

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN  
TOWNSHIP BOARD REGULAR MEETING - **APPROVED** -  
5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198  
853-4000, Town Hall Room  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2006, **6:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting, Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra (6:04 PM), Woiwode  
ABSENT: None  
STAFF: Township Manager Gerald Richards, Director of Community Planning & Development Mark Kieselbach, Director of Engineering & Public Works Ray Severy, Police Chief Dave Hall, EMS/Fire Chief Fred Cowper, Personnel Director/Assistant Manager Paul Brake, Attorney Michael Woodworth

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the meeting to order at 6:02.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Supervisor McGillicuddy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the roll of the Board.

4. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened Public Remarks.

Janet VanGorder, 2370 Sapphire Lane, East Lansing, requested the Board give consideration to the names of Virginia White and Carlene Webster as a tribute to these two women when dedicating any land, building, park, etc.

John Anderson, 215 W. Newman, Okemos, spoke concerning Liaison for Inter Neighborhood Cooperation (LINC) and its position on community issues.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed Public Remarks.

5. REPORTS/BOARD COMMENT/NEW WORRIES

A. Board Policy 5.1, Commission Accountability – Annual End of Year Reports by the Zoning Board of Appeals, Planning Commission, Land Preservation Advisory Board, Park Commission, Meridian EDC, and DDA.

Pat Jackson, Chair, Planning Commission, expressed appreciation to the Planning staff and noted the Planning Commission sought to bring consistency and stability to the Wardcliff community through extensive rezoning of the area. The Commission conducted various levels of plat review as well as Section 9 reviews for more than 200 acres of Land Preservation purchases. The compilation and recommendation of the approval of the 2007-12 Public Improvement Program (PIP) was undertaken and the Planning Commission reviewed and commented on the East Lansing and Williamstown Township Master Plans. Presentations by the Ingham County Road Commission, Ingham County Parks, and Clerk Helmbrecht on Land Preservation were hosted. Most recently, a special study of the Okemos Village area as called for in the 2005 Master Plan was initiated.

Jim Hershiser, Chair, Zoning Board of Appeals, expressed appreciation to the Planning staff for its hard work. He stated a decline in the number of meetings indicate the Township's ordinances are not over restrictive and the number of applications continue to decrease. Chair Hershiser expressed concern with the yearly increased percentage of applicant approvals while recognizing that the Planning staff screens and works with the applicants to accommodate their requests without the need for variances. He requested an accredited training class endorsed by the Michigan Townships Association (MTA) for the Zoning Board of Appeals members some time next year.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 21, 2006 \*Approved\*

Eckhart Dersch, Chair, Park Commission, expressed appreciation to the volunteers who help within the park system, Harris Nature Center, the Meridian Historical Village, etc., specifically indicating the Meridian Garden Club, Friends of Harris Nature Center, Kiwanis and the Boy Scouts. He also applauded the Parks and Recreation Director and staff for the success of the many parks program as well as the maintenance staff.

The Park Commission currently oversees sixteen (16) parks and eight (8) natural areas on 800 acres of land in the system. Noted accomplishments include: 1) Finalized 2006-2010 Five Year Park Plan; 2) Innovative plans for Orlando and Wonch Parks; 3) Expansion plans for the Harris Nature Center; 4) Oversight function for the Farmers Market (vendors grossed over \$500,000 during the summer); 5) Accessibility of Brattin Woods Park; 6) Towar Rain Gardens storm water storage area, and  
7) Development of a special events policy for park users.

Paul Brake, Executive Director of the Okemos Downtown Development Authority (DDA), stated the DDA's purpose. Progress this year included development of the Tax Increment Financing and Development Plan; Board approved tax sharing agreement with Ingham County, input on the Master Plan development of the Wonch Park and community enhancement projects.

Gerald Richards, Chair of the Meridian Economic Development Corporation (EDC), gave an overview from a prepared list of activities and projects initiated by the Meridian EDC.

[Prepared list in Official Minute Book]

Clerk Helmbrecht, Vice-Chair, Land Preservation Advisory Board, gave an overview of the Land Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) activity. She showed a map on the overhead projector of land preservation parcels acquired to date, which total nearly 500 acres. Clerk Helmbrecht noted the properties contain some of the most beautiful environmentally sensitive natural feature areas within the Township. She also displayed a sample of the signs on the overhead projector which will be placed on the natural areas which have been purchased by or donated to land preservation.

6. APPROVAL OF AGENDA — OR CHANGES

**Trustee Brixie moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Seconded by Trustee Such.**

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

Supervisor McGillicuddy reviewed the consent agenda.

**Trustee Such moved to adopt the Consent Agenda with the following amendment:**

- **Amend the motion for Agenda Item #7D by striking the word “the” after “sign” and inserting the word “an”**

**Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

**Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:**

- **Agenda Item #7B: Amend page 5 of the Minutes of November 9, 2006 by inserting the words “City of East Lansing” alphabetically into the heading for Agenda Item #11B**

**The amendment was accepted by the maker and seconder.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

The adopted Consent Agenda items are as follow:

A. Communications

- (1). Board Determination (BD)

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 21, 2006 \*Approved\*

- 9C/11D-1 Leonard Silverman, OD, 2080 Hamilton Road, Okemos; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-2 Patrick Corr, Corr Commercial Real Estate, 5944 Buttonwood Drive, Haslett; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-3 Bill Mory, Meridian Sun Golf Club, 1018 Haslett Road, Haslett; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-4 Martin J. Furey III, 5164 Madison Avenue, Apt. B6, Okemos; RE: Proposed lighting ordinance and opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-5 Teresa Kenaga, 5613 Cornell Road, Haslett; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-6 Noel S. Walker, 4411 Wausau, Okemos; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-7 Gina Farnelli, 1551 Forest Hills Drive, Okemos; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-8 Noel S. Walker, 4411 Wausau, Okemos; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
  - 9C/11D-9 Tyler D. Tennent, Dawda, Mann, Mulcahy & Sadler, 39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills; RE: Second supplement to Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.'s application for amendment to Special Use Permit #99091
  - 9C/11D-10 Sean Quinn, 2070 Lagoon Drive, Okemos; RE: Opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091(Wal-Mart), request to add 49,427 square feet and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive
- (2). Board Information (BI)
- BI-1 James and Karen Carlson, 2672 Rockwood Drive, East Lansing; RE: Opposition to Rezoning #06090 (Meridian Four Seasons)
  - BI-2 Baxter Webb, 5938 Park Lake Road, East Lansing; RE: Ability for Michigan citizens to vote by mail
  - BI-3 Carl Harmon, Vice-President, LINC, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Annexation Recommendations
- (3). Regional Linkage (RL)
- RL-1 John W. Midgley, Managing Director, Ingham County Road Commission

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 21, 2006 \*Approved\*

(ICRC), 301 Bush Street, Mason; RE: Reduction in ICRC services to Meridian Township

RL-2 Ingham County Road Commission, 301 Bush Street, Mason; RE: Adopted abandonment resolution for Zephyr Drive

(4). Staff Communication/Referral (SC)

SC-1 Michigan Townships Association Legislative E-Report, November 3, 2006 Edition

SC-2 Michigan Townships Association Legislative E-Report, November 10, 2006 Edition

(5). On File in the Clerk's Office (OF)

Material received at the November 9, 2006 Board Meeting

Will Tyler White, 4695 Okemos Road, Okemos; RE: Mixed Use Planned Unit Development Traffic Study Requirement

Pat Lindemann, Ingham County Drain Commissioner, 707 Buhl Avenue, Mason; RE: Towar Rain Garden Drains 2007 Awards Entry by the Michigan Association of County Drain Commissioners (MACDC)

**Trustee Such moved that the communications be received and placed on file, and any communications not already assigned for disposition be referred to the Township Manager or Supervisor for follow-up. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None  
Motion carried unanimously.

B. Minutes

**Trustee Such moved to approve and ratify the minutes of the November 9, 2006 Regular Meeting as amended. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None  
Motion carried unanimously.

C. Bills

**Trustee Such moved that the Township Board approve the Manager's Bills as follows:**

Common Cash	\$ 155,882.91
Public Works	\$ 296,059.31
Public Safety Bldg Debt Fund	
CK 1102-Bank of New York/Bond Fees	\$ 250.00
Total Checks	\$ 452,192.22
Credit Card Transactions	\$ 12,793.30
Total Purchases	\$ 464,985.52
ACH Payments	\$ 290,682.47

**Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None  
Motion carried unanimously.

[Bill list in Official Minute Book]

- D. Intergovernmental Agreement Governing Access to Geographic Information System Databases  
**Trustee Such moved that the Township Manager be authorized to sign an intergovernmental agreement governing access to Geographic Information System Databases on behalf of Meridian Township. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
 McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
 NAYS: None  
 Motion carried unanimously.

- E. Amendment to the 2007 Fee Schedule  
**Trustee Such moved that the Meridian Township Summary of Fees – 2007 attached to the memo from the Finance Director dated November 11, 2006, be approved as presented. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
 McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
 NAYS: None  
 Motion carried unanimously.

- F. Liquor License Transfer, Mango’s Mexican Restaurant, LLC  
**Trustee Such moved to approve API Park Lake Properties, LLC and Mango’s Mexican Restaurant, LLC (co-licensees) application to transfer ownership of escrowed 2005 Class C licensed business with Dance-Entertainment Permit, for a business located at 5900 Park Lake, East Lansing, Michigan, Meridian Township, Ingham County, Michigan, from Park Lake Management Co., LLC to the Co-licensees listed above, and further authorize the Township Clerk to execute the resolution for local approval of this transfer. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
 McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
 NAYS: None  
 Motion carried unanimously.

- G. Assessing Stipulation  
**Trustee Such moved that the Township Assessor be authorized to sign a stipulation with Eric R. and Carolyn A. Eggenberger on the following property:**

YEAR	DOCKET NO.	ADDRESS OF PROPERTY	
2005/2006	0316313	6035 E Lake Drive, Haslett, MI	
<u>Assessment</u>	2005	<u>AV \$400,000</u>	<u>TV \$400,000</u>
<u>Assessment</u>	2006	<u>AV \$456,000</u>	<u>TV \$413,200</u>
<u>Proposed Assessment</u>	2005	<u>AV \$350,000</u>	<u>TV \$350,000</u>
<u>Proposed Assessment</u>	2006	<u>AV \$362,000</u>	<u>TV \$361,550</u>

Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
 McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
 NAYS: None  
 Motion carried unanimously.

H. Ratify Police Officer Appointments

**Trustee Such moved ratification of Edward Mark Besonen II and Brandon Michael Sredzinski to the position of Police Officer contingent upon successful completion of those items stipulated in the conditional offer of employment. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

I. Fire Department Chaplain

**Trustee Such moved to authorize the Fire Department to name Reverend Rick Stacy as Chaplain of the Fire Department. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

J. Budget Amendment, General Fund (Replacement of PSB A/C Condenser)

**Trustee Such moved that the 2006 General Fund budget be amended to add \$27,000 to the Capital Outlay Account (#101-900.901-974-000) for replacement of the condenser on the Public Safety Building air conditioner. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

8. QUESTIONS FOR THE ATTORNEY (See Agenda Item #9C, #10A, #11D)

9. HEARINGS

A. Herron Creek Sanitary Sewer Special Assessment District #50

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened the public hearing at 6:43 P.M.

Director Severy summarized the proposed sanitary sewer special assessment district as outlined in staff memorandum dated November 17, 2006.

Supervisor McGillicuddy asked if any of this was part of the payback district for the Neilson sewer extension that was at Hagadorn and Mt. Hope.

Director Severy responded that he would check and see if that was the case.

Trustee Brixie inquired as to who would be financially responsible for the elimination of the school lift station.

Director Severy responded that was part of the assessment district so the developers would be responsible. The Director has met with the school for input on where the sewer easement would be located.

Trustee Brixie added that she understood the Township was trying to move away from lift stations toward gravity sewer systems. She inquired if there had been exploration to connect a different way and some form of a gravity system could be implemented.

Director Severy responded that it has been looked at. He stated the reason that there is a lift station at Bennett Woods is because there is no way to connect the school by gravity to the existing sewers on Bennett Road. He stated the design is being looked at to make the lift station deep enough to extend north on Hulett some time in the future to eliminate the lift station on the east side of Hulett Road. The property to the south belongs to the City of Lansing and it is serviced by a lift station because the entire area is low and can't be served by a gravity system.

Trustee Veenstra inquired if the petitioners are still in support of the project despite the cost increase.

Director Severy responded that the Township had recently met with the developer and the petitioners who were both in agreement with the concept.

Trustee Brixie asked if the design was such that the lift station on the east side of Hulett Road could be eliminated, who would pay for that.

Director Severy stated it would be a Township cost.

#### PUBLIC

Scott Fairmont, 4429 Apache Drive, Okemos, and managing partner of Champion Woods, LLC, stated that the Board approved PUD has 83% of the site left in its natural condition and 90 % of the site will remain green. The developer took on the engineering to ensure that it would work as there are two significant wetland areas across the Sturk property. The Ingham County Drain Commissioner required the sewer to be five (5) feet below the ICDC ditch, which made the Herron Creek sewer too low to be gravity fed. The lift station can be placed on high ground and directional boring used under the wetland which goes under the Herron Creek Drain. This method would have no impact on any of the wetlands for the sewer.

Mr. Fairmont stated Champion Woods, LLC has agreed to pay its entire share of the assessment district with the first bill.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed the public hearing at 6:56 P.M.

- B. Wetland Use Permit #06-11 (White Family), 6200 Pine Hollow Drive  
Supervisor McGillicuddy opened the public hearing at 6:56 P.M.  
Director Kieselbach summarized the wetland use permit request as outlined in staff memorandum dated November 17, 2006.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed the public hearing at 7:00 P.M.

- C. SUP #06-99091 (Wal-Mart, Inc.), request to add 49,427 sq. ft. and a drive-through pharmacy to existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive  
Supervisor McGillicuddy opened the public hearing at 7:00 P.M.  
Director Kieselbach gave a brief overview of the special use permit request as a continuation of the public hearing from October 17, 2006.

#### APPLICANT

John Mucha, Dawda, Mann, Mulcahy, & Sadler, 39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills, introduced Nick Miller, Nick Infante, Damon Garrett, Frank Duff and Roger Walther.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: I really don't have a formal program or presentation here to make this evening. We have been here several times, as everyone knows. In response to questions at the last hearing, we provided responsive information; I believe you have that. We also requested at the October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting that if there were any additional questions, comments, concerns or recommendation, we would welcome getting them sometime between the 17<sup>th</sup> and today. What we did receive, as Mr. Kieselbach indicated, was comments from the groundwater consultant which did not require any sort of response. We also received comments from the traffic consultant and we did meet last week. Mr. Walther and others met with him last week and they will, in a moment here, give you a little summary of what that discussion was all about.

Other than that, I think we believe we've addressed the questions that have been presented to date. We're here to try to work with you and to try to get your recommendations, your suggestions, your direction to help this process conclude. With that, I will turn things over to Roger and to Damon. They can talk briefly about the traffic.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE GARRETT: Just a brief explanation of our meeting Friday. There had been some questions that were in the November 14<sup>th</sup> correspondence from the Township traffic consultant that we wanted to address with regards to traffic generation for our proposed expansion. We sat down, as you know, and we went through that. We agreed to adjust our methodology to incorporate what Mr. Savage was suggesting, which would result in an additional 266 trips (which was more than what we projected). Since then, we have taken that information, put it back into the model, and concluded that the proposed traffic signal and right turn lanes on Marsh and Central Park and Central Park and Times Square would be adequate to mitigate our proposed expansion. We haven't had time to get all of those numbers to Mr. Savage, but we wanted to lock down the methodology so that we are on the same page.

That's all I have to say in regards to traffic. If you want more of a detailed explanation and numbers, we do have Roger here who can provide that.

BOARD MEMBER: Was there somebody else going to speak for Wal-Mart tonight? Is this it?

ROGER WALTHER: Thank you Madam Supervisor, and members of the Board for allowing me to speak. Damon's basically synopsized very well what went on when we did meet. I want to thank your staff, by the way, and Mr. Savage, your consultant, for meeting on such short notice. We appreciate that very much on their behalf.

As Damon indicated, we have started the process of adding to the number of trips; your consultant's suggestion of 266 trips. We are in the process right now; the initial numbers, we are starting to see those. We feel very comfortable that, with those higher trips, we can accommodate those with the changes that Damon outlined and with some signalization timing changes as well. The reason we are not prepared to provide those to you tonight is that they are going through our quality assurance/quality control process to make sure that what we input is correct and what has been calculated is correct. Shortly we will prepare a technical memorandum which we will provide to Wal-Mart for their use and eventually, likely for your consultant's and staff's review.

Thank you.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Just very briefly. In the packet that you received, the bound information that we provided (the responsive information), there are a number of sheets in there, some of which admittedly did not print out real clearly or real dark. I think that's because the color of the original text was fairly light, so I have some additional color copies here that are much more legible. I will make them available to the Board and make them part of our submission package so that you have the ability to read that without having to strain your eyes.

PUBLIC

Fred Buehler, 1448 West Grand River, Okemos, spoke in opposition to SUP #06-99091 (Wal-Mart).

Leonard Provenchur, 5824 Buena Parkway, Haslett, expressed appreciation for the Board's endurance, citizen input and HOM-TV coverage on the Wal-Mart special use permit. He believed the Board has a responsibility only to the Township's residents.

Nikki Hart, Vice-President, Meridian Futures Coalition, 2717 E. Grand River, Lansing, expressed appreciation to the Board and read from a prepared list of Board questions allegedly not answered by Wal-Mart representatives. She also submitted postcards from Township residents in opposition to the proposed Wal-Mart expansion.

[Prepared list in Official Minute Book]

Carolyn Baumgart, 425 Iriquois, Prudenville, read from a prepared list of questions regarding the Carlson & Associates Study. She noted that the Oriental Mart, Latte Market and Foods for Living were not included in the Carlson study.



CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 21, 2006 \*Approved\*

Ms. Baumgart also read a prepared statement from Bob Blakeman, 5607 White Ash Lane, Haslett, in opposition to SUP #06-99091 (Wal-Mart)

Joan Guy, 1083 Woodside Drive, Haslett, stated one of the suggestions in the zoning ordinances relative to the definition of the purpose of a SUP is that certain uses may have a negative effect on adjacent land uses as well as the health, safety and general welfare of the community. She believed Wal-Mart's proposal, as presented, does not meet many of the standards specified in this section of the ordinance (i.e., compatibility with the Master Plan, the lack of factual evidence that the project will not result in adverse impact on the natural resources, the Township resources for public safety, water and sanitation and on the economic health of the current business community).

Ms. Guy added she thought there was a tendency in the Township to treat residents who live in multiple housing different from single-family residential when the issue of the impact on the surrounding neighborhood is considered.

Jean Nicholas, 6232 Brookline Court, East Lansing, read from a prepared statement in opposition to SUP #06-99091 and showed photographs to allegedly support the points contained in her statement.

[Prepared statement in Official Minute Book]

Roger Fowler, 4181 Indian Glen Drive, Okemos, spoke in support of controlled development and urged the Township Board to have the courage to make the "correct" decision.

John Anderson, 215 W. Newman, Okemos, urged the Board to deny Special Use Permit #06-99091. He expressed concern over the alleged increase in traffic which would be generated by the proposed expansion.

Richard Baumgartner, 1064 Cliffdale, Haslett, expressed concern regarding safety within the Wal-Mart store and the proposed signal on Marsh and Times Square Drive.

Bruce Reisen, 2900 Northwind, #525, East Lansing, read from a prepared statement in opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091.

Leonard Silverman, 4085 Shoals, Okemos, read from a prepared statement in opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091.

Jeffrey Persico, 4451 Satinwood, Okemos, read from a prepared statement in opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091.

[Prepared statement in Official Minute Book]

Donald Twohy, 2202 Haslett Road, East Lansing, spoke in opposition to Special Use Permit #06-99091.

Carl Harmon, 1924 Birchwood, Okemos, commended the Board for its careful consideration of this special use permit request. He stated there would be community support should this request be denied and the applicant exercise its legal option.

John Frost, 1621 Dobie Circle, Okemos, expressed concern with increased traffic and citizen safety should this special use permit request be approved.

Richard Heisey, 2055 Sheldrake Avenue, expressed appreciation for additional public information presented during this public hearing.

Bill Leveque, owner, G & W Maytag, 4661 Okemos Road, Okemos, expressed concern for the local small business owner should this special use permit request be granted.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Madam Chairman, and members of the Board, we sit here and have sat here patiently, and we respect all of the comments that we've received. No one is here to try to bully or intimidate or to push. We are here trying to present information, get questions from the Board and answer your questions. Legally, we are not obligated to answer the questions of each individual resident nor would we be capable of standing here today before you and, off the cuff, provide information that would be meaningful or reliable. This has been a long and tedious process; we recognize all that. It has not been easy for anyone and we understand the intensity that the local community has about this issue. But we want to be treated fairly, as much as anyone wants to be treated fairly at these kinds of hearings. We want the opportunity to be evaluated as other businesses have been evaluated when they've come before you for special use permits. We don't want to have criteria applied to us that hasn't been applied in the past.

We believe that...let me just say from personal experience, I appear at many, many different boards. I see a variety of different characters of Boards, different personalities, if you will, at these Boards. Most of the Boards that I appear at are very eager to provide questions and recommendations. They usually work with the applicant. Believe it or not, there are many communities where Wal-Mart is very welcomed. We don't seem to have the same kind of antagonism that we have here. But, my purpose here is not to lecture. My purpose is to simply say we are here to try and answer your questions, to deal with your recommendations in a very constructive manner. We welcome you presenting us with those questions, and we will try to give you as much information as we can provide you within the confines of the SUP criteria that you have. I'm not here trying to be anything other than cooperative and I think that's the message I want to convey most of all. We want to be cooperative, we want to provide you with the information, we will work with you just as we have worked with your planners and consultants. I guess with that, we're willing to listen to any further questions that you may have so that we can attempt to respond.

Previous special use permit applications with limited hours of operation: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

Q. At our last meeting, we tried to clear-up with Wal-Mart this question of previous special use permit applications where we required limited hours of operations and where we were also provided with market analyses. After reading through their current supplement, there's some legal "mumbo jumbo" in here. I'm just wondering is there anything that we need to do as part of the public hearing to explain to them that there were these previous cases which we talked about at the previous meeting?

A. I think the applicant is fully aware, of course, of the procedural history that underlies this matter. The fact that it comes out of the settlement agreement, is a product of litigation and that we're looking at the same criteria that would apply to any other applicant.

BOARD MEMBER: These may sound picky, but when I read this, it felt like postering versus facts. I wanted to clarify for the record some of the statements that are made in here that are just not accurate. The October 20<sup>th</sup> FOIA which is represented in here to have been sent on October 20<sup>th</sup>...it was received in the Clerk's office on October 30<sup>th</sup>. In trying to clarify why the letter said the 20<sup>th</sup> and we received it on the 30<sup>th</sup>, I called UPS to find out why it took ten (10) days to get it. UPS did not receive it until October 27<sup>th</sup>, so the implication in here that we sat on this FOIA and did not respond to it is just inaccurate. We did not receive it until October 30<sup>th</sup> and the law firm was made aware of that the minute I figured out why it took ten (10) days to get it.

The other thing (and I think maybe this is what Julie was referencing), it is my understanding as fact that the Farmer Jack file was specifically handed to those who came up to the Township and it was specifically noted that that was the file that had the limited hours on it, and the request was made that any pages you want copied out of that file, please ask us. There was no request for copying one single page out of that specific file that was pointed out to them. It further says they have still not received this and this is dated October 16<sup>th</sup>. On the night of the last hearing, which was October 17<sup>th</sup>, pages out of that file were specifically handed to Wal-Mart. So, they do have them, they have had them, and they are not acknowledging in here that they do have them.

BOARD MEMBER: I'm disturbed by the general tenure of this second supplement supplied by Wal-Mart. It seems to say that if the Township didn't supply you with a document, the condition doesn't exist. The Clerk has already addressed your statement on page 4 that there are no resolutions about anybody else having their hours limited; in fact, the hours were limited for Farmer Jacks and Buddies (which wasn't a special use permit, but the Board did set limits on the hours). So, it has been done before. Basically, you seem to assert there can't be any traffic problems because you weren't supplied with any documents. Well, people were here and testified about traffic problems; the same with noise and glare.

I have a question for you. Are you saying that all the testimony from people who have come and spoken at these hearings doesn't exist or doesn't matter? Is that Wal-Mart's position, because it seems to be what you say in this document?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE GARRETT: Supervisor, if I may address...Trustee Veenstra, we've worked extremely hard. If you remember, I tried to go into a very long explanation on traffic in April. We've sat down with the county and we sat down with the Township engineering consultants regarding traffic. You know, there's a lot of perception with traffic and what generates it and what causes it; is it there now, and what's going to be there after we come. We've worked very hard to try to make sure the methodology is correct and make sure that we have your consultants buy in on what we are doing. We have proposed some mitigation so, at this point, as far as the traffic goes, I don't know what else we can do to demonstrate what our proposed expansion is going to generate.

Another question I have is I hear residents...no one says they shop at the store. And you have to have shoppers to generate traffic. We've been asked by the engineering consultant to add additional trips which we've done. So I think we have been on all ends of the spectrum with regards to traffic in trying to analyze the facts and provide factual information back to the consultants. All Wal-Mart intends to do is mitigate for the proposed expansion. That's all I can really say about traffic issues at this point.

BOARD MEMBER: Well, my question was do you pay any attention to the testimony that's done at these hearings and do you accept people's testimony at these hearings as evidence that you need to consider?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE GARRETT: Absolutely, we do. We take that back and we analyze it. We find out if there's factual information or if there's opinions. If there's factual information, we try to address that. That's what we've done in meeting with the county and meeting with the Township consultants.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Can I address that as well? Trustee, I think there is a difference between lay opinion evidence and traffic counts and objective evidence that is being looked at by your consultants. We are required to meet your criteria; we are required to meet the objective evidence. If the lay opinion evidence tends to agree with the objective evidence, then it agrees. If it doesn't agree, then I don't think that we are required to satisfy lay opinion criteria or lay opinion evidence or substitute it for the criteria. That's the way we've approached this. We look at your criteria; we look at what your engineers... we look at what the other engineers who are involved in traffic say actually are the burdens on the intersections in the roads and then we seek to mitigate that traffic within the boundaries of what the law permits. That's what we've attempted to do. In so doing, we don't sit here and just tune out the local residents and their concerns; but, we look to see whether or not those are corroborated by the objective evidence. If your consultants believe that it is corroborated by the objective evidence, and that we can't mitigate here, then they would say that to us. But, in fact, what your consultants have said is that we believe you will be able to mitigate and not make this traffic any worse than it already is. That is our burden, and that's the burden we intend to meet.

BOARD MEMBER: Well, I don't know whether you think this is objective evidence or not, but it is difficult to make a left turn out of Tihart onto Marsh Road. We had other people say the same thing; difficult to make a left turn into Haslett High School. We have a letter from Shane Goodall saying that it is common knowledge that parents living in Haslett director their children who are

driving to Haslett High to do the following: Travel south on Cornell, turn right on Tihart then go right up Marsh Road so they can make a right turn into the high school rather than make a left that is too dangerous.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: If there's a recommendation from your traffic consultant to do something for the expansion that's proposed that he has not already given to us, then please make that recommendation.

BOARD MEMBER: Maybe the recommendation is the traffic problem is already so bad, it shouldn't be made any worse.

BOARD MEMBER: Madam Supervisor, I have a question for you about how you want us to proceed in terms of any, at this point, vs further discussion later. I'm concerned that there appear to be some factual errors in materials that were submitted by Wal-Mart that I would like to either raise in comment later or raise now. I'm not sure what your preference is.

SUPERVISOR McGILLICUDDY: Well, I think if the Board feels we have sufficient information to make a decision at our next meeting, then I would really like to close the hearing. I think it's fine to make statements such as what you are talking about at our discussion later on when we have Board discussion, but right now, I'd just like to get some last minute clarifying questions out of the way so I can close the hearing so they feel like Wal-mart representatives have given us the information we've requested and that we have all the information we need for our own decision making.

BOARD MEMBER: The traffic expert indicated we won't have the information from them today that is necessary to do that. Now, I'm quite concerned because I believe one of the things that we do is allow our often extremely well informed and expert public to take a look at the information that is provided. I am happy to have us move ahead with closing the hearing, but I want to assure that any new information that is presented after the hearing is closed is available for the public to review and adequately comment on prior to us making a decision. I'm assuming that could be accommodated, but I would like to state that up front now rather than have us continue to get a flow of information from Wal-Mart that no one else will have access to.

SUPERVISOR McGILLICUDDY: I'm sure that our staff can provide that.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE GARRETT: We have been working with the IT Department on this last supplement and the previous supplement and, as that traffic study becomes available, I can get with Stephen and we can get make sure that that's available for the public.

BOARD MEMBER: I'm concerned if we close this hearing without seeing that traffic study final, we may have some questions that may not be able to be answered. I'm concerned about adding 266 trips. I'm pleased to see that Wal-Mart accepted the number from our traffic consultants. But I'm also concerned that the indication that it will require a traffic signal (not just make it optional or "Gee, we'll get around to it when we pick up the number of trips") and also require what I understood to be the expansion of the right turn lanes. My main question to Wal-Mart is who intends to pay for this. Are you guys going to pay for this or the county?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE GARRETT: Wal-Mart intends to mitigate for the traffic, so this signal....

BOARD MEMBER: Does that mean pay for it?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE GARRETT: Yes, sir, yes.

BOARD MEMBER: Next question. Does Wal-Mart agree that we have the right to discuss hours based on the previous cases of Farmer Jack and others that have been in the Township?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: I think you're entitled to apply your ordinances and your criteria.

BOARD MEMBER: I understand that. What I want to know is.....

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: I don't fully understand the history here. I do know, with all due respect to the Clerk here, that there was an error or some difficulty in getting these things to you. I don't know how an overnight package that UPS claims that was sent on the 27<sup>th</sup>, for example, doesn't arrive here until the 30<sup>th</sup>. But I can tell you that the date that we put it in their hands was not the 27<sup>th</sup>; it was much before that, it was the date of the letter which I think may have been the 20<sup>th</sup>?

In any event, Trustee Veenstra here, a moment ago, mentioned that the limited hours discussions and the imposition of those limited hours previously was not in the context of an SUP. It may or may not be appropriate as a legal matter, therefore, to impose those hours. I think you're asking for a legal opinion here. I'm sure that your attorney may have his opinion and we may have ours. If you feel comfortable, from the advice of your counsel, that you have that ability, then by all means apply that. But I'm not sure that I'm going to necessarily agree with you from a legal perspective here and take away my ability to disagree later.

BOARD MEMBER: Have you examined the documents concerning the Farmer Jack case?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: I personally have not.

BOARD MEMBER: Has anybody on your staff?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Probably Tyler Tennent has, but I'll take a look at those.

BOARD MEMBER: And what has he recommended to you?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: With regard to....

BOARD MEMBER: The Farmer Jack information.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Well, we haven't talked about it frankly, so.....

BOARD MEMBER: I have a question for our staff. Mr. Kieselbach, do you happen to know how many residential units are within 300 feet of the Wal-Mart property?

DIRECTOR KIESELBACH: I don't know, but we can have that information available to you. I don't have it ready tonight.

BOARD MEMBER: I would appreciate having that information prior to a decision, but I do feel that I'm at the point where I think I have enough information to make a decision, understanding that we will be receiving a traffic report. And, I'm assuming our traffic consultant will look it over like they always do. I also would like to request that perhaps we ask the Anderson Group to look at this question that we received by the Meridian Futures group about 16% of the available dollars leaving the area that they're capturing. Just sort of have them look over that number and think if that's a reasonable assumption or, in their opinion, if that's not a reasonable assumption.

BOARD MEMBER: Yes, on page 6, point 8 at the top, it says "no person has complained in writing to the Township...regarding any noise issues, lighting or glare concerns...." Well, I have a letter in my hand from Mr. Martin Furey, dated 10/17, who lives at 5164 Madison, and he complains about the glare and the noise and so on. So, I don't understand your assertion that nobody has complained in writing because I have in my hand a letter from a person who complained in writing.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: I think that can be explained by the fact that the submission that we made to you was prepared before we received the response to the FOIA. That would have been included in the response to the FOIA.

BOARD MEMBER: So, you're accepting that that statement is not true.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Apparently not, if you have it in your hand. I'm not going to disagree with what you have in your hand, but...

BOARD MEMBER: Thank you. If I may, on page 7, there is a statement that Wal-Mart said there would be an additional \$1.1 million in state tax revenue and the estimate was based on the sales of existing goods and new sales of grocery items. Now, is grocery items food?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: What section was that?

BOARD MEMBER: Page 7, number 5, in the middle of the page. It says there's going to be an additional \$1.1 million in state tax revenue generated based on increased sales of existing goods and new sales of grocery items, and I'm wondering, I thought grocery items were food.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Well, I guess it would be food plus any other items that are sold in a grocery store not currently sold in the merchandise side.

BOARD MEMBER: Well, maybe you folks down in Arkansas don't know this, but in Michigan, there's no sales tax on food, so I don't think we're going to get a lot of increased revenue by the sales tax on food.

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: We understand that. That's why I'm saying; a grocery store does sell a lot of other things besides...there are taxable items as well as non-taxable items in a grocery store. That was clearly understood when the answer was given.

BOARD MEMBER: It sounds misleading.

SUPERVISOR McGILLICUDDY: Are we ready to close this hearing? Trustee Veenstra, a lot of your questions can be raised during our discussion.

BOARD MEMBER: One other rather critical question based on a letter received, an e-mail from Leonard Silverman. He gives quite a list of the locations of Wal-Mart stores in Michigan and, as I look through it, most of them seem to be at expressways or state highways or something like that. So, I would like to ask are there any other Wal-Mart Supercenters that are on just the local street and not on some major expressway or at least a state highway?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER: How many?

WAL-MART REPRESENTATIVE MUCHA: I don't know off hand, but we could find out for you.

BOARD MEMBER: I would like to know, because as I read through this list of six pages or something, five or four, I guess, I didn't see any. So, I would like to know because there were only like half a dozen that seem to be on local streets and were adjacent to residential property and so on. So, I would like to know of the cases where there's a SuperCenter that's on local streets and is adjacent to residential property.

SUPERVISOR McGILLICUDDY: O.K. Barring any other requests from the Board, I would like to close this hearing. O.K., we are officially closed.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed the public hearing at 8:36 P.M.

[Supervisor McGillicuddy recessed the meeting at 8:37 P.M.]  
[Supervisor McGillicuddy reconvened the meeting at 8:52 PM]

10. ACTION ITEMS/ENDS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed public comment.

- A. Rezoning #06050 (Newton Property LLC/Forsberg), request to rezone approximately 26.17 acres, located at 6276 Newton Road and the parcel to the east from RR (Rural Residential) to C-2 (Commercial) conditioned on the sites being developed as a Mixed Use Planned Unit Development. Director Kieselbach summarized the rezoning request as outlined in staff memorandum dated November 17, 2006.

Peter Preston, Project Planner, Trinity Engineering, 107 N. Clinton Avenue, St. Johns, stated he had worked with staff, delineated the areas and limited the amount of uses. Part of the basic intent was not to create basic district lines which have buffers, screens and setbacks which would be an impediment to the Township's desire for walkability. The applicant has agreed in writing that the conditions outlined in the staff memorandum would be applied.

**Trustee Veenstra moved to refer Rezoning #06050 (Newton Property/LLC Forsberg) to the Planning Commission to consider the applicant's request to rezone approximately 26.17 acres, located south of Saginaw Highway and east of Newton Road from RR (Rural Residential) to C-2 (Commercial) with the condition to develop the site as a mixed use planned unit development based on the materials submitted by the applicant on October 2, 2006. The Planning Commission shall provide the Township Board with its recommendation within 90 days. Seconded by Clerk Helmbrecht.**

Board members discussed the following:

- Possible impact of large Consumers tower next to the proposed rezoning
- Not necessary to send back to the Planning Commission as the Board can condition approval
- Agreement with the applicant's statement there will be more freedom without setbacks
- Planning Commission recommendation of three (3) distinct zoning categories
- Applicant's offer of a conditional mixed use rezoning

Referral back to the Planning Commission: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

- Q. This would be a conditional zoning. Does that change our requirement to send it back to the Planning Commission?
- A. If the conditional zoning was not a part of the original application, it should go back to the Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: Trustee Such

Motion carried 6-1.

11. DISCUSSION ITEMS/ENDS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed public comment.

- A. Herron Creek Sanitary Sewer Special Assessment District #50

**The consensus of the Board was to place this item on for action at the December 5, 2006 Board meeting.**

- B. Wetland Use Permit #06-11 (White Family), 6200 Pine Hollow Dr.

Board members and staff discussed the following:

- Clarification of multiple applicant request
- Lengthening the initial permit time beyond one year

**The consensus of the Board was to place this item on for action at the December 5, 2006 Board meeting.**

- C. Special Use Permit #06051 (Giguere), request to construct a five-building commercial complex with total square feet measuring greater than 25,000 at 6200 Pine Hollow Drive  
Director Kieselbach summarized the special use permit request as outlined in staff memorandum dated November 16, 2006.

Board members discussed the following:

- Five buildings may be commercial and/or office
- Expiration of the previous special use permit approved in October, 2005
- Pathway on Pine Hollow to be added as a condition during site plan review

**The consensus of the Board was to place this item on for action at the December 5, 2006 Board meeting.**

- D. SUP #06-99091 (Wal-Mart, Inc.), request to add 49,427 sq. ft. and a drive-through pharmacy to the existing building located at 5110 Times Square Drive

Board members and staff discussed the following:

- Concern with traffic focuses on Times Square Drive and Marsh Road
- Concern that traffic analysis did not go further north to address left turns onto Marsh Road
- Problems with southbound traffic on Marsh Road making left turns into Haslett High School
- Customary consideration of distance for traffic implications from a special use permit request site
- Need to look at traffic south on Dobie down to Grand River
- Concern that citizens will use Dobie as a cut-through to go further north
- Allegation from the public that current SUP criteria is not being met
- Significantly flawed information within the Carlson study relative to including the 15,000 dorm students to Table 4.2 as people who would be shopping in grocery stores
- Exclusion of the 15,000 dorm students from the study in Table 4.2 accounts for almost all of the "uncaptured" expenditures in this area
- Exclusion of the 15,000 dorm students changes the square footage calculation which results in no capacity for additional grocery store space in this area
- Anderson Group to look at the math anomaly listed above
- Burden is on the applicant to assure this SUP will not adversely affect or be hazardous to the existing neighboring uses
- Burden on the applicant to prove the project would not be detrimental to the economic welfare of surrounding properties or the community
- Concern with construction, operation and maintenance of the facility
- Current design of the expansion does not take the residential character of the neighborhood behind the existing building
- Concern with lighting and noise as the site has many residential uses adjacent to it
- Tax ramification to the Township's general fund if the Wal-Mart store closes
- No rationale or community support for expanded hours of operation
- Requirement for additional buffering, a change in buffering or change in lighting as a condition of a special use permit would necessitate showing a connection as to why the condition is being added
- Additional deterioration of Marsh Road with increased traffic from both trucks and cars
- Approval of several new subdivisions near Wal-Mart since the original SUP was approved
- Previous approval of senior citizen housing complex on Marsh Road
- More traffic on roads lessens the Township's ability to have increased walkability
- Placement of additional submitted information on the Township's website

Board consideration of alleged false or misleading information: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

- Q. How do we deal with false or misleading statements in this document?



- A. Their submission is a submission that was done by Wal-Mart's attorney. I view it as an advocacy package; a highlight of what they perceive to be the relevant facts and circumstances. If, in your experience and in your examination of the facts, you determine that there are inaccuracies in the report, you are entitled to reject them. You are entitled not to include them as part of your consideration in deciding the merits. The fact that they're contained in this submission does not render them true.

**The consensus of the Board was to have staff prepare motions for approval and denial and place this item on for action at the December 5, 2006 Board meeting.**

- E. Zoning Amendment #06100 (Planning Commission), request to amend Section 86-440(c)(1) of the Mixed Use PUD ordinance to permit the use in the C1 (Commercial) district  
Director Kieselbach summarized the proposed zoning amendment as outlined in staff memorandum dated November 16, 2006.

**The consensus of the Board was to place this item on for action at the December 5, 2006 Board meeting.**

- F. Proposed Outdoor Lighting Ordinance  
Director Kieselbach summarized the consultant's comments on the proposed ordinance as outlined in staff memorandum dated November 15, 2006.

Board members discussed the following:

- Exemption of residential lighting
- Enforcement of prohibition on glare through a complaint process
- Exploration of incentives vs regulation
- Address the issue of residential lighting aimed directly into the sky
- Sign lighting will be addressed through down lighting in the sign ordinance
- Angle change of flood lights to 20 degrees vertical is too restrictive
- Target the obvious offenders in residential districts first
- Look at definition of off premises
- Original reason which birthed the proposed outdoor lighting ordinance was to have subdivision streetlighting districts use fully shielded cut-off fixtures to reflect light downward
- Concern with continued delay of proposed streetlighting districts in order to pass the outdoor lighting ordinance
- Preference for "classic" grandfathering to address the nonconformance issue
- Suggestion by the consultant to establish flexible times for implementation dependent upon the lighting so all lighting will eventually be brought into compliance
- Identification of lights which can be inexpensively modified at the Township's cost
- Problematic enforcement of a comprehensive program
- Comprehensive program for compliance
- Stronger language than "encourage" the lights in a parking lots to be turned off when the store is not open

**The consensus of the Board was to place this item on for discussion at the December 5, 2006 Board meeting.**

12. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened Public Remarks.

John Mucha, Dawda, Mann, Mulcahy, & Sadler, 39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills, expressed appreciation to the Board for its consideration of Wal-Mart's request. He asked that the applicant be given an opportunity to receive any questions in advance of the next Board meeting, should the Board have any additional questions or concerns.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed Public Remarks.

13. CLOSED SESSION

**Trustee Such moved that the Township Board go into closed session to consider material exempt from discussion or disclosure by state or federal statute. Seconded by Trustee Woiwode.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried unanimously.

The Board adjourned to the Administrative Conference Room for a closed session.

**Trustee Veenstra moved to return to open session. Seconded by Trustee Woiwode.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor  
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried unanimously.

14 ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor McGillicuddy adjourned the meeting at 11:12 P.M.

---

SUSAN MCGILLICUDDY  
TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR

---

MARY M. G. HELMBRECHT  
TOWNSHIP CLERK

Sandra K. Otto, Secretary