

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 9, 2006 **TIME: 7:00 P.M.**
PHONE: 810-659-0800 **FAX 810-659-4212**
WEB PAGE: <http://www.flushingtowship.com>

ADMINISTRATION MEMBERS

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

TRUSTEES

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

TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY:

Steven Moulton of
Cooley Moulton & Smith
Attorneys at Law

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: 22 interested individuals

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

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA: FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Pratt to adopt the Agenda as presented. **MOTION CARRIED.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 12, 2006: REED MOVED, seconded by Liepmann to approve the Minutes of January 12, 2006 as presented.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION:

1. **FOTENAKES** inquired if the old secretary chairs referred to in the January 12, 2006 Board of Trustee Minutes (No. VIII, Board Comments) would be going to the Genesee County Auction. **MORFORD** stated she had contacted Lt. Don Gansen of the Charter Township of Flushing Police Department and he would be taking three (3) old secretary chairs to the Auction scheduled for Saturday, April 22, 2006.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF BILLS: FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to pay the bills as listed.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 **MOTION CARRIED.**

PUBLIC HEARING – 7:03 P.M. OPENED - Establishment of a Water Line on Stanley Road, 3,991 feet East of Johnson Road, Flushing, Michigan, to be known as Stanley Road Waterline No. 2006-1.

LIEPMANN stated the Public Hearing was a meeting of information to determine if the residents would like to continue with the installation of the waterline on Stanley Road from Johnson Road East to Elms Road. At the end of the Public Hearing, there would be a vote to determine the outcome of the matter - one vote per parcel.

REQUIREMENTS FOR A PUBLIC HEARING:

The Township Board of Trustees has received and accepted a petition signed by more than fifty (50%) percent of the parcel owners in the district. The Township, by law, is required to hold a Public Hearing to determine whether or not the waterline would be installed.

The Public Hearing Notice was published in the Flint Journal on January 29, 2006 and February 5, 2006 as required by State Statute. The Deputy Clerk signed an Affidavit certifying she had sent, on January 24, 2006, the Notice of Determination Hearing letter to all thirty-four (34) parcels in the proposed district.

LIEPMANN stated the Board of Trustees had nothing to do with the installation of the sewer line on Stanley Road which has caused the residents a lot of difficulty. The sewer line is being installed by the Genesee County Drain Commission. The Public Hearing is to discuss the waterline, not the sewer line, which the Board of Trustees cannot degenerate from the issue at a Public Hearing into the complaints about the sewer line.

ROUTE FOR THE PROPOSED WATER LINE:

The route is unusual. The valve to connect on Elms Road happens to be offset from Stanley Road. There is an easement from Mr. William Alexander's property to cut across his property, which will be a tremendous savings; this will eliminate going in another direction and putting in a new valve. The water line will be on the North side of Stanley Road for a distance (normally waterlines are on the South side of the road) because: 1) utilities are in the ground and the contractor does not want to work around, and 2) the Genesee County Drain Commissioner (Drain Commissioner) has required the waterline run on the North side, which will run to the Cattail Swamp Drain. The line will then cross under Stanley Road and remain on the South side of the road connecting to the valve at the South corner of Johnson Road. The line will be installed on the Genesee County Road Commission's right-of-way (ditch) as much as possible. There is very little space on the South side of the road that is within the boundary of the Road Commission; also easements would be required from everyone on the South side of the road.

DISTANCE OF THE WATERLINE:

The distance for the waterline would be approximately, 3,991 feet.

COST AND MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION REGARDING THE WATERLINE:

The cost of the waterline will be approximately \$238,000; or actual cost of \$58 per foot. The cost per parcel will be \$3,800 and can be paid over a ten (10) year period. Interest of up to eight (8%) is allowed to be placed on the assessment. Since the water fund is very solvent at the time, the current Board of Trustees has forgiven the interest on all assessment districts for the past three (3) years; the interest will also be forgiven for 2006. There is no guarantee of interest being forgiven in the future. The normal interest rate is ten (10%) percent per year, which would be \$380 per year for ten (10) years. The cost is then placed on the tax roll and paid when taxes are paid. The assessment could be paid over a ten (10) year period with or without interest depending upon the decision of the Board of Trustees each year. The cost could be paid up front or paid anytime during the ten (10) year period at simple interest.

CONSIDERATION FROM THE GENESEE COUNTY DRAIN COMMISSION'S OFFICE:

LIEPMANN stated the Drain Commissioner has offered to pay the tap-in fee of \$1,000 for each parcel, in the particular district, if the property owner connects to the waterline within one year after installation; and also to do the engineering for the project, which would normally cost \$26,000; the inspection is normally \$2 per foot or approximately \$8,000. Normally, the water line cost is between \$4,500 and \$7,800.

The permits have been let. In trying to get everything in order and done as quickly as possible, if approved at the current Public Hearing, all the engineering has been done and the permits approved. The construction would start as soon as possible.

RESTORATION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES:

Restoration is one of the most important things to deal with when it comes to installation of sewer/water lines. Fourteen hundred (1,400) feet from the Bowman Drain going East has been restored due to the installation of the sewer line. **LIEPMANN** stated that ten (10%) percent of the \$238,000 will be withheld from the contractor until restoration has been completed.

Because the contractor knew road restrictions would be going into affect soon, he placed his digging equipment in the Stanley Road area prior to the time the restrictions were to go into affect.

The pipe can be delivered to the contractor because the company is located on a primary road and the road restrictions will not affect the delivery. If the waterline is approved, he will deliver the pipe with his own pickup in order to get all the supplies to Stanley Road. The estimated completion time for the water line is two (2) to three (3) weeks, depending upon the weather.

OPENED TO THE AUDIENCE:

1. **Porn, 7292 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “is the tap-in, just for the tap-in to the water line?” **LIEPMANN** stated the tap-in fee, which the County is forgiving, is a fee for any property owner that is tapping into the proposed water line. The cost for tapping into the line is \$895, which includes the meter and the actual tap and has no affect on the side of the road the parcel is located. **PORN:** the resident is responsible for the tap-in to the house, which might be \$2,000 to \$2,500. **LIEPMANN:** it would depend upon how far you are located off the road. It is normally \$8 per foot. The resident is not required to hook into the water line. **PORN:** if he doesn't hook up now would the tap-in fee be waived? **LIEPMANN:** The resident has one (1) year to connect to the water line for the County to cover the tap-in fee. **LIEPMANN:** if the resident is on the opposite side of the water line, the \$895 would bring the waterline under the road and “stubs” (caps) the line. The cost for the homeowner will be from the “stub” to the home, not from where the actual water line is installed. The cost for the actual tap and the meter is the same for everyone regardless of which side of the road the resident resides and is taken care of by contract (through the County) with Steve's Plumbing and Heating. **PORN:** what are the current normal water rates? **LIEPMANN:** there is a monthly fee of \$10.60 and usage fee of \$1.77 per one hundred (100) cubic feet. The water bill generally runs approximately \$35 every two (2) months; the average water bill with two (2) to three (3) people in the home would be approximately \$32 to \$36 every two (2) months.

PORN: wanted to know the status of the water line from Port Huron. **LIEPMANN:** the issue would need to have the cooperation of Oakland and Lapeer counties and other entities including Saginaw. It has been in the works for several years. Flushing Township and most of the communities in Genesee County, over the past two (2) years, have all agreed that whatever the increase of water would be from Detroit, it would be passed through the system without any increase from the local entity.

PORN: had a new well put in several years ago and has plenty of water; if the well lasts another three (3) years and he decides to tap-in, he would have to pay \$1,000.

2. **Mike Nagel, 7080 Stanley, Flushing** – “are the wells going to have to be capped or can the residents keep their current wells operating. **LIEPMANN:** residents can keep their current wells but it has to be isolated from the house or at least from the water line. If a water failure should happen and the water pressure, coming from the road decreased, the well would kick on and the well water would back into the water line and contaminate the line – causing the whole water line to be re-chlorinated, which is very expensive.
3. **Spencer Ballard, 7321 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “one of the first things the contractors did with the sewer line was to sink a series of wells along the road to suck the water out to ease the installation.” **LIEPMANN:** there won't be any problems with the water line going in because the water line is between 48 and 56 inches deep.

4. **Phil Bleck, 7243 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “his well was ruined, but another well was put in and the Drain Commission stood behind the well; Blecks stayed in a hotel during the time of the problem.”
5. **Marion Nichols, 7329 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “she lives on the South side of the road; the residents have to trench the line to the house themselves? **LIEPMANN:** all the residents have to pay the \$895, which is the same cost for everyone; if the residents have the means to trench the ditch to the house, they are welcome to do so; certain specifications have to be met for the installation.
6. **Leslie Wonsey, 7103 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “just for clarity, beyond the \$3,800, there would be \$895, for the meter and tap-in; the responsibility to get the line to the house; and the monthly water charge. **LIEPMANN:** the specifications of the permit have to be followed and “Yes” that is all that is involved.
7. **Ulysses Singleton, 7306 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “is there a possibility the contractors will come back in two (2) or three (3) years and the residents will have to tap-in to the sewer.” **LIEPMANN:** the township can only pass ordinances that are backed by State Statutes; there are no State Statutes requiring residents to connect to the water. If a resident’s well went bad and the resident could not get another good well, the Health Department would require the resident to tap in. The township does not have any tap-in requirements.
8. “how come the residents are not getting sewer lines the same time as water lines?” **LIEPMANN:** the price for a sewer line is \$9,000 or \$10,000 a parcel, which is very expensive. The seventy-two (72) inch sewer line currently going in the middle of the Stanley Road is not a regular line - it is nineteen (19) to twenty-four (24) feet deep.
9. **Harley Schroeder, 7324 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “understands the people on Johnson Road are tapped into the high-pressure line.” **LIEPMANN:** the only high-pressure line in Flushing Township is on Coldwater Road across from the new Middle School; the line has been eliminated. (The line is an interceptor where all the sewer lines throughout the County are dumped into the line so that it can flow to the Montrose Sewer Treatment Plant.
10. **Marsha Lemmon, 7353 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “the construction would possibly start in two (2) to three (3) weeks.” **LIEPMANN:** everything depends upon the frost laws and when the one mile of pipe can be delivered. **LEMMON:** “does the work in the ditch have to be done at the same time. **LIEPMANN:** recommended waiting until the tap was in place where it should be before the work was done to connect to the house.
11. **Pat Gillespie, 7100 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “with the proposed water line, are the residents going to have to come in through their back yard.” **LIEPMANN:** there should not be any problem; the contractors will do about four hundred (400) feet of work a day, depending upon the weather. The contractor would be digging in the ditch and not in the road. The restoration will not be 100% complete now, but will wait until spring and come in and do the final finish by putting the seed down and covering with straw.
12. **Marsha Lemmon, 7353 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “will the installation of the waterline be in the bottom of the ditch.” **LIEPMANN:** generally the line is in the bottom of the ditch and the fire hydrants on the back side of the ditch. **LEMMON:** there are two (2) hickory trees planted on the edge of the yard at the top of the ditch; would like to have them saved. **LIEPMANN:** it depends upon where the trees are located; the contractors try to go around the trees.
13. “are the water line contractors going to be like the sewer contractors?” **LIEPMANN:** the contractor has done the last four (4) water lines for the township and has done such a good job and has been the lowest bidder, so the township has hired him as the exclusive contractor for the rest of the current Board of Trustees’ term. The contractor is located on Commerce Drive, Flushing, Michigan.
14. **Ulysses Singleton, 7306 Stanley Road, Flushing** – “how is the water line going to be installed as there is a lot of heavy equipment in the yard.” **LIEPMANN:** the equipment

will have to be moved as the water line contractors want to get in and out as quickly as possible.

LIEPMANN stated there is only one vote per parcel.

LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Elizabeth Hedrich, 7213 Stanley Road, Flushing **(08-13-200-005)**
“for” the water line.
2. James and Elizabeth Hedrich, 7223 Stanley Road, Flushing **(08-13-200-004)** – “for” the water line
3. John M. W. Hayek, 7266 Stanley Road, Flushing **(08-12-300-025)**
“against” the water line.
4. John M.W. Hayek, 7266 Stanley Road, Flushing **(08-12-300-024)**
“against” the water line.
5. Karen and David Rocker, 7132 Stanley Road, Flushing **(08-12-400-003)**
“against” the water line
6. Donnalee Young, 7067 Stanley Road, Flushing – **(08-13-200-011)**
“for” the water line.

THERE WERE 16 PARCELS REPRESENTED IN THE AUDIENCE.

	<u>IN FAVOR OF</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
	Hedrich	Hayek
	Hedrich	Hayek
	Young	Rocker
	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>
TOTALS	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>

LIEPMANN MOVED, seconded by Fotenakes that the township board approve the plans and cost estimates, the assessment amount of \$3,800 per parcel for the installation of a water line on Stanley Road from Elms Road to Johnson Road to be known as Stanley Road Water line #2006-1, and direct the Supervisor to prepare the Assessment Roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

LIEPMANN MOVED, seconded by Fotenakes that a Public Hearing is set, to set the Assessment Roll for 2006-1, to be duly published and letters be sent to all parcels within the proposed district. The date of the Public Hearing to be March 9, 2006 at the Flushing Township Hall. MOTION CARRIED.

LIEPMANN stated the purpose of the Assessment Roll Hearing would be to determine if someone felt they should not be assessed. The main reason to be exempt from the Assessment Roll would be if the waterline would not benefit the individual. (Benefit = whether the line is available to you).

7:42 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **Dan Kildee – Resolution Regarding the Genesee County Land Bank Authority Brownfield 2005 Amendment**

GENESEE COUNTY TREASURER DAN KILDEE (KILDEE), and also Chair of the County Land Bank Authority was in attendance to give a brief synopsis of the Genesee County Land Bank Authority Brownfield 2005 Amendment. **KILDEE** and his staff have been attending local government meetings to explain the Brownfield Development Plan

for all properties that have been taken. Flushing Township has one (1) vacant/residential parcel. There is stability of the real estate market in Flushing.

KILDEE stated that, under the new tax foreclosure law, the County has taken title to 4,400 pieces of property. With the assistance of former State Representative **JACK MINORE (MINORE)**, plans have been developed and new legal and financial tools to come up with a new approach to abandoned property.

The matter before every governmental body in the County, where property owned by the Land Bank is located, is an opportunity to include the property in a Brownfield Redevelopment Plan. It is the discretion of the local unit of government to choose to include the piece of property. The Plan would allow the property in question to benefit from Brownsville Tax Incurrment financing to do a number of activities to redevelop the property. Demolition, which would not be necessary in the particular case (one single vacant parcel), but site preparation, infrastructure improvement, title clearance, are all eligible activities.

KILDEE stated March 31, 2006 would be the next deadline for tax foreclosures. Under Michigan law since 2002, a uniform deadline for taxes that were due in the year 2003 would be going to Circuit Court and would be foreclosed if not paid. A very aggressive program is in affect to prevent tax foreclosures; 1,350 families have been prevented from loosing their property in the first four (4) years of the program due to the flexibility built into the law. The Plan could help people that are facing financial hardship and have been unable to pay their property taxes. The individual would be put on a payment plan, and by working with the individual, the taxes could get caught up to date. The Land Bank does the administering but had to rely on the Legislature to write the laws. (Jack Minore deserved a lot of credit).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM THE BOARD:

1. **LIEPMANN:** there would be no cost to the township.
2. **FOTENAKES:** would be able to work under the Plan with properties if needed.
3. **PRATT:** wanted **KILDEE** to review the money process loop and how the property is recaptured

KILDEE stated that typically the property would be a property that is tax foreclosed and required some improvement in order to get the property back on the market. Typically, demolition would be referred to where the Brownsville Redevelopment would finance the demolition of the structure by borrowing the money to demolish the property; redeveloping the property; and then capturing the tax from the redevelopment until the demolition has been paid off. There was an expansion under the legislation of the Brownsville Eligible Activity to include site preparation, cleaning, grading the property, preparation for development, and some infrastructure improvement if there should be a cost associated with connecting water and sewer which would become a Brownsville Eligible Activity. The main idea would be to make the properties, which are generally problematic properties, more easily developed.

KILDEE stated there would not be a cost to the Township, but in the sense that the Brownsville Eligible Activity (Brownsville) would not be asking for money. The township would not generate tax collecting until the debt has been paid off on the particular property. The townships would defer its collection until the Brownsville was able to pay off the cost of the cleanup of the property.

LIEPMANN MOVED, seconded by Fotenakes to approve the Brownsville Provision as provided by the County. **MOTION CARRIED.**

2. **First Reading of Ordinance to Amend Sections 12-62, 12-63, and 12-67 of the Code of Ordinances to Define “Junk” “Recreational Vehicles” “Recreational Items” and “Properly Stored”; To Require the Proper Storage of Junk, Recreational Vehicles, and Recreational Items; and to make Violation of Sections 12-61 through 12-66 a Misdemeanor**

ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON (ATTORNEY MOULTON) stated the Township has been trying to tighten up the “Junk Ordinance”; one person’s junk would be another person’s treasure. There have been situations in the township where the language of the existing Junk Ordinance gave the township the tools needed to obtain the results in the township in terms of keeping properties looking somewhat decent.

ATTORNEY MOULTON stated what is primarily being attempted would prohibit keeping junk out in the yard where it is visible and then in turn, define junk. The whole section of the ordinance that deals with the category of “junk motor vehicles” was not in view of the Board of Trustees, which had been fairly set out and did not need any changes. There are also provisions as to what needed to be done to “junk” motor vehicles.

In addition to expanding the definition of “junk” and setting out requirements to either getting rid of it or storing in fashion that is not visible from the road including category of “recreational vehicle,” “recreational items,” and defined “properly stored.” The ordinance would go beyond where it had been previously by expanding the definition of certain other types of “stuff” which the township is going to require be maintained and stored in the fashion, which the township had not previously required. Under the definition of “Recreational Items” things that would not be junk: bicycles, tricycles, sleds, sports equipment, toys, barbeque grills, lawn furniture those items not being currently used by the occupants of the premise but strewed across the front yard and remain in place day after day, week after week, would not give the township the authority to go in and insist those items be properly stored as defined. Stored means in a fashion so the item would not be visible from the public road.

The violation of the proposed amendments is deemed a misdemeanor instead of a civil infraction so that if there should be non-compliance, the township would be able to go into District Court on a misdemeanor and have a tool to enforce compliance more than just treated as a civil infraction. There had been a push about ten years (10) ago to go with civil infractions as opposed to misdemeanors. Every municipality had jumped on board but found the method had not worked. **FOTENAKES** wanted to know who would enforce the misdemeanor. The act could be investigated by anyone; the actual issuance of a criminal citation would generally come through the Police Department and then **ATTORNEY MOULTON** would handle the matter as part of the regular ordinance pre-trials held monthly on the pre-trial calendar at the Flushing District Court. The matter would not have to be treated as a separate case. **REED** wanted to know if the Supervisor, Treasurer or Police Department would purposely go out to look for certain violations or would action only be taken from complaints from neighbors? **TROTOGOT** said it would be both methods.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

- **FOTENAKES** inquired about the “recreational vehicle”. Years ago there was a problem with a bus on a farmer’s land; should the term be clarified more? **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the particular matter had been under the Farm Act.
- **PRATT** stated under the description of “junk”, would “any machinery” include a riding lawnmower that was not working? **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the list was not supposed to be all inclusive, just by way of example and the more general terms would be picked up by the things that are not specifically described.
- **PRATT** was concerned about “recreational vehicles” which included boats, jet skies, etc. Would there be any way to allow people to park on their driveway for seasonal use. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** referred to

page 2, paragraph 3, “kept in the rear lot of the parcel or on the driveway of the premises for a period not to exceed fourteen (14) days.” **PRATT** wanted to know if the vehicle could be kept on the property owner’s driveway during June, July, and August rather than fourteen (14) days. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated that when an ordinance or a State Statute is written, one of the things that has to be done is it could be deemed void because the issue isn’t specific. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated most of the issues arise when it is visible from the road; you can see what is located in the side yard, but generally not in the back yard. People have to have some place to store their vehicles. It could be stated that as long as the vehicle is kept in the rear or side yard and eliminate the front yard as a storage place. Most people do park their motor home in the driveway for a period of time, not necessarily permanent. **PRATT** wanted to know if a practical “seasonal use” not to exceed ninety (90) days such as June, July and August could be put into force where people do not have to take a huge boat, etc and haul it to the back yard outside of the usage time.

- **PRATT** was concerned about page 2, number 3, “kept in the rear lot of the premises in such a manner that same are not visible from any public road.” The statement could cause people to have to build a barn or face a \$500 fine. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated a boat was considered a recreational vehicle and did not have to be out of site, just in the rear lot.
- **REED** stated that sometimes the lawn or yard does not permit the individual to haul the vehicle to the back of the yard.
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** suggested changing the wording for page 2, number 3, “kept in the rear lot of the parcel or on the driveway of the premises for a period not to exceed fourteen (14) days” **to** “kept in the rear lot of the parcel or on the driveway of the premises for a period of appropriate seasonal use not to exceed ninety (90) days.”
- **PRATT** wanted to know if the Zoning Ordinance Section 20-413, *Storage in the Front Yard* would have any affect on the junk ordinance.
Section 20-413 states: “Nothing in this chapter shall permit the storage or parking of any vehicle or non permanent structure within the required front yard of any lot within a residential district, except that the parking of an operable passenger vehicle on a driveway located on private property shall not be prohibited”
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the Zoning Ordinance itself should not be interpreted to prohibit the parking of an operable passenger vehicle on a driveway and could not be construed. The scheme of the regulation that is being accomplished with the existing “junk” ordinance and the amendment would be under the general Police power; zoning is land use.

FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Liepmann to adopt an ordinance amending Sections 12-62, 12-63, and 12-67 of the existing ordinances and to make a violation of the existing ordinance a misdemeanor with the change to paragraph 3 as noted on the record at the Public Meeting. **MOTION CARRIED.**

3. Review of Possibility of allowing Innovative Web Development of Flushing, Michigan revamping the Web Page for Flushing Township

MORFORD has requested **RICK ZORN (ZORN)** of Web Site Development and Network Solutions come to the Board of Trustees Meeting and give a detailed layout of a proposed redesign of the current web page, which would bring the township up to speed and would also be more user friendly.

ZORN produced an ala carte type of quotation for such items as hosting the redesign, the search engine submission, and maintenance. The specific request involved a web site redesign estimate as well as a yearly or hourly billed maintenance program.

- Web Site Resign Estimate based on the current structure – of \$650.00
- Web Site Maintenance - \$360 per year or \$30.00 per hour
(Included in the maintenance are new pages, deletion of pages, added minute meetings, additions/deletions to content, etc. The only thing that is not included is another complete web site redesign).

LIEPMANN stated contractors were very interested in having the zoning ordinances on the internet.

The Township’s web page has been hosted through Genesee Free Net; **ZORN** would like to offer his services to host the web site due to the potential high volume of documents. **ZORN** offered to match the current hosting and charge but place on his service as to organizing and redesigning all the web sites on his server. The current URL would be changed from www.gfn.org/flushing/index.html to www.flushingtowship.com

PRATT wanted to know if the “old” minutes would be in an archive style format. **ZORN** stated there would be additional “pages” listed under a specific year of the minutes.

FOTENAKES inquired as to how the update of the web page would work. **ZORN** stated the redesign would be a one-time cost; the maintenance would be a yearly fee and would be a voluntarily renewal each year. The new domain name of www.flushingtowship.com would be \$8.95 per year. The search engine submission would be to get the township posted on various world wide search engines; not a placement service. The quote of \$99.95 for the Search Engine Submission would be a one-time cost. A link page could be added to the service. **LIEPMANN** stated the price would be \$1,205 for the first year which would be for the cost of \$360 (maintenance) plus \$8.95 (domain name) per year. The Policy Manual allows the Board to purchase anything under \$2,500 without taking bids and recommends to the Board that local vendors be used. **LIEPMANN MOVED**, seconded by Morford to employ Innovative Web Development to redesign the web page at a cost of \$650; approval of the web site maintenance on a yearly basis at \$360; \$99.95 to be included for the Search Engine Submission; and \$95 for the posting of the page for a total cost of \$1,205.

DISCUSSION:

REED wanted to know if there would ever be a point where the publication of minutes could be published on the internet instead of in the newspaper. **FORMER STATE REPRESENTATIVE JACK MINORE (MINORE)** stated there were (3) three pieces of legislation in the last three (3) years that has moved in that particular direction. Two of the pieces were: 1) one would allow bids on the net instead of having to publish request for bids and proposals; 2) one would allow public notices on the net, provided once a year you published where the meetings could be found – none of the legislation passed while **MINORE** was in office.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 **MOTION CARRIED.**

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1. Committee for the Review of the Code Enforcement Officer

TROTOGOT recommended forming a committee consisting of **MINAUDO, TROTOGOT, and REED** to review the job description and requirements of the Code Enforcement Officer. **LIEPMANN MOVED**, seconded by Fotenakes to approve the Committee consisting of **REED, MINAUDO, and TROTOGOT** to review the

requirements and job description of the Code Enforcement Officer. MOTION CARRIED.

2. Parks and Recreation Committee

LIEPMANN stated that DN West was the low bidder at \$152,290 for the improvements at the Flushing Township Nature Park. West previously has done work in the Nature Park and has an idea of what has to be done; West was also recommended by Rowe Engineering. **LIEPMANN MOVED**, seconded by Pratt to recommend the Board accept the low bidder of DN West for the Park improvements.

DISCUSSION:

FOTENAKES wanted to know the exact price of the bid. **LIEPMANN** stated that sixty-one (61%) of the cost would be paid by the grant. **REED** wanted to know if anyone had considered bringing water back to the Park; the water line is considered in the grant.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

3. Selling of Generator and Pumps

LIEPMANN stated the generator and the pumps have been sold to Fenton Township for a total of \$12,000; the two (2) pumps were sold for \$4,500.

VI. REPORTS:

1. Building Inspector's Report: FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to approve the Building Inspector's Report. MOTION CARRIED.

BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED:

NEW HOMES	1
ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	0
DECKS	0
REMODELING	1
ADDITIONS	0
GARAGES	0
FENCE PERMITS	0
ROOF REPAIR	0
POOL	0
COMMERCIAL	0
SIGN	0
TOTAL PERMITS ISSUED	
	2
PERMIT VALUATION FOR JANUARY 2005	\$ 36,860
PERMIT VALUATION FOR JANUARY 2006	244,370
PERMIT FEES COLLECTED FOR JANUARY 2006	
	\$ 1,223
TRAILER INSPECTIONS	250
TRASH AND RECYCLING CHARGES	0
SPECIAL USE PERMIT	50
HOME OCCUPATION PERMIT	0
EARTH REMOVAL PERMIT	0
VARIANCE REQUEST	0
REZONING REQUEST	0

CODE BOOKS	0
FOR A TOTAL OF	\$ 1,523
CONSTRUCTION TO DATE JANUARY 2005	36,860
CONSTRUCTION TO DATE JANUARY 2006	244,370
FOR AN INCREASE OF	\$ 207,510

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

OPENED AT 8:45 P.M.

1. **FORMER 49TH DISTRICT STATE REPRESENTATIVE JACK MINORE (MINORE)** was in attendance to announce he was a candidate for the 27th District State Senate position currently held by Robert Emerson. The district consists of all of Flushing Township, extends along the west side of Genesee County from Montrose to the Linden/Fenton area.

During his six years in the House, he made a practice of attending as many local government meetings as possible. He found attending the meetings was very useful to get an idea of not what just the elected officials were thinking, but also what citizens were thinking about. **MINORE** passed out calendars with his home telephone number on the back; if there should be any questions regarding his (Minore's) campaign or any other issues, individuals should feel free to contact him.

MINORE stated he and **TROTOGOT** had been attending a lot of meetings concerning the Drain Commission and the SWPPI (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Initiative). **MINORE** is currently the Executive Director of the Flint River Watershed Coalition (Coalition). He encouraged municipalities to become a member of the Coalition; a lot could be done in perspective of assisting the education particularly with the SWPPI. No place has more at stake with the Flint River than Flushing Township.

MINORE stated a citizen had raised the issue of what would happen if Flint took water out of the Flint River to use for drinking water. Currently, the City of Flint adds about 20,000,000 gallons of water on average per day to the River; in Flushing Township the water sometimes gets low. If the 20,000,000 gallons from Lake Huron went into the Flint River Watershed, at the Flushing plant, that would reduce the flow dramatically; if there were any sewage spills or anything similar, the flow might be so bad there would not be enough flow to carry it down the river. **MINORE** encouraged everyone to keep an eye on the issue as it may come up soon in the City of Flint. The water could be taken out of the River and made potable but for the City of Flushing, Flushing Township and Montrose, it would be a concern as far as habitat, Township Nature Park, and the flow.

PRATT inquired as to sewage overflows? **MINORE** stated that during the length of time the current Drain Commissioner has been in office, he has reduced about eighty-five (85%) or ninety (90%) percent overflows. **MINORE** stated the Drain Commissioner has made a lot of changes as far as increasing pumping station capacities, and in reducing some bad spots where there have been problems. There have been innovations in design for new developments as to what has to be done to connect into the lines especially with subdivisions, not just the lines in new developments but actually where the line would be going.

REED wanted to know the other candidates for the Senate Position: Jack Minore, John Gleason, and Candy Curtis with additional rumors of two (2) or three (3) other individuals. **TROTOGOT** stated the individuals now serving could not announce they are a candidate until a particular date. **MINORE** stated that judges could not make a

declaration of candidacy, but **MINORE** has announced his candidacy and he did serve six (6) full years in the House.

VIII. BOARD COMMENTS:

1. **FOTENAKES** stated, at the 2006 MTA Conference, she had talked to a vendor that designed web pages with a system to where if something was filed and if the item needed to be retrieved at a later date, it would remind you. It would be a great program to have.

2. **MINAUDO** wanted to know if there was a change in procedure for placing an item on the Agenda. There had been certain items that he had ask to have placed on the Agenda, but the items were not on the Agenda. **TROTOGOT** ask which items – **MINAUDO** advised two (2) items referencing the Code Enforcement Officer. **MORFORD** stated her office door was always open for items that needed to be placed on the Agenda.

3. **TROTOGOT** would like permission from the Board to send out a flyer to the community detailing road problems in Flushing. Located on the back of the flyer, are four (4) questions that would allow the residents to make a decision. Quotations ranging from \$690 to \$2,200 have been received for the printing but have been with different aspects. **TROTOGOT** will return to the printing companies to get quotes with all the same specifications. The flyer would be on cardboard stock with a perforated bottom portion to where the resident would be able to tear the portion and send back to Flushing Township. The postage would be \$525 for mailing to 3,500 homes. The total cost would be approximately \$1,100 with \$600 for printing, folding/perforation and tabbing and about \$585 for the mailing which would be approximately \$1,200. **PRATT** wanted to know if there would be a “catch phrase” on the flyer that would attract a person’s eye when the flyer was received. **FOTENAKES** felt there should be “action” or “catch” word on the flyer. **PRATT MOVED**, seconded by Fotenakes to send the road flyers out at a cost of \$1,200

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

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

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business matters, Supervisor Trotogot adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Julia A. Morford, Clerk

Andrew Trotogot, Supervisor

APPROVED DATE: _____

02/09/06 Regular