

**Whitewater Township Board
Minutes of Regular Meeting held May 22, 2018**

Call to Order

Supervisor Popp called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Whitewater Township Hall, 5777 Vinton Road, Williamsburg, Michigan.

Roll Call of Board Members

Board members present: Benak, Goss, Hubbell, Lawson, Popp

Board members absent: None

Others present: Grand Traverse County Prosecuting Attorney Bob Cooney, Zoning Administrator Dennis Habedank, Interim Fire Chief Tim Arbenowske, Interim Deputy Fire Chief Nicholas Carpenter, Interim Fire Captain Dave Tilley, insurance agent Paul Olson, Assessor Dawn Kuhns, Steve Mangus, Kim Mangus, Jan Mangus, and 5 others

Set/Adjust Meeting Agenda

Goss apologized that she inadvertently put on the agenda that the new fire chief would be here; he will be here on June 12th with his family.

Goss stated she would like to add approval of a Recreation Fund expenditure.

There was consensus the item could be added as New Business #7.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

None

Public Comment

Grand Traverse County Prosecutor Bob Cooney, 7247 Henderson Drive, Traverse City, Peninsula Township, stated he is running for 86th District Court judge. Judge T.J. Phillips is retiring at the end of the year, and Cooney is hoping to take his 25 years of experience in the prosecutor's office and 27 years as an attorney and put it to work on the bench. He provided further details about the court and the reasons he is running for this position.

Greg Hamilton, 9895 Elk Lake Trail, thanked the board for their time and service to the residents of the township. His concern is he has neighbors who are concerned about the situation with ADUs, accessory dwelling units, and the adverse impact they see it having on their neighborhood for the permanent residents. The real concern is the high volume short-term rentals, Airbnbs, VRBOs, where there will be weekly large numbers of people coming through the houses and bringing their vacation aspirations with them and trying to have a good time. He stated he is not against that or against rentals in general, but he thinks we need to be proactive to avoid problems that are going to develop for all of us, including the township. He believes the language of Proposed Amendment No. 75 is vague and not restrictive enough. He stated ADUs are just not compatible with R1 zoning, at least in his neighborhood. He stated it is like having a small motel in your neighborhood. He cited an example of someone who renovated a home into living space for about 12 people. He listed problems such as extra traffic, extra noise, possibly littering,

fireworks, excessive drinking, violation of the rights of other people, including trespassing. He stated he understands the proposal is to legalize ADUs, but he cautioned the board to use extreme discretion in approaching the issue. There a lot of questions: How will complaints be handled, what kind of code restrictions are in place, what kind of restrictions in general are going to be in place that are going to keep these things under control, who enforces the rules, and are people at the township going to be able to say no to some of these ADUs if they do not comply. He stated the house in his neighborhood does not meet several of the restrictions recommended in the language. He stated it is a situation where very possibly it is going to impact the quality of life in his neighborhood. He referred to a 5-foot strip co-owned by three parties, which is attached to a 15-foot private access, and listed several concerns with use of this restricted property. He asked: How do we deal with these things that have already been established? Are you going to go back and review and possibly say no to some who have not met the restrictions and requirements? Some suggestions in his letter were to look at the language other townships have come up with, limit the number of people staying there, require the owner to be present. Where do you draw the line? There are three houses for sale next to him. If they all put ADUs in, where is the boundary with this stuff? Once the door is open, it is potentially going to be a big problem. If we allow it to happen in the first place, how are we going to control it moving forward? He asked the board to think about those considerations.

Sucile Mellor, 9604 Bluff Trail, stated she was reading Proposed Amendment 75 and thought it sounded good for guest accommodations, companionship, security. Then it says rental income through tenants, and she started thinking about all these questions. We are going to limit it to one ADU on the property, but are we limiting the number of people that are going to be in the ADU? Are we going to limit how long or how short they can stay? If people are staying for six months, it is different than if they are changing every two or three days. Are they going to be allowed to put up signs? Are we going to be able to limit the number of vehicles? Does it mean that some people can wheel out their 5th wheel camper and park it and have it as an ADU? What kind of impact is it going to have on septic systems on the lake? What happens with all of the boats and trailers and ski-doo's; where are they going to put all that? What kind of impact is it going to have on people who have legitimate rental property like resorts and small motels? They have to pay taxes. The way this is set up, it is like you do not have to do that, you do not have to have regulations; nobody comes and inspects, you do not have certifications. She stated her primary concerns are what is it going to do to the value of her property. Is it going to lower the value of her property because nobody wants to buy where there are a lot of rentals? And what is it going to do to the character of the neighborhood? She stated that changing the R1 residential to commercial – and that is essentially what we are doing -- is not anything that she would like. She stated the proposal sounds great except when you get to the rental income thing. She would propose that the township do the amendment but take out the rental income thing.

Nels Nichols, 9788 Elk Lake Trail, stated his first question is: Does the township have the authority to change a subdivision that is set up as R1 to multi-family dwellings? He asked if someone could answer that.

Popp advised that this is not a question and answer session; it is public comment.

Nichols stated that it is his understanding that R1 is single-family dwelling. He purchased his property in 1984 and that is the assumption he went under. He stated he purchased a property north on Elk Lake Trail that was zoned for duplexes and he purchased a duplex. The fellow that bought his duplex tried to put in a third unit on the top and they stopped him; he was going to have an “ADU” there and rent it out. Thirty years ago, another fellow put three dwellings on a lot in his neighborhood, one being a trailer, and told the township what they could do with their zoning restrictions and did it anyway. He stated he has questions on the term “district.” Is that your property, or your house, or the whole area? He asked if that could be answered.

Popp replied no.

Nichols then quoted some of the purposes of the proposed amendment. He asked if “services” means you can set up a beauty shop. He stated there is a home on his street that has an apartment in it which is being rented out, which violates the zoning restrictions. He stated he questions the ability to put an addition on a house to accommodate more people with the strict restrictions we have in this township and in the county on septic systems. When you are building a house and get a permit, it is based on the square footage of the house. He does not think a lot of people are putting in oversized drain fields. He stated the township board should be concerned about that. Referring to the square footage limitations, he stated you can build a 2400 square foot duplex and have two units, in an R1 subdivision, so you are putting a two-family dwelling in an R1 subdivision. He brought up the possibility of someone moving upstairs in their garage while they rent their house for 6 or 8 weeks and having three families living in the house, with six cars and two boats. An Airbnb in his neighborhood is \$375 per night. Another rental always has two full garbage cans sitting out in front of the house. He stated he would like to see the zoning committee address the garbage situation. He said he called in about that a couple years ago. He thanked the board for their time.

Popp noted that he does not want anyone to think the board is unreceptive, stating the board will look at this item most likely at the next meeting. He asked the board if they have any questions.

There were no questions from the board.

Popp noted that the zoning administrator would be the person who could get many of the questions out of the way early for Mr. Nichols, and gave the zoning administrator’s office hours.

Hamilton returned to the podium and pointed out that part of the problem that is being created is because of the way that this Airbnb was advertised as shared frontage. It is not shared frontage. There is an access. The property owner has rights to use the access, but everything changes when it becomes a commercial operation open to the public.

Correspondence

None

Public Hearing

None

Reports/Presentations

Paul Olson (Municipal Underwriters of West Michigan) – Annual Insurance Review

Paul Olson stated Whitewater Township has had some changes in the past year. A number of pieces of equipment have been added, as well as a fire department. He sent out the information. One change is that the AM General was added at \$75,000 for physical damage, premium of \$783 for the year. New bill is for \$26,604.

Popp pointed out that the AM General is not a DNR vehicle.

Olson will make that change. On the workers' compensation, around 03/14/2018, he requested the Accident Fund to add payroll of \$90,000, which was a year of payroll but only three months was used, so the township should be getting back about \$4,500 from this year's audit. The prior bill was an endorsement to add the fire department from 3/14 to 6/1. The new bill is for the new year, 6/1 to 6/1.

Popp had questions for Olson regarding the experience rate.

Olson explained that the experience modification is going to stay the same. There have not been any claims. The experience modification is claims driven. The State of Michigan rates the experience modification. On a renewal policy, it will continue to be the same or go down, based on loss history. He explained the situation with companies not writing fire exposure. He confirmed that there was no extra bump on the experience modification due to adding a fire department. Olson stated he is also giving the township an agency schedule credit of 0.69, which would be 41% off the standard rate.

Benak inquired about the Business Electronic Equipment Coverage and whether it would apply to the recent phone system failure.

Discussion followed.

Olson stated he would submit something on the township's behalf for that and asked the clerk to send him the information on phone repair/replacement. There is a \$500 deductible.

In response to a question from Popp regarding Inland Marine scheduling, Olson described what is scheduled on that coverage and how it works.

Olson offered that he would be happy to come speak to the fire department about a number of things, i.e., the public safety officers' benefit program and other things that are available to firemen that they may not know about, and talk to them about liability issues.

Goss requested that the insurance bills be broken down between the fire, general, and park funds.

Olson said he would provide that information tomorrow.

Unfinished Business

Whitewater Township Fire Department

a. Introduction of New Fire Chief Brandon Flynn

Chief Flynn will be here on 6/12.

b. Notification from Grand Traverse Metro re: Turtle Creek Fire Response

Notification was recently received from Chief Parker that Metro will be providing fire service to the casino through a Memo of Understanding with the Grand Traverse Band.

Goss noted that Whitewater Township should probably get a mutual aid agreement out to Metro in case we get called to assist, so that the township can get paid.

Benak stated her only question is that it looks like Metro is going to be the one making the decision on ambulance service for Turtle Creek.

Discussion followed.

Carpenter added that what Metro might be stating is they are providing a squad unit that is now responding to the casino with MMR.

General discussion followed.

c. Verbal Update re: 06/23/2018 Open House Planning

Goss noted that MMR is planning to do hands-only CPR demonstrations. She will ask if they will do child/infant CPR also. A meeting has taken place with WESA members and the clerk recently to do some planning. Goss relayed that Steve Myers (MMR) provided information about a combined open house and safety day. Goss inquired if the board is interested in adding a safety day.

Carpenter said the best time to do a safety fair is in late summer or fall, during Fire Prevention Week in October. It is not uncommon in this area, and with the right planning, it would be great to have. He suggested fall would be a better time, but they are definitely excited to show off the station and their capabilities.

Discussion followed.

There was consensus to do a safety day at a later time.

Goss brought up the issue of asphaltting of the front approach. Kyle Richter from RCI has volunteered to get some quotes. The firefighters have asked about having the east drive and rear parking lot done also. Goss has requested two quotes, one for new asphalt out front and the east drive and one for just the rear parking lot.

Brief discussion followed.

New Business**Resolution #18-14 Audit Procedures for Granting or Removal of Real Property Exemptions**

Assessor Dawn Kuhns is present.

Goss noted a typographical error in the first paragraph, i.e., “properly” should be “property.”
Motion by Goss to adopt Resolution #18-14; second by Hubbell. There was no further discussion. **Roll call vote: Benak, yes; Goss, yes; Hubbell, yes; Lawson, yes; Popp, yes.**
Motion carried.

A true and complete copy of said resolution is attached to the minutes.

Kuhns stated the audit is scheduled for June 21. It will be at Grand Traverse County. She explained several potential changes in the law regarding assessing which have been proposed.

Brief discussion followed.

Review of Whitewater Pines Site Condominium

Zoning Administrator Habedank is present. Steve and Kim Mangus are present.

Popp suggested we begin with recommendations from the zoning administrator.

Habedank stated this is the first site condominium approval process that he has been through. In other townships he was at, it was left up to the zoning administrator and they did not have to look at all the things he had to look at here. It was very complex because he had to look at a project that is 13 years old, has been through two or three zoning administrators, and it was designated as a special use permit for a site condominium. He described having a question as to whether the township board would have to have a public hearing, because under most special use permits, they are approved by the planning commission, and the township board does not necessarily see them. However, in the Zoning Enabling Act, it requires a public hearing and then talks about the body of government which has the discretionary decision. Since it had to be referred from the planning commission to the township board, he felt it was the township board who had really the discretionary decision-making ability. He talked to Popp as well as the attorney about it. There is nowhere in the zoning ordinance that mentions site condominium as being a special use, and there is nowhere in Ordinance 16, the subdivision control act, which talks about site condominiums. The subdivision control act was written in 1990, and no one really did a site condominium project until the early 2000s, when people figured out they could do a site condo and not get a state-approved subdivision built. Also, the private road ordinance falls into this, as well as Act 59 of 1978, the Condominium Act. So there are four to five documents to wade through to figure out where we are at.

He stated he did recommend to the planning commission for approval, but he meant to say preliminary approval because that is what was requested back in May. He was not here at that time. He stated he was then told that, for the most part, everything had been approved by the township board as a final approval, but he cannot document any of that. When looking at the special use permit file that was created over a couple years by somebody, it left him blank. There is paper in there, but nobody put their name on anything, pages are not numbered, all the pages are mixed up.

He stated he thinks it is a good project, but because of the lapse in time, 13 years, things change. He stated he cannot find that the 11 recommendations that the previous developer was supposed to do were completed. There are preliminary approvals but no final approvals. He stated he thinks that is because there was not a site plan that was developed in accordance with Public Act 59 of 1978 that he has been able to find, specifically dealing with Section 66. There are no sealed drawings in the file. There are no drawings of utilities or anything like that. He stated that he searched the office today and came up with a couple plans that look like they might have been removed from the file. One is how the roads in the development were built. He noted the current roads that are in over there do not reflect the private road standards that were passed in 2003. They were built, but he does not know when or by who or how. He stated it does not appear that they meet the private road standards, but he thinks we have to live with that.

He suggested that we do another preliminary approval pending the 11 items that are covered that the original board talked about. One of them would be an engineered site plan that has everything as built.

There was brief discussion concerning the lack of a site condominium ordinance or policy in the township.

Benak asked if the developers need to get a variance for roads that do not meet the private road standard.

Habedank stated he believes that would be the proper thing to do because it covers the entire site, and that is something the board can do under Ordinance 32.

Popp cited requirements of the International Fire Code and noted the Whitewater Pines roads do not meet some of those standards. Maybe we have to have the fire chief sign off or be okay with a variance.

Benak stated she wants the project to go through, but we need to look at all the things that were not done that need to be done, i.e., sealed engineered drawings, went from 21 units to 28, it has been reconfigured. The storm water drainage was supposedly approved for 21, but we cannot find the documentation on it. The drainage needs to be looked at again. She noted that one of the documents specifically states that if the subdivision or the site condominium has not been completed in two years after preliminary granting from the township board, that granting is gone. Whatever they granted is not there anymore. After 10 years, per Dawn, you have to start over from step one.

Goss brought to the board's attention that Page 92 of the packet has some erroneous information on it. The document in question is page 1101 of the minutes. The date at the top, 12/21/2004, is incorrect. Goss advised that she did an exhaustive review today of township board minutes going back to the first time the Hidden Pines project was on the board's agenda. That was on minutes page 1065, which was the 12/21/2004 meeting of the township board. Page 1101 should be dated 05/17/2005. Goss read the 12/21/2004 minutes aloud regarding the Hidden Pines project, which was the date that pre-preliminary approval was given. Goss noted that she reviewed four years of minutes, all the way through December 2008. The only other place that

Hidden Pines was on the agenda was on 05/17/2005, minutes page 1101. On that date, preliminary approval was given, with 11 conditions set forth.

Goss went on to recite that letters dated 12/21/2005, 08/14/2006, and 10/02/2006 were sent by Vanessa Gembarski (former zoning administrator) warning Hidden Pines developer Yates that this project needs final approval from the township board and that she was waiting for the required final approval letters from all agencies and a letter from the engineer stating compliance with the private road ordinance, as well as an as-built site plan. Goss stated that is where it all ended apparently and that project was abandoned, for whatever reason. That was a 21-lot project. Now a new owner wants to have a site condominium approved. Goss stated she also feels it is a great project for the community but wants to see it done properly.

The process laid out in Ordinance 16 was briefly discussed.

Benak stated Section 3.24 in Ordinance 16 says, “Approval of the preliminary plat by the township board shall be for a period of two years from the date of its approval, after approval by the other required authorities.” Benak stated we do not know if the other authorities approved it.

Steve Mangus stated they have all the letters and asked to speak.

It was noted that there was preliminary approval of the old project, but it has been more than two years.

Board discussion followed.

Habedank noted it is pretty complete but is lacking a few things. The engineered plan is probably the biggest thing.

Kim Mangus stated when you get to the preliminary approval process in the subdivision ordinance, that is when the board gives you a list of the remaining things you need to have final. Final approval means everything is filed and it is a done deal with the county. She stated they have skipped no steps. The roads, utilities, and drainage are already there. Preliminary approval of the plan for the old subdivision was granted by all agencies listed in the to-do list. She stated that does not matter because they have to go get new letters. What they are asking for from the board is preliminary approval, which means the board gives them a list of the things they still need to do to qualify to register their deeds and have final approval. They had a pre-preliminary with the planning commission, they had a preliminary, they had a public hearing.

Benak noted the planning commission did not send the board a formal letter.

Kim stated as the chair of the planning commission it is not appropriate for her to send the letter and she could not get anybody else to do it. She stated she was told that their meeting minutes would suffice, along with Habedank’s report.

Benak noted that, at the meeting where the Manguses met with the planning commission, Kim left the table because she declared a conflict of interest, but the minutes reflect that she voted on this.

Kim stated she did not vote on this matter at the planning commission meeting.

Benak noted that will have to be corrected, and stated that because Kim is the chair of the planning commission, that is the other reason Benak wants to make sure all the documentation is in place. She does not want anyone coming back to this board and saying there was any favoritism.

Steve said he does not want the board to skip anything and stated they just need to know exactly what they need to have so they can have the surveyor provide whatever documentation is needed. He stated he has the letters and can make copies if that will help. It reflects the stuff that is actually there, the asphalt, curbs, approach, how the drains were put in. He stated he has maps of borings that were done. He stated they can go through the steps with each of the agencies and make sure everything is brought up to current approvals. They just need to know exactly what the board wants and they will do it.

Kim detailed what they have on their personal to-do list.

Popp noted that Ordinance 16 calls for traffic, school, and economic impact studies, a site plan drawing with topographicals, and a timeline for installation of infrastructure. Popp asked that a completion date be chosen so that those documents are in a file for board review.

Kim asked that they be given a list of what the board needs.

Discussion turned to whether a list of requirements would be generated by the zoning administrator or by the board. Goss urged that the list be formalized in the minutes, and asked that a drawing signed by the surveyor be provided.

Benak stated that Popp's suggestion is we have the zoning administrator put together a list of things that are required for this project and the Manguses can start checking off what they have and what they need, and then they come back to the board with a folder of all the things. Then if there are other things the board needs, we put those in the meeting minutes.

Discussion back and forth touched on the following:

- Kim stated they have done everything asked of them but cannot help it if the ZA at the time didn't ask for something different. She further stated the board has the next meeting and no more than 30 days from the planning commission's approval. It is at three months.
- Benak replied that the board did not get the written letter they were supposed to get.
- Popp stated there is no way that the planning commission should have given approval when there is at least two items missing.
- Kim stated they need approval of the lot configuration to be able to go forward.
- Popp stated one of the things for that approval is topographical information.

- Kim stated they were told that did not need to be on this document because it was on the other documents that were in the township's files for the 21 units.
- Steve asked if moving ahead with 21 units would speed anything up.
- Kim provided an explanation of how the number of lots went from 33, as shown on the application, to 28, as shown on the drawing.

There was discussion of public versus private roads in the development.

Habedank stated a regular subdivision has to have county-maintained roads. A site condominium can have either public or private roads.

It was noted that Grand Traverse County Road Commission will not accept private roads anymore and have retracted all of their recommendations.

Benak stated that somewhere in the future the township will have to look at getting their own site plan condominium ordinance so that any future developments can go a lot smoother.

Popp noted the statement of intended use is also missing.

Kim stated they were told it was unnecessary.

Discussion followed regarding the proposed density of the development.

Kim stated the impact statement was incorporated into the blueprint. They were not intending on giving up or altering the normal agricultural zoning. But it was not a separate document.

Steve stated the surveyor can sign the drawing. He just wants to know what direction to go in and they will do what has to be done.

Goss drew attention to Ordinance 16, Section 3.2, Preliminary Plats, and read off the requirements. Is that the list?

Benak stated the direction she would like to give them is to meet with the zoning administrator and he will go through here and provide them with a list.

Popp agreed.

Goss asked what list the zoning administrator is going to use.

Popp replied Ordinance 16.

Kim stated the zoning administrator has already provided his list in two different documents.

Benak stated she wants a checklist from the zoning administrator.

Kim stated they need preliminary approval of the layout of the subdivision to be able to get the letters.

Discussion followed regarding whether the minutes of the planning commission meeting will be accepted instead of the report from the planning commission talked about in Ordinance 16.

Popp stated, in his opinion, the minutes suffice as a report, but the checklist puts all of the paperwork in order.

There was explanation by the Manguses of why the development went from 21 to 28 lots and other features of the plan.

Hubbell stated his opinion is that we should let the zoning administrator sit down with the Manguses and tell them what they need. If we have to have another meeting, we have to have another meeting.

Benak stated there is a list of letters that should be updated and in the packet.

Steve stated he did not want to waste a lot of time doing all of that if he didn't know that it was actually going to go through, because there is a certain dollar amount where it becomes not worth it. He stated they will work with Habedank, and asked if they should then come back to the board at another meeting.

There was board consensus to have the Manguses meet with Habedank and provide the documents that are talked about in General Ordinance 16. There was consensus that Habedank will create a checklist using Ordinance 16 to come up with the documents and the information that the developers need to provide to the township board.

Popp said he does not think those documents were generated and reviewed by the planning commission, and stated he does not necessarily want to go that far back, but it is a good learning experience for the board that we have to have some oversight of the planning commission, that if you are going to review a submittal, you have to have the minimum documents. Popp stated he is making a statement about the elephant in the room and he is going to ask for board consensus what they think needs to be done. He does not want to push it back to the planning commission. He is willing to take the PC minutes and the PC vote as their report to the township board, as their recommendation for the township board to review it.

Benak stated she agrees with that only on this project.

Hubbell stated, going forward, the planning commission needs to review these a little bit better.

Brief discussion followed on the issue of review of site condominiums.

Kim asked if the board is willing to give them a variance on the roads and accept the roads as built.

Popp stated, because some of the infrastructure already exists, he thinks the board is willing to accept those items that are already there, i.e., the roads, the electrical, but we still have to go through and have those people tell us that they accept it, like the fire department and the road commission.

Benak stated we will also have to go through the process of the Ordinance 32 exemption because it is still in place.

Popp noted it will be the International Fire Code, too, which he feels is more restrictive than Ordinance 32.

Kim stated they are looking for the likelihood if this is going to go through and whether or not it is worth wasting another dime on.

Popp offered his view on certain aspects of the project, including that he is a proponent of the 30,000 gallon water tank, but he will default to what the fire department says.

Kim stated the fire tank is a deal breaker; they were told it was not needed prior to purchase of the property but could not get the ZA or Theo Weber to put it in writing. If it is required, they will go back to metes and bounds lots.

Discussion followed. It was noted that there needs to be a letter from the fire chief.

There was consensus that when Habedank has all of the items in Ordinance 16, this issue will come back to the township board, not the planning commission.

WMDLS Corrections

Benak provided a memo regarding two errors that were made in the calculations, leaving the fund short. She is asking for a motion to transfer \$9,226.55 from the General Fund to the WMDLS Fund. It is important to note that \$5,972.36 of that will be coming back when it is repaid, but \$3,254.19 will not. That was an overpayment to all the parcel holders. Two parcels were paid short through a data entry error. The \$3,254.19 in additional funds was divided amongst the others because the error was not found. There were almost 300 checks to produce.

Further explanation and discussion followed.

Lawson questioned whether that type of error, a clerical mistake, is covered under the municipal plan, and suggested we need to look at that first before we take money out of the General Fund.

Discussion followed.

Benak suggested she could check with MTA to see what they recommend.

Goss also suggested checking with the auditors.

This matter will be brought back after Benak speaks with the MTA and the auditors.

Approval of METRO Act Right of Way Permit Extension – Ace Telephone Company

Goss stated this company comes into the township on Supply Road. They do not come up Williamsburg Road at all. At one time, they used to service the Williamsburg Recovery Center, now the Woodland School. Their exchange is 369, mainly Fife Lake and South Boardman phone numbers. They pay METRO Act fees.

Motion by Hubbell to approve the METRO Act right of way permit extension for Ace Telephone Company; second by Lawson. There was no further discussion. **Roll call vote: Goss, yes; Hubbell, yes; Lawson, yes; Popp, yes; Benak, yes. Motion carried.**

Approval of 2018 Park Rangers

Motion by Lawson to approve Dan Belanger, Peggy Quast, Brian Cobb, Chuck Loper, Raejean Loper, and Kali Anderson as 2018 park rangers, to be compensated according to the 2018/2019 Graded Wage Scale; second by Hubbell. There was no further discussion. **On voice vote, all those present voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.**

Foreclosed Property in Whitewater Township

Parcel number 13-830-029-00 has been foreclosed upon and the township has a right of refusal to purchase the property “for a public purpose.”

There was brief discussion of the stipulations attached to such a purchase.

No motion was made. There was consensus that the board is not interested in it.

Approval of Recreation Fund Expenditure (added)

Goss reported that she just found out yesterday that we were successful on the Rotary Good Works grant for \$5,000. They are very interested in the batting cage, shed, dugouts project. Also, the Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee now wants to put a roof on the batting cage. They have provided a quote showing the cost of erecting the batting cage and a separate cost for the roof. Goss is asking the board to approve these expenditures so they can move forward with the project.

Motion by Hubbell to approve the expenditure of \$4,926.07 from the Recreation Fund; second by Lawson. Popp stated we need to see a picture. Goss noted that it requires an engineered drawing, which is part of the expenditure. It was noted that the board will need to approve the final plan before applying for permits. **Roll call vote: Hubbell, yes; Lawson, yes; Popp, yes; Benak, yes; Goss, yes. Motion carried.**

Tabled Items

Review Administrative Policy Section 5 (tabled 10/14/2014)

This agenda item will remain tabled.

Review Ordinance 22 Pension Plan (tabled 10/25/2016)

This agenda item will remain tabled.

Review Whitewater Township Planning & Zoning Fees (tabled 02/28/2017)

This agenda item will remain tabled.

Board Comments/Discussion

None

Announcements

Next regular township board meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 12, 2018, at 7:00 p.m.

Public Comment

None

Adjournment

Motion by Lawson to adjourn; second by Popp. On voice vote, all those present voted in favor, none opposed. Meeting adjourned at 10:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Goss
Whitewater Township Clerk

DRAFT