2) primary concerns: 1) if the existing .7 mill that is accessed County wide for Senior Citizens Operations isn't renewed in four (4) years, the money that is coming from that existing millage that is used for operations in the Senior Citizens Center will have to be made up somewhere, and 2) since 2007 property values have declined, so when you take an existing millage applied against a diminishing property values the revenues generated decline; we don't know if the values are going to decline so we are trying to project the amount of revenue that is going to be generated on a 1 mil levy – it is very difficult to determine – if property values continued to decline from eight (8) to ten (10) to twelve (12) percent rate per year, but don't think that will happen. There may be another year or two decline but have to be close to the bottom and then work our way up to the top. But there could be a revenue shortfall and there is nothing that would prohibit the three (3) governmental entities from using General Revenues if they felt that was appropriate to maintain an existing level of funding to the operation, but would not be legally required to. The issue would have to be addressed at

some length in the governing document that is put together with the operation of the entity.

TWO METHODS OF FUNDING:

- 1) Going to commercial banks and borrowing the money and have a mortgage against the property or 2) bonding. In either case the governmental entities full faith and credit will be behind the debt. If everything went sideways, you would just shut down the operation and there wouldn't be any operational expenses and you would expect that the revenue generated from the millage along would be sufficient to pay the construction cost.

NOECKER mentioned the construction problems with the new Flushing City Hall and didn't want that to occur with the proposed Senior Wellness Center. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated that the proposed Senior Center would be a public building and bonded. The City did run into sufficient problems but eventually came out financially fine because it was bonded. The issue did take a lot longer and a lot more legal proceedings than it should have been to get to where they needed to be. There is risk to anything whether construction, or anytime you borrow money whether an individual or governmental entity. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** speaking as a township resident, not as an attorney, you can sit and do nothing or agree to accept some amount of risk, plan for every contingency that you can plan for and go forward. The question: "Does the Board make the decision and not allow it to go to the voters or do you let the voters make the decision as to what they want to do?"

NOECKER had nine (9) other concerns:

- Major inconsistencies in cost of the proposed center.
- Did anyone consider the Hamady Brothers Building which was recently torn down. What about leasing the Flushing Golf Course.
- Obama Care for all of us – how much more wellness care do we need or can we afford - being bombarded with wellness issues.
- Shouldn't we see a rise in local jobs and rising home values prior to raising a tax.
- Unfair method of taxation regardless of amount one would like to raise for whatever the cause. By putting as a millage, punish the widows who have a more expensive home compared to a smaller home because based on a millage instead of a special assessment. Special assessments would be the much fairer way to raise the money.
- According to State Law, township government cannot buy a box of Girl Scout Cookies, cannot sponsor a Little League Baseball Team in Flushing, so in a sense why sponsor a Senior Facility if we can't sponsor our grandkids.
- The Board has been rushed and hadn't had the time to really debate the issue. Where are the Boards priorities – police, roads, schools, or seniors?
- Alternative method to raise the money. Were told a month ago, there were 5,500 active users at the Center over the age of sixty (60) years of age, minimum age fifty (50) years of age. A lot of people are dealing with hard ships. If we could get ten (10%) percent of the 5,500, which would be 550 people, and each pay \$1,000 it would raise \$550,000 to get started with a very nice affordable project that wouldn't be in debt. There are other ways to tackle the issue.
- Gave his word to the voters "No New Taxes"! He has to stay true to his word.

4. **MINAUDO:** Karen gave a great presentation. After the presentation last time, he went out and spoke to a lot of people and the majority of the people, more than sixty-five (65%) of the people that he talked to were either not in favor of, didn't know about it, or were not interested in the center. The majority were age fifty (50) and up. If Minaudo voted to place the issue on the ballot in November, and it failed, he would never vote to put the issue on the ballot again. There has been a lot of work put into the project and felt the issue had been rushed, maybe not for the Center but for the Board. Everytime Minaudo has felt rushed and went forward with it, it always "bites him in the rear end." Minaudo's point is that the Center is doing a great job and wants the Center to continue to do a great job, wants the economy to get better,

wants everyone on the same page, and wants to do the project the correct way so that voters will approve it so there will be a great Senior Center. Right now, can't give the Center his vote.

5. **MATZKE:** agreed with Scott Minaudo but if the majority of the people don't agree with the project, they have the right to vote "no" on the project and it will go down; at least give the people the right to vote.
6. **PURKEY:** there isn't enough details in the brochure that was given out including never seeing a budget, the problem of the legal governance has been brought up, to say that Purkey had done "due diligence" would be incorrect as he hasn't had the information; Purkey has been knocking on doors and hasn't had one (1) person tell him they will back the millage; felt the project was too rushed.
7. **MORFORD:** by being a member of the Board she obtained some interesting facts – Clayton Township has seven (7) members on their Board, Flushing City has seven (7) members on their Council, and Flushing Township has seven (7) members on their Board. The Center is not asking the Flushing Township Board to vote "yes" or "no" to construct the building but asking to place the issue on the ballot so the public can vote.

COMMENTS FROM ATTORNEY PAT O'CALLAGHAN:

Attorney Moulton did an excellent job outlining the timing of the statute. One of the biggest issues is the McLaren lease that is going to be a major tenant. The statute itself is a brand new statute. Attorney O'Callaghan and three (3) other very fine lawyers reviewed the statute with something that the Governor is trying to encourage. From a timing standpoint want to express that the issue has to be voted at a General Election, keep the tenant, and still follow the statute. Not sure if the tenant will stick around for two (2) years. There is a letter of intent contingent upon the approval of placing the issue on the ballot by Flushing Township.

Attorney O'Callaghan has been in practice for twenty-eight (28) years; very confident that Attorney Moulton (Flushing Township), Attorney McKone (Flushing City), and Attorney Tucker (Clayton Township) will be able to put together a contract that will address many of the issues. The reason the contract wasn't done was because not sure if the issue would be placed on the ballot. An "iron clad" contract can be put together very quickly with the assistance of the other three (3) lawyers.

8. **PURKEY:** has anyone noticed how many times McLaren Hospital has changed their name; what is that all about? What happens when they sell the corporation to someone else, which happens all the time? **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated that if there is an existing lease agreement and an entity acquires McLaren, they take subject to that existing lease agreement. McLaren has been very aggressive in expanding its operations but it doesn't change its name; it has many subsidiaries and affiliates as it incorporates one particular facility that it acquires. Nationally, McLaren is very well regarded, but Attorney Moulton is not sure if he is in favor of the aggressive expansion in health care; there are always risks and the risk with McLaren would be minimum.
9. **PECK:** has discussed the issue with Karen Popovits who wanted no commitments or promises, but only wanted to present the case. Peck has placed on campaign signs and literature "No New Taxes" because he does not support new taxes; we need to live within our means. Personally, Peck feels that he does not have the right, as an official of the Board, to keep other residents of Flushing Township from having the right to vote for or vote against the issue. Peck has ask a lot of people what their feelings are regarding the new senior center and he receives one of two responses: 1) "what senior center", or 2) "I don't want it" to "we don't need it". This week thirty-one (31) people have called and voiced their support for the proposed center. Not sure if he will support the issue in November.

10. **NOECKER:** concerned about the kids and grandkids; most of the people in the room have had good jobs, Blue Cross forever, good paying jobs, vacations, nice pensions and retirements, and well cared for. With the exception of the children who have gone on and gotten very good college degrees, we all know how many young people with degrees in business or education don't have a job; has two (2) daughters that own houses in the township and neither has a corporate pension set up for them; one (1) doesn't have adequate insurance for her and her son; the burden putting on middle age children who are trying to buy houses and keep their heads above water, feels this tax is an unjust tax and even if there is more of us "gray hairs" than them, and even if we can out vote them, and get our selfish way again at their expense, says "shame on us".

"Ayes" (Yes) means to place on the ballot – "Nays" (No) means not to place on the ballot.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Matzke, Morford, and Peck

NAYS: Noecker, Minaudo, Purkey, Gardner

Motion Failed

1-c. Sheriff Department /Police Office Signs

NOECKER MOVED, seconded by Purkey to approve the \$795 cost for the new Sheriff signs.

DISCUSSION:

It was suggested to update the Web site with the new signs. The signs are beautiful but inappropriate; Fenton Township says "Genesee County Sheriff Substation"; Atlas Township says "Genesee County Sheriff"; Vienna Township says "Genesee County Sheriff"; the counties have Sheriff Departments not townships.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried

1-d. Stanley Road Chip and Seal

PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Morford to approve the \$46,030 which will take care of the increase for the chip and seal for Stanley Road.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried

1-e. Possible Amendment of Chapter 13 of the Code of Ordinances

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Noecker to approve Attorney Moulton to prepare possible amendments to Chapter 13 of the *Code of Ordinances*.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 7

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

1-f. Update of Ordinances for signs, pools, etc

PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Matzke to have Attorney Moulton review the Recreational Vehicles Ordinance and have the sign ordinance go before the Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION:

The sign ordinance should go back to the Planning Commission. Attorney Moulton will take care of the recreational vehicles issue; the issue regarding the site plan being sealed by an architect or engineer has also been discussed at the Planning Commission level.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 7

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

1-g. Longhorn Capital Advisors (Ed Taylor)

Ed Taylor and Brian Brown of Longhorn Capital Advisors gave a very interesting presentation regarding investments for Flushing Township. Two (2) packets were given out to the Board, which can be reviewed at the Board’s leisure, regarding the *Most Frequently Asked Questions* concerning Cash Management Strategies, Investment Advisories, and other concepts.

No action was taken on the presentation.

1-h. Approval of the Budget

PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to approve the Budget as presented.

DISCUSSION:

It was asked if the “Police Fund” should be changed to “Genesee County Sheriff” or “Police Protection”. The name of the line item will not change. There was a question regarding the line item for road repairs, but the line item is included in the budget.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLLCALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried

1-i. Ditching of Potter Road

SUPERVISOR PECK gave an update on the Township’s 60/40 funds which are restricted: 60/40 funds can be used for ditching; there are extensive ditching needs on Potter Road from Seymour Road almost to M-13 (Sheridan Road). The total cost is almost \$44,000; the Genesee County Road Commission (Road Commission) will pay \$17,500 (40%); Flushing Township will pay \$16,300.

Flushing Township gets \$17,900 as the forty (40%) percent for road repairs; after the ditching on Potter Road, there will be \$500 remaining in the fund. Currently, ditching is the biggest concern Flushing Township has because most of the roads have been repaired and there is great need to have the ditches done. Flushing Township only gets five (5) days free ditching. Most homeowners feel ditches are to drain their fields, sump pumps, etc. The ditches have one purpose and that is to take the water off the road. Four (4) things can happen to the water in the ditch: 1) evaporate, 2) drain to a local storm sewer, 3) sink in the ground, and 4) stay there forever. As long as the water is not on the road, the County is happy.

GARDNER felt the mowing of the ditches should be taken care of because it takes care of the saplings.

MOTION AND SECONDED to pay \$26,304.71 for the ditching of Potter Road from Seymour Road to M-13.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

None

REPORTS:

1. **Treasurer's Report:** As submitted.
2. **Additional items:**
 - a. Received a letter from a company wanting to purchase cell tower rights.
 - b. Other companies have tried to purchase the rights.
 - c. It was determined to not sell the cell tower rights at this time.
 - d. Attorney Legal Fees: Attorney Schultz - \$7,355.50 regarding arbitration/grievances; Fee for Arbitrator from Detroit – Township paid half and Union paid half = \$1,852.50 each

8:40 P.M. – OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS

Five (5) individuals gave their comments

8:50 P.M. - CLOSED FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS

BOARD COMMENTS:

1. **PURKEY:** there has always been a problem with the microphones. never worked;
2. **NOECKER:** due to the lawsuits, have been advised they can't talk; there is a very lopsided opinion in the newspaper; everything will come out in Court and it isn't as bad as it seems.
3. **MINAUDO:** there is a rebuttal regarding arbitration; don't believe everything that you hear; can't discuss the issue. The microphone issue has been addressed in the past but due to the high cost, nothing was done.
4. **GARDNER:** Three (3) quotes from the L.A. Times: 1) San Bernadine seeks bankruptcy protection; third city in less than a month to seek bankruptcy protection; the City can't be pay rolled over the summer; crisis has been in the works for years; elected officials wasted taxpayers money on transit projects and other non-essential issues; Gardner would rather be too fiscally conservative than to let something like the above happen. 2) wanted to remind everyone that we are a democrat republic. 3) thanked John Cuddeback for his comments during Public Comment time.
5. **MORFORD:** years ago checked into having individual microphones on each section of the credenza and it was too expensive; have tried to repair the microphones but nothing seems to work.
6. **GARDNER:** one of his early issues that Gardner was debating was the spending of \$500 to \$600 for drapes; he was the only "no" vote; simple thing do we need drapes or microphones; we want to build new infrastructure for the seniors but we are having crumbling infrastructure; focus on the basics; when everything has been repaired then focus on new things.
7. **SUPERVISOR PECK'S COMMENTS:**
 - a. Genesee County Health Plan: will be on the Agenda for next month to review.
 - b. Microphones: something will be done.
 - c. Benefits: in 2008, the current Board decided to eliminate their health care, and any other thing that could be cut. Wanted to give themselves a pay cut but was told they could not do that; the pay structure that was put in place has to stay until the current term is over. A Compensation Committee was formed – the Supervisor, Clerk, and Treasurer's wages

- will be cut twenty (20%) and the Trustees wages will be cut in half and if they do not attend a meeting, they will not get paid for the meeting.
- d. Trees: have cut fifty-four (54) trees to save money.
- e. Article in M-Live from Supervisor Terry Peck which was sent to the Flint Journal and also given to the Reporter.

To the Editor:

Might there be an election in Flushing Township this year?

I write to correct an outrageous article written by reporter Roberto Acosta and published on July 10, 2012. The article related to the decision of Flushing Township to eliminate its police department due to serious budgetary concerns. Those budgetary constraints are still affecting the Township, but to read the reporter's article, you would think otherwise. Let's set the facts straight.

First, let's talk about the reporter's methods. He spoke to NO ONE at the Township about this story. Not the Township Supervisor, whose picture he so prominently displayed in the article; not to the Township Clerk or Treasurer, who would have the facts; not to any of the members of the Township Board. Who did he talk to? The Union representative who has been challenging the Township Board's responsible action. It is unfortunate that the Township had to close its department and lay off its officers due to our budgetary problems, but what would you expect the union official to say? No wonder the story is flat out wrong.

Second, the reporter apparently did not read the part of the ruling by the arbitrator where he AGREED with the Township that property tax revenues for the police department had DECLINED from over \$1 Million in 2010 to just over \$800,000 (about 20%), and that the Township had an unfunded retirement liability left to it by a previous Board of almost \$3 Million. He also agreed that the Township had to BORROW money EVERY YEAR to run the police department and that, even though the police millage might raise enough to pay current expenses, "that is not to say the Township is without economic difficulty." In the end, what the arbitrator ruled was that even though the Township was in dire straits with its police department, he would not require some future police officers to bear the cost of the annual loans the Township needed for its department "because a prior Township Board apparently granted benefits which made the borrowing necessary."

Finally, the story would have you believe that someone ruled that the Township did have the money to operate its police department. Nothing is further from the truth and the reporter had no understanding of what he was being told by the former police officers' representative. The arbitrator's decision he was shown was from a dispute over what the terms for a police officers' contract should be IF THE TOWNSHIP EVER HAD A DEPARTMENT AGAIN. What the reporter did not see or recognize was that BEFORE this decision was ever issued, a wage freeze was imposed for 3 years, the use of part-time officers was allowed because the Township did not have enough money for full-time officers, a reduction in police pensions that were granted by a previous Board was accepted, a reduction in a huge sick leave bank was accepted, and 2 of the officers' 13 paid holidays were eliminated, ALL of which was intended to reduce the Township's costs for its police department, IF THE TOWNSHIP EVER HAD A DEPARTMENT AGAIN. Even with these reductions in cost, the Township did not have the money to operate its department on a day to day basis, a fact the reporter didn't read in the arbitrator's report.

Had the reporter bothered to ask, all of this could have been explained to him, but he never spoke to anyone at the Township before he ran a story about a decision that was released to the public on June 18, over three weeks ago! What was the rush?

Again, you have to ask: Is there an election in Flushing Township this year that this reporter got used for? Was this article fair and balanced? You decide.

THE NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING WILL BE THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE FLUSHING TOWNSHIP HALL.

ADJOURNMENT: PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Morford to adjourn at 9:08 p.m.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 7

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

JULIA A. MORFORD, Clerk

TERRY A. PECK , Supervisor

APPROVED DATE: _____

07/12/2012 Regular Min