

**WEST TRAVERSE TOWNSHIP
BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, August 8, 2023
6:00 PM**

Supervisor Bartlett called the meeting to order at 6:00

Roll Call: Green, Mooradian, Hollingsworth, Bartlett, Baiardi

Absent: none

Visitors: Jimmy & Marci Spencer, Paul Mooradian, Jay Olson, Joey Arbaugh, Shirley Anderson, John Riggs, Bill McKinley, Jim & Kim Palmer, Martha Dyksterhouse, Amy Stefanik, John Dohan, Joanne Murphy, Gary & Sue Rentrop, Naomi Singer, Donald Para, Laurelynne Harris, Glenn Remos, James Anderson, Edward J. Murphy, Gail Kozlowski, Barbara O'Hara, Jane Horn, Paul Lamarche, Dion Flannery, Pat Rowe, Kathy Olmsted, Chris Lamarche, Patty Cappy, Eve Lauer, Garon Gopigian, Julie DePuydt, Lou Kasischke, Carolyn Sandford, Ted Cummings, Joe Graham.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Approve agenda & additional items: Bartlett states there is one item to add - two Budget Amendments from the Clerk which will be item "h". Hollingsworth added item "i" - ZBA request.

Approve Minutes of Regular Meeting on July 11, 2023: **Hollingsworth makes a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Green seconds the motion. All yes.**

Review correspondence: Bartlett states a letter was received from the Auditor, Richard Mahlmeister, informing us he is retiring this year. We will need to begin looking for his replacement.

Thorne Swift report: Riggs gave his report.

Public Comments: Gail Kozlowski stated "I have a concern regarding your representative Mr. Green on the Planning Commission, at the July 12th meeting which was a big deal for everyone involved. Mr. Green seemed quite uninterested in what was going on." Kozlowski stated, "it appeared to me he had arrived with his mind already made up about the issue at hand and was anxious to get to the motion that he had written and prepared." Kozlowski did not feel he represented the Board well and did not reflect the intention or the spirit of his position on the Planning Commission.

Action items:

- a. Planning Commission recommendation for Pond Hill SUP – Lane gave his synopsis on the case. Lane reviewed the application for Pond Hill SUP. Lane advised the Township Board can act on the recommendation from the Planning Commission and

Proposed: August 8, 2023

Accepted:

approve it, it can be modified with additional conditions, or it can be denied. Lane believes the majority of the Findings of Fact items were satisfied but there are some he left undetermined or suggested that the Planning Commission further discuss with the applicant and now he is suggesting the same for the Township Board as the PC did not discuss them. Lane states there was some talk at the Planning Commission and there are letters from members of the public wanting to keep the event attendees to 300 with the Township issuing an outdoor gathering license for the overage. Lane feels it creates a conflict between the Special Use Permit which is a contractual obligation and runs with the land. Also, a license is revokable and temporary.” Lane states he received an email from Martha Dyksterhouse asking a number of questions he would like to respond to. Question 1 - “Is Pond Hill a West Traverse Township approved agritourism business?” Lane response is “yes they have approval to be an agritourism business with a commercial event component.” Questions 2 & 3 are similar - “under Article 2 in the Zoning Ordinance there is a definition of agritourism business and does that definition automatically allow a qualifying applicant to exercise all of the enumerated uses? Lane responds “no - those definitions are designed to be illustrative. You will note in both definitions it says including but not limited to. So, it is not an all-inclusive list.” Lane states “in my opinion those items capture the spirit of what an agritourism facility or commercial event facility would be. It only lists some of the things that would be allowed. The details are in whatever permit is issued by the Township.” Lane states “one of the new things added to the definition of agritourism is farm stay and essentially the way I read it is like a new vacation experience and would not be allowed because there is an expressed condition in the SUP for Pond Hill that does not allow vehicles to be parked there overnight. The farm stay is something they would need a new amendment to the SUP if they wanted to add.” Question 4 - as of the last PC meeting on July 12, with the motion passed to recommend approval of the SUP by the Board, it was explained there would be a maximum of 999 attendees allowed on site at any given moment for any number of commercial events within the hours of operation for 365 days a year? Lane states “yes that is correct”. Question 5 - “under #2, paragraph “A” of the SUP agreement signed on October 17, 2022 by James Bartlett, Supervisor,” Dyksterhouse questions if review that includes extension of the duration of the events and if the amplified sound can still be done? Lane responds – yes - there still is the ability to review those deviations not only for the extended hours but amplified sound because the permit was actually issued in March 2023 and it’s a year from that date.”

Lane says Question #6 was whether or not there was a complaint about the noise and what was the plan for addressing that would be.” Lane continues, “under the Zoning Ordinance there is a provision under the commercial event component, that says to regulate amplified sound it needs to be to be at least 100 feet from any property line. Amplified sound cannot create a public nuisance across the property line.” He further explains one complaint does not create a public nuisance.

Lane would suggest the Township and the PC amend that section to include more substantial noise provisions that can be easily enforced.” Dyksterhouse wanted

further explanation of the noise complaint process. Spencer states he had heard about the noise complaint and would welcome someone addressing him directly so he could respond and solve the problem. He continues, “since our last meeting I have heard a lot of strong feelings from neighbors, whether they are positive or negative and we take them very seriously.” Spencer feels as a business they recognize concerns of the community. He continues, “when we look at what we are asking for there are a couple points; the first is the original application was for 999 and that was based on our Fall Festival weekends when we have peak visitation. We were limited to 299 when permission was granted and told we could come back for more if necessary. So, this original application for 999 is where we are at.” Spencer states “what seems to be creating the most angst in the community is ticketed concert events. We would be comfortable with the Township Board stipulating we can’t have ticketed concert events. Spencer hopes that this will help ease the minds of his neighbors and the community. Spencer states that the other concerns they have heard about are the numbers of attendees. Spencer believes within their business model they can live with 500 attendees at any one time ten months out of the year, but the two months on the fall weekends is when they see peak visitation, they need to increase the number. Spencer states they would be willing to limit the Fall Festival weekends to 999 attendees and would accomplish the limitation by designating the parking spots and roping off the lots so it is easy to see how many cars are parked.

Spencer states the 4th item which is the closing, they feel they can go back to what the Ordinance says and keep that at 10PM. Spencer states “we would like this to be part of the Special Use Permit so we can alleviate some of the concerns.” Spencer thanks the people that came out and talked to him about it.

Lane states “whatever motion the Board makes, if it’s an approval or an approval with conditions, the terms and conditions in the existing SUP agreement other than what is modified by the Board should remain in full force and affect. He recommends a new agreement be drafted that incorporates, if its approved or approved with conditions, whatever the new conditions are and then be signed by the Township.”

Mooradian asks for clarification of where the handicap parking is on the site map. Bartlett opens the floor for public comments.

Martha Dyksterhouse voiced her concerns about the loophole of the ticketed events and the number of vendors they can have. She feels there should be someone there to keep track of how many people come and go.

Barbara O’Hara voiced her concerns about the number of vehicles and accounting for the number of people in them.

Gail Kozlowski voiced her concerns of the safety issues with the ingress and egress and patron traffic through the Conservancy property.

Bill McKinley states he is against the SUP. McKinley voiced his concern about noise, safety issues and ticketed events. He believes Pond Hill Farm is currently violating their SUP.

Julie DePuydt is in full support of the new SUP.

Patty Cappy supports Pond Hill but not 999 attendees. She is concerned about the traffic on M119. She also is concerned about what happens with the SUP if Pond Hill sells the property to someone. It was explained the SUP runs with the property.

Lou Kasischke is concerned about what will happen in the future with Pond Hill and how much they will be allowed to grow.

Betsy Costello stated she is in support of Pond Hill Farm but has reservations about the traffic on M-119 and leaving at 11pm.

John Dohan supports a thriving business but is concerned about increasing the capacity to 999 and the noise. He questioned the reason for the increase.

Gary Rentrop discussed the difference of the Special Use Permit and a public gathering with the numbers of attendees.

Lauralynne Harris states she upset over the disrespect of the designation of M-119 as a Scenic Byway. Harris states it has been ignored in this situation. She is also concerned the current SUP has been violated and feels if this is approved it will continue to be violated.

Naomi Singer is concerned how the SUP is currently designed and what will happen down the road when the Spencer's don't own the property anymore since the SUP runs with the land. Singer states that there needs to be a way to ensure the public the number of attendees can be monitored.

Bartlett closed the public comments for Board deliberations.

Bartlett starts with Section 504, page 2 of the Site Impact Statement and states "I am confused, when you filled out the application for the SUP increase and stated no significant changes, are you relating to no significant changes from the 999 on the original permit?" Berryman states "the original application...correct." Bartlett thinks that has caused a lot of consternation. He continues, we are not looking at jumping from 300 to here. The original one was for 999 and that is what you mean?" Berryman states "the Health Department Impact Statement was made for a 999." Bartlett is content with the statement from Berryman. Baiardi states "I sat on the Planning Commission at the time and I don't believe that to be a true statement about the Health Board. I believe the sanitation was limited to somewhere in the 700s." Bartlett states "unless somebody asks, I don't know if that is true or not, I was not at that meeting and the Planning Commission worked on that quite hard. That doesn't

mean we can't require the Health Department approval to meet the 999 people." Mooradian states "it would definitely have to be increased to accommodate 999 because I do recall the 700 also and we are probably at 700 when we have 300 through the course of a day with multiple events. If you have a septic for 700 and that's for the course of the day, you can certainly get to that number." Mooradian questions Pond Hill's statement of no anticipated impact. Mooradian feels there has to be some additional impact with tripling the number. Bartlett states "the phrase on here related to the application of 999. The original application did deal with the questions on there." Baiardi states "I don't believe either that it was just the parking that limited it to 299." Bartlett states "that is certainly my recollection of why we ended up with where we were with it. It is clear that the original application was for more than the 300 they ended up with." Bartlett states "the catch on that was the Conservation Easement being discovered at that meeting at the high school."

Bartlett moves to Section 506 Site Plan Review Standards to discuss drainage and the change made to the pond. Lane thinks it is unclear how it may affect other areas of the site or adjacent properties in relation to the storm water drain runoff. Bartlett believes it is covered by the Building Department through the Drain Commissioner. Lane says "the Zoning Ordinance does not allow improvements that are going to create a nuisance because of storm water runoff onto adjacent properties. Under the Zoning Ordinance we are not to allow something that could essentially create water runoff onto the road or neighbors' property." Spencer says it's not a paved parking lot. It is a field so the water soaks into the ground and they increased the storm water holding capacity where it drains into the front pond.

Bartlett moves to Section 604, Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation. The Board needs to consider if the ingress/egress routes proposed by Pond Hill, based on permission by the Little Traverse Conservancy, are sufficient to accommodate the increased number of vehicles and attendees. The Township Board may want to consider whether the recently constructed driveway improvement is sufficient. Mooradian states there was a conflict in the drawings they received and pointed it out on the Site Plan. Mooradian states the verbiage needs to agree with the Site Plan because it is different on the maps they have. Berryman states "the handicap is in the front of the parking lot and we allow people to go around to the door to be dropped off." Bartlett asks Lane if the parking area is sufficient for 375 cars or 999 people?" Lane states "I believe so, yes." Lane states he can verify that, and it can be a condition of approval. Bartlett points out the two-way traffic arrows on M-119 on the Site Plan. Bartlett states the PC was working to make it a one-way, but they did not have the Easement go ahead from the Conservancy, which Pond Hill now has. Bartlett states "one-way traffic coming in the east way and exiting out the west one was the original plan that the PC wanted to see." Bartlett states "I think that addresses some of the concerns of that Section if we were to make it part of the motion. That would be required every day unless they don't go above the 299." Baiardi states "so a Conservation Easement really means nothing anymore, if they are allowed to use it for a commercial use?" Bartlett and Hollingsworth do not agree with that. Bartlett says the main focus of the farm is agritourism and if the property is not used for that the Conservancy can withdraw the

permission to use the Easement which would remove the SUP. Spencer states “we are comfortably saying no change in use, as we have never had the need to not have those gates chained shut as they are all year except October.” Spencer states “there isn’t a traffic jam problem in my opinion with families coming and going. The need is to be able to open the west entrance to direct traffic that way about two weekends during peak color on Saturday. This is why we would need this amount of parking because we don’t know what kind of traffic will be on M-119” Spencer states they serve as a rest stop and believes they are an asset and not a liability. Bartlett asks Lane if they could condition this if it is moved forward. Lane says if the attendees are up to 999 it would be appropriate. Bartlett asks “if we go to a 400 or 500 number would you still require one-way traffic. Lane says yes it would be the best way. Mooradian states “I thought that Little Traverse Conservancy said for EMS vehicles and ingress for large events.” Baiardi says no.

Bartlett moves to Section 506 K, Compliance with other Statutes and Regulations. Based on the requested increase as it is unclear whether permits or approvals from other relevant entities are up to date and will be consistent with the requested increase of attendees and vehicles. Bartlett states this was covered with the SUP allowing 299 by making it a condition that all required permits from regulatory agencies are met and all documents are on file at the Township. (The condition stated they would be held by the Clerk).

Bartlett moves to Section 733, Supplemental Development Standards, which limits the hours of events from 10am to 10pm. Bartlett states it was increased to 11 PM by the PC due to a request by Pond Hill and supported by the Board, with a yearly review. Spencer is now content with the original time of 10pm.

Section 733 F, Amplified Sound, which limits the hours from 12pm to 10pm. Bartlett states the deviation was approved.

Bartlett moves to Section 733 H, Capacity - the number of persons allowed should be compatible with the proposed facility and infrastructure for the site. Bartlett states “a two-level setup where most of the time the business is open, they don’t need or want the 999 which makes this fit in a little easier.” Bartlett thinks we should look at dropping the 999 for all events except for the Fall Festival weekends in September and October. Hollingsworth agrees it should be dropped. Bartlett clarifies with Spencer they will be limiting the parking restrictions during the big fall weekends to 375 spaces. Bartlett states it was a recommendation from the PC. Bartlett states “in my mind that is a contraction of where you have been in the past.” Green states “I view it as a subtraction by addition.” Green clarifies “I have noted too that there have been more than 1000 people at Pond Hill and we have been anxious as a Board to put some fence post around them, because they have had all of this growth and has been kind of unrestricted.” Green states “they have agreed to adhere to the conditions of the SUP if we approve the 999 they put on the table and the Board is willing to enforce that.” Green states “they are going to have to put a sign out at the road at some point saying the lot is full.” Green states Lane is willing to enforce it.

Mooradian asks Spencer “why not go for the Large Gathering Ordinance for the weekends in October and capitalize on that?” Mooradian states she agrees with the comments Rentrop and Kasischke made about not making a decision too quickly and the SUP is an underlying operating agreement. Mooradian states “the SUP is a land use, the Outdoor Gathering Ordinance (OGO) is a police ordinance, so why cut down when you can have the full number.” Mooradian doesn’t believe the 999 is necessary if they can do their business at 400 on 365 days of the year and want more for two months for events and concerts. Hollingsworth states “what we are hearing is people do not want those large numbers out there.” Mooradian doesn’t believe people will care about the numbers in October since it’s only a couple of weekends. Green states “for them to try and come back for a Large Gathering permit each year and the uncertainty of changes in the Ordinance would not allow them to plan in advance.” Bartlett states “the best approach to this is to limit the daily operation and accept Pond Hills’ limit of 999, because it is less than what they have had in the past.” Bartlett states “it reduces the amount of traffic on the hill, and it allows them to plan for the future.” Bartlett states “as the Board changes the availability of getting a Large Gathering Ordinance can change.”

Bartlett states Pond Hill will need permanent signage and parking attendants. Spencer states “I agree with Mooradian. We don’t want to turn cars away in October.” He says they are open for a different number than 999 if the board thinks it would be best. Spencer states “that would be more palatable for us so we can plan for it and we have the infrastructure to support it. We don’t need that for July.” Bartlett states “we are obligated to act on the application you have with us, but that would not preclude you from coming back with a request for a Large Gathering Ordinance if that is something you would want later on down the road.”

Bartlett moves to 733 K, Ingress/Egress. He indicates the applicant provided an updated letter from the Conservancy.

Green states four members of the PC voted in support of the SUP that is on the table, which is twice as many as voted against it. Green states it is meaningful and that the Township Board should support the PC as it always has. Green states “even though it was not unanimous, it was still 4-2. I am impressed that Pond Hill has offered significant modifications to the SUP in an effort to be a good neighbor and appease the people that are here.” Mooradian believes this should have been brought back to the PC since the recommendations lacked any disciplined conditions. Mooradian states “we should have expected more from our Planning Commission. They rushed it through and it was careless. There were so many things that were not addressed that night. They pushed it through to get it here tonight.” Mooradian states “there are a lot of questions that still need to be answered and since the Spencer’s are willing to go to a different number, I think that should be considered. I think doing the Large Gathering, you wouldn’t cut off your agritourism in the height of your season.” Mooradian states “maybe we as a Board can do something better on the OGO to make it less challenging to go through the permit process each year for the Fall Fest.” Mooradian states she got the attorney to agree that if Pond Hill applied for a license

for an OGO and if the maximum number of people do not attend, it would still be a valid license.” Green states one of the biggest concerns is that there will be a venue that is too large.” Hollingsworth states “I do agree with Mooradian, there is a healthy compromise somewhere. I disagree this was rushed through. The Planning Commission worked on this for three plus years.” Hollingsworth notices the work Pond Hill Farm has done through this whole process. Hollingsworth states she appreciates the respectful comments from the community.

Green states he would be prepared to make a motion. Bartlett said he wanted to clarify a few things before a motion is made. Bartlett states the concerns he heard tonight are what the PC dealt with originally. Bartlett feels Pond Hill has nothing to do with the traffic. Traffic in the fall on M-119 is a result of the “Pure Michigan” campaign. Bartlett states “we can remedy the concerns by not selling tickets and that goes with the land.” Bartlett talked about the safety and road across the Easement and that the Fire Chief John Cupps signed off on the plan as well as the Emergency Action Plan.” Bartlett discusses the concerns of all the attendees leaving an event at the same time and why the Board should get away from the 999 year-round and come to a different number. Bartlett states with a 400 or 500 number year-round there would be minimal trouble with traffic. Bartlett is concerned if the property is sold there should be conditions to protect the Township so tickets could not be sold for concerts. Bartlett asks Spencer if they could find a way to get 999 on three or four weekends in September or October? Spencer states “we would prefer asking for the six weekends of Fall Festival which is the 3rd weekend in September to the last weekend in October.” Bartlett feels Pond Hill is being cooperative and has addressed many of the concerns raised tonight. Mooradian states there have been some challenges through this whole process and the Planning Commission worked very hard.

Green makes a motion to approve Case #3-2023, a request for an Amendment to approve a Special Use Permit as submitted by David Berryman on behalf of Pond Hill Farm, located at 5699 S. Lake Shore Dr., Tax parcel #24-16-12-33-100-001 to allow for the construction of an additional parking area as depicted on the Site Plan dated April 2023, and to allow for an increase in the number of Pond Hill Farm event attendees from 300 to 500 during the regular season and up to 999 for periods during their Farm Festival weekends, held annually in September and October. Because the applicable standards of the West Traverse Township Zoning Ordinance have been met subject to the following conditions: the total number of onsite parking spaces, including employee parking spaces will be limited to 185 during all business hours other than Fall Festival weekends where it is limited to 375. Parking areas shall be delineated on the defined parking lots by berm, fence or some other method so that the total number of spaces can be identified and the number of parked vehicles shall not exceed 185 during the regular season and 375 during the Fall Festival weekends in September and October. Parking attendants provided by Pond Hill Farm shall be onsite during business hours to direct vehicle and pedestrian traffic and to ensure the number of parked vehicles should not exceed the number of approved

parking spaces and all vehicles are parked in approved spaces. All activities shall cease by 10:00 p.m. All required permits from all required regulatory agencies such as: District Health Department #3, MDOT, Emmet County Building Department and others are current and a copy is kept on file *with the Clerk* at West Traverse Township. Express permission from the Little Traverse Conservancy as provided in its June 15, 2023 letter you advised the driveway and access route labeled secondary emergency vehicle entrance and secondary entrance to M-119 under revised Site Plan dated April 2023 for emergency purposes. For ingress/egress and customer attendee vehicle ingress/egress shall remain valid and available to Pond Hill Farm and shall not be modified or revoked. To ensure agritourism and farm operations continue to serve as the primary business component of Pond Hill Farm, attendees at a musical series or concert event shall not be required to purchase or acquire a ticket or otherwise provide any form of compensation for admission. This condition shall apply to persons and vehicles except as expressly amended by this motion. All conditions of the original Special Use Permit and corresponding Special Use Agreement as executed between Pond Hill Farm and the West Traverse Township and finalized on March 23, 2023, shall remain in full force and affect. This is also subject to the Site Plan review by the Drain Commission and subject to verification of adequate handicap spaces. A revised Special Use Agreement incorporating this approved Amendment and conditions shall be executed by Pond Hill Farm and West Traverse Township.

Bartlett states “we should change the Site Plan to say one-way traffic should be used all of the time. Currently it is indicated on the Site Plan as two-way.”

Green amends his motion to include “one-way traffic required at all times as part of the required Site Plan.”

Hollingsworth seconds the motion.

Bartlett asks for comments from the Board after the motion has been made. Hollingsworth thinks this was a good compromise. Bartlett states his only concern reducing the 500 to a smaller amount to 400 or 450. Hollingsworth agrees with 450. Spencer states it will be difficult for their business around the 4th of July with the 400-450 amount. Bartlett states at the meeting at the high school they were okay with 300 except for the fall weekends and asked if that had changed. Spencer states they have to look at the future and to be able to run a profitable business and still have room to grow. Spencer felt the compromise from 999 to 500 was good but is unsure about going to 400. Green feels they need to be fair to Pond Hill and if it's reduced to 450, which is 15 or 16 vehicles and does not think it will make a big difference. Mooradian asks why are they limited to the week in July and October and why it's not left at 400 or 450. Mooradian feels that the OGO is not much different than their SUP, just a few changes.

Roll Call: Hollingsworth – yes, Green – yes, Mooradian – no, Baiardi – no, Bartlett – yes

Motion carries 3-2

- b. Sewer Authority Invoice for Pine Hill: The Sewer Authority had requested payment from WTT for the invoice to repair the pipe that was broken in Pine Hill. The Sewer Authority insurance ended up covering the entire amount as it was an error on the part of the Authority.
- c. Accept Audit: **Hollingsworth makes a motion to accept the audit done by Rick Mahlmeister for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, as presented. Baiardi seconds the motion. All yes.**
- d. Consider extending METRO Act thru 12/31/23: **Motion by Bartlett - effective January 1, 2024, and extending through December 31, 2028, the West Traverse Township Board authorizes the extension of the METRO Act right-away permit for ATT, allowing them to facilitate providing broadband service to the community. Green seconds the motion. All yes.**
- e. Bookkeeping and Payroll discussion. Green received 3 proposals, Kanine, a local CPA firm; Sara Garber Young and Two Raven - Clare Borgan. Green states “my recommendation is to go with Two Raven Solutions. It looks that the total cost is going to be around \$4,000 to \$5,000 just depending, but do not expect to exceed \$5,000.” Green states Two Ravens is willing to learn the BS&A software and reduce their cost when they understand its functionality.” Green says Kanine’s proposal was from \$14,000 and \$22,000 as compared to Two Ravens at \$4,000. Green states he requested references and he checked out three on Two Ravens Solutions and they came back favorable. Green states “the issue with Sara Garber Young there is no backup other than her husband and I am not sure what his qualifications are. Hollingsworth likes Two Ravens Solutions because they are willing to learn the BS&A software. Hollingsworth states she is concerned when they get into BS&A there is going to be more to it than meets the eye. Hollingsworth states there are a lot of variables that go on. Bartlett is in favor in going with the firm that has some depth. Mooradian feels a challenging time is coming up with having a new Clerk, up to four elections, and losing Baiardi who does the bookkeeping and payroll. Mooradian states “I suggest we come up with a number and change less things in this Township for the next year or two. If Baiardi would do it for the next two years and we could come to some compromise. Mooradian feels this is a mistake by changing when there is someone who uses the BS&A. Mooradian states “Clare is still charging \$50 an hour and Kanine is over \$20,000. I believe we are going to be very challenged with a new Clerk next year.” Hollingsworth agrees it is going to be challenging but we did have outside booking keeping in the past.” Hollingsworth states “I think this is a great opportunity, we have outside council, an outside Zoning Administrator. As a Township I think we are taking so much more on than we need to.” Bartlett feels there should be a backup. Hollingsworth states she would not be opposed if Baiardi wanted to help transition someone to her position. Lauer states the Township would be making a big mistake if they change since Baiardi has agreed to stay a year or two. Bartlett states “maybe the best thing to do would be to come up with a rate to help

- make that transition.” Baiardi asks “what is the proposal for what they are doing. Are they going to access the system that we have or are they getting BS&A on their own.” Green says “they are going to access our system.” Hollingsworth feels it is necessary so they are able to access the taxes and posting. Baiardi states she will give it some thought. **Hollingsworth makes a motion to extend an offer to Two Ravens Solutions and Baiardi works with them to transition the bookkeeping duties solely to them and then evaluate after 6 months. Bartlett seconds the motion. Roll call: Hollingsworth – yes, Green – yes, Mooradian – yes, Bartlett - yes**
- f. Discuss Request for Speed Limit Study on State Rd south of Quick Rd. – Bev Osetek had written a letter to the Board with her concerns about the speeding on S. State Rd. Osetek states it is a problem in both directions. She says it starts where the City line is which is 25 mph and then quickly changes to 45 mph and then even quicker to 55 mph. Vehicles rapidly increase speed which is right in the neighborhood and there are young children and elderly that cross the road. Osetek states this problem has grown over the years and it is a safety issue. She suggested in the letter it would be safer and less of an impact on the area if the speed limit was consistent all the way to Quick Rd. Bartlett states “speed limits are not set by the Township but by the State Police. **Bartlett makes a motion to have the State Police to do a traffic study from Quick Road to the City limits on State Road. Green seconds the motion. All yes.**
- g. Zoom meeting update: Bartlett met with the couple and is waiting on information from them.
- h. Budget Amendments: Baiardi says money is being moved around because of the ARPA project. We need to allocate the road construction portion, which is roughly \$231,000. If these Budget Amendments are approved, we will write a check out of the Road Fund and put it in the Water Fund to pay for the road portion. The ARPA project is being paid out through the one Fund. **Bartlett makes a motion to adopt the resolution to Amend the 2023/2024 Budget, Whereas the amounts budgeted for certain items and 2023/2024 Budget approved by the Township Board on March 23, 2023 are no longer appropriate, and Whereas prudent administration and Michigan Law require the Township Board to amend its budget to ensure no expenditures exceed the budget amounts previously approved, and Whereas it’s appropriate to amend the budget to reflect known revenue changes now, Therefore it be resolved, that the Township’s 2023/2024 operating budget is hereby amended to increase the Road Fund, Roads Construction expenditure account 204-446-801-000, from \$196,000 to \$231,000 to cover the Township’s increased road construction cost for fiscal year 2023/2024. Baiardi seconds the motion. Roll call: Hollingsworth – yes, Green – yes, Mooradian – yes, Baiardi – yes, Bartlett – yes**
- Bartlett states “Therefore be it resolved that the Township’s 2023/2024 operating budget is hereby amended to increase the Water Fund/Water Engineering fee-ARPA expenditure account 591-536-815-003 from \$10,000 to \$45,000 to cover the Township’s increased engineering cost on the ARPA project for the fiscal year 2023/2024. Baiardi seconds the motion.**

Roll call: Hollingsworth – yes, Green – yes, Mooradian – yes, Baiardi – yes, Bartlett – yes

- i. ZBA request: Hollingsworth thinks the Minutes are posing problems. The ZBA is wondering if there is another way to transcribe minutes that would be less frustrating for the people involved.” Hollingsworth has researched software that will transcribe while the person is speaking and a lot of options are available. Hollingsworth asks the Board to consider looking into different methods to transcribe minutes for the ZBA and possibly the other boards in the future.

Reports and Updates:

- a. Clerk - None
- b. Treasurer – Treasurer gave her report.
- c. Planning Commission – Green gave his report.
- d. Zoning Administrator – Board has copy in packet.
- e. Recreation/Thorne Swift Committee – Mooradian gave her report.
- f. Supervisor – Bartlett states he did talk to the Sheriff Wallin about Lake St. and he will step up patrol on it.

Approve Payables and Payroll: Hollingsworth moves to approve payables and payroll as presented. Green seconds the motion.

Public comments: Lauer let the Board know they are doing a good job. Moore stated he would like the Board to seek legal counsel with the special event use. Moore stated the Supervisor was saying to the Board “we are not telling the applicant not to apply for the Outdoor Gathering Ordinance” and the Township Attorney gave a written opinion saying they could not do that. Moore states “there is a disconnect and meanwhile there is a Land Use Attorney sitting in the audience disagreeing with what our Attorney says. I think an attorney with a specialty in Land Use would be valuable to the Township.”

Board comments – None

Next Regular Meeting – Tuesday, September 12, 2023 at 6:00 pm.

Supervisor Bartlett adjourned the meeting at 8:53

Respectfully Submitted by:

Cindy Baiardi, Clerk

Transcribed by:
Paige Fisher

Proposed: August 8, 2023
Accepted: