

MEMBERS PRESENT: CRAWFORD, OPRITA, BUECHLER, BRADLEY, KISH AND MONTGOMERY
 MEMBERS ABSENT: BRUCKNER
 ALSO PRESENT: PAT SMITH, FIRE CHIEF
 SHARON WILTON, COMMUNITY EVENTS COORDINATOR
 LISA SHAGENA, ASSESSOR
 WILLIAM SHAGENA, FIRE DEPARTMENT CAPTAIN

SUPERVISOR OPENS PUBLIC HEARING TO REVIEW PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES FROM DTE FOR OLD FARM SUBDIVISION LIGHTING ASSESSMENT DISTRICT, and continues with the Regular Agenda at this time.

Motion by Montgomery, seconded by Buechler, to approve the Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING** of October 2, 2019, as printed and posted. Vote, Unanimous. **MOTION PASSED.**

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD: * NONE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion by Crawford, seconded by Bradley, to approve the Agenda, with the addition of NEW BUSINESS: Item #3., Fire Chiefs recommendation to promote Bo Devroy from Probationary Member to Paid-on-Call Member; and Item #4, BMJ Proposal to provide professional surveying services to split Parcel ID No. 74-20-017-3003-100. Vote, Unanimous. **MOTION PASSED. AGENDA APPROVED, AS AMENDED.**

TREASURER'S REPORT:

GENERAL FUND	\$ 1,703,082.32
FIRE DEPARTMENT FUND	\$ 680,879.75
FIRE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	\$ 229,525.88
POLICE PROTECTION FUND	\$ 408,159.56
TRASH / RECYCLING FUND	\$ 198,135.07
BUILDING DEPARTMENT FUND	\$ 41,779.62
UTILITY RECEIVING FUND	\$ 1,944,131.98
TOTAL	\$ 5,205,694.18
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS	\$ 1,503,888.08
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 6,709,582.26

Motion by Montgomery, seconded by Buechler, to receive the Treasurer's Report, as given. Roll Call Vote, 6/0. **MOTION PASSED. TOTAL TREASURER'S REPORT APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$ 6,709,582.26.**

BILLS PRESENTED FOR APPROVAL:

GENERAL FUND	\$ 20,371.77
FIRE DEPARTMENT FUND	\$ 2,378.64
FIRE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	\$ 10,000.00
POLICE PROTECTION FUND	\$ 62,665.83
TRASH / RECYCLING FUND	\$ 54,504.60
BUILDING DEPARTMENT FUND	\$ 155.00
UTILITY RECEIVING FUND	\$ 473,505.44
TOTAL	\$ 623,581.28
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS (Maint. & Imp.)	\$ 20,591.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 644,172.28

Motion by Montgomery, seconded by Oprita, to pay bills, as presented. Roll Call Vote, 6/0. **MOTION PASSED. BILLS APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$ 644,172.28.**

* According to Section 6 of the Charter Township of Fort Gratiot By-Laws adopted 02/20/2003.

SHERIFF DEPARTMENT REPORT: Given by representative of Sheriff Department: Under Sheriff, Paulus

Total Calls for Service for the month of September, 2019, (383). Number of Patrol Hours, (900). 9 Animal Complaint; 2 Assault & Battery; 29 Assist Other Depts.; 67 Assist Public; 2 B&E Bldg./Vehicle; 22 B&E/Alarm; 3 Child Abuse/Neglect; 6 Disorderly Persons; 9 Domestic Assault; 5 Fraud; 6 Harassment & Threats; 6 Juvenile Matter; 3 Larceny; 3 MDP; 1 Narcotics; 2 PI Traffic Crash; 40 PD Traffic Crash; 15 Retail Fraud; 31 Suspicious Incidents; 5 Trespasser; 117 Misc.: School Checks/Warrant Arrests/Follow-up/BOL, 911 Hang-ups, etc.; 146 Traffic Stops; 36 Tickets Issued.

Under Sheriff Paulus discussed the uptick in drug overdoses; and recreational marijuana use.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE SHERIFF: * Unidentified resident re: speeding and red light running

Under Sheriff Paulus noted much of that is still from cell phone use and distracted driving.

FIRE DEPARTMENT REPORT: Total runs for the month of September, 2019, (117). 3 Fire; 93 Rescue/EMS; 5 Hazardous Condition (No Fire); 4 Service Calls; 10 Good Intent Calls; 2 False Alarm/False Call. Total Cost, \$22,060.00.

BUILDING DEPARTMENT REPORT: Total permits issued for the month of September, 2019, (21). 1 New Homes (Val. \$180,000); 10 Residential Addition/Alteration/Repair (Val. 88,661); 4 Residential Accessory Structure (Val. 51,970); 4 Fence (Val. 8,046); 2 Manufactured Mobile Homes (Val. 12,000). 2 Commercial Addition/Alteration/Repair (Val. 175,000); 4 Sign (Val. 24,580). Total Valuation, \$ 540,257.00. Total Fees, \$ 5,726.50.

PLUMBING/MECHANICAL INSPECTOR'S REPORT: Total permits issued for the month of September, 2019, (19). 14 Mechanical (2,035.00); 5 Plumbing (765.00). Total Fees, \$ 2,800.00.

ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT REPORT: Total permits issued for the month of September, 2019, (18). Total Fees, \$2,527.00.

ORDINANCE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER REPORT: Total complaints in the month of September, 2019, (36). 6 Blight; 2 High Grass/Noxious Weeds; 17 RV Storage; 1 Unlicensed Vehicle; 10 Misc. Ord. Violations.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. COMCAST notification of changes/updates to Xfinity TV Channels, effective October 29th, 2019 & December 5th, 2019.

Motion by Kish, seconded by Buechler, to accept Reports and Correspondence, as presented. Vote, Unanimous.
MOTION PASSED.

PUBLIC HEARING, CONTINUED:

1. PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES FOR OLD FARM SUBDIVISION FROM DTE ENERGY:

- POINTS OF DISCUSSION: *
- Installation of 35 72-Watt LED Colonial Style Street Light Fixtures, black fiberglass street lamp posts, fed by underground distribution utilities.
 - Special Assessment includes construction, interest, publication and postage costs related to establishing the Special Assessment District totaling \$201,222.04, divided among each individual Parcel ID Number (213) and assessed over a three (3) year period at an interest rate of 4%:

ASSESSABLE UNIT	1	2	3
	01/20____	02/20____	03/20____
UNPAID BALANCE	1,339.08	892.72	446.36
PRINCIPAL	446.36	446.36	446.36
INTEREST	53.56	35.71	17.85
TOTAL PAYMENT DUE	499.92	482.07	464.21

- * Special Assessments are billed each year on the December 1st (WINTER) Property Tax
- * This is the first (1st) of two (2) Public Hearings. The second Public Hearing is when the Special Assessment Roll is created and adopted.

PUBLIC HEARING, ITEM #1, CONTINUED:

Clerk Buechler noted the Petition was started around 2015 or 2016. He referred to information he mailed to residents, that should have been received yesterday, advising of different options (i.e., 4 year assessment as opposed to a 3 year assessment); and noting DTE costs for construction/installation & operation, as well as SEMCO Energy costs for removal of gas lamps. DTE construction costs are approximately \$201,500, plus annual lighting/maintenance costs of approximately \$9,567 per year. SEMCO costs for the decommissioning of existing gas lamps is approximately \$84,000.

4 YEAR ASSESSMENT ROLL – 4% INTEREST ON UNPAID BALANCE:

ASSESSABLE UNIT	1	2	3	4
	01/2019	02/2020	03/2021	03/2021
UNPAID BALANCE	1,339.08	1,004.31	669.54	334.77
PRINCIPAL	334.77	334.77	334.77	334.77
INTEREST	53.56	40.17	26.78	13.39
TOTAL PAYMENT DUE	388.33	374.94	361.55	348.16

PLUS ANNUAL LIGHTING COSTS

Supervisor Crawford asked for citizen comments, questions/and or objections to the petition to convert the existing gas lamps within the Old Farm Subdivision to electric LED lamps.

Al Spencer - A 29 year resident of Old Farm Subdivision. Asked if there is an option to do nothing and just let the existing gas lights die? He asked if safety is a concern, why are we replacing 84 lights with 35? Why aren't we talking about equal numbers?

Clerk Buechler explained that the LED lights are significantly brighter than the gas lamps. He referred to Stoney Creek, noting that they aren't LED, but they are a similar style and a similar layout as to what DTE has provided for Old Farm. He stated that Whitney Place went with a light for light replacement and it looks like an airport.

Mr. Spencer stated the gas lights were a 20 year assessment. Why is this only a three (3) year assessment?

Supervisor Crawford noted that residents have had an Assessment every year since these lights were installed, but he doesn't believe the construction assessment was 20 years. Normal assessments on a lighting district is three (3) years.

Supervisor Crawford stated, we are here because a Petition was circulated throughout Old Farms Subdivision and presented to the Township Board with more than 51% of property owners requesting the Township convert the existing lights from gas to LED. This, then, got the Township, SEMCO Energy and DTE Energy to come together to obtain plans and cost estimates. We are here, tonight, to share those costs estimates with residents. The Township Board makes the determination as to whether this project moves forward and it is very important, for that reason, to hear from residents as to whether or not they want it. The Township Board also has to look at the cost of this construction because the Township has to front the cost from the General Fund.

Mr. Spencer doesn't think it's not ideal to do nothing and thinks most people would agree to that. He submits that this is an advisable project.

Bob Derocha - Has lived for 26 years in the Old Farm Subdivision; and has over 30 years in the Natural Gas industry. The statement has been made that the gas lights have been in a poor state of repair for a considerable time and that's the truth. Very few are putting out any illumination at all. What that means is the Old Farm Subdivision is not really dependent on those gas lights. Lamps are in poor shape, knocked down, and burned out. If you travel the subdivision, many, many homes have lighting on and he doesn't expect that to change. Most homes have a front door light and two additional lights beside their garage doors. If each house had one 10 watt LED light, what lamination level would we obtain even if only half the homes had them on? It would surpass what is being presented at far less cost. Three 10 watt LED lights power his home 12 hours a day, 365 days a year; this would cost the average home owner \$15/year. If you take a look at what we're talking here in terms of the amount of money to install a lighting system, the homeowner isn't doing something it's their own fault. He is suggesting that "yes" the gas lines need to come out, they're in lousy shape. He thinks the price being talked about here is a bit on the high side, based on his experience and that should be fully investigated. But, the merits of falling on an electric lighting in a subdivision, he thinks, is very much in question. He doesn't think the illumination is needed. We haven't had it for a long time and we haven't had a problem.

PUBLIC HEARING, ITEM #1, CONTINUED:

Mr. Derocha is opposed to the lamps and the cost. He is suggesting not to install any electrical systems, for a year or two; and, then, get peoples response. Turn them off and see how people feel. He thinks they are more offended by the lousy shape of the gas lights. Get rid of the existing lighting system, let people light their own and if that's insufficient, then consider an alternate lighting system.

Two (2) unidentified residents agreed with Mr. Derocha.

Chris Schofield - Has lived in the Old Farm Subdivision for a couple decades, at least. He asked how tall the light fixtures will be. He stated he has seen two (2) different poles. Which of the two are being used?

Clerk Buechler indicated they will be the Colonial Fixture. It is his understanding that they are similar in height to the current gas lights.

Mr. Schofield stated that DTE isn't providing a heck of a lot of information. Residents had earlier meetings with the Homeowner's Association and he feels it was presented improperly to the people in the subdivision. They thought they were going to be able to vote on this, which is not really what it turned out to be. That has some people upset; but he understands according to State Law it is how these things are handled. But we were misinformed by the Homeowner's Association as to how the procedures would go. As far as the lighting goes, this seems sensible that they are at every intersection and he doesn't think this is totally overdone. If you're going to do lighting, you would have to be out of your mind to not go LED. He asked how bright the lights are?

Supervisor Crawford stated DTE has planned for a 72 watt LED, which is quite bright.

Mr. Schofield asked how far those lights would go out from the post. He stated it would have been nice if DTE would have sent someone out to explain this; feels it was very inconsiderate of them. He stated it is his understanding that the Gas Company is intending to abandon the current light system as it is.

Supervisor Crawford explained that SEMCO will continue to provide service to the existing gas lamps that are usable. But, as the light becomes non-repairable/non-replaceable, that light will be disconnected; meaning that the gas will be shut off at the light.

Mr. Schofield noted the subdivision will just have fewer and fewer lights as time goes on.

Supervisor Crawford stated there aren't many parts available to replace many of the older lights because of their age.

Mr. Schofield stated when he is driving at night, through the subdivision, his car does not shine its lights to the right or left, even when he turns his turn signal on. Some very expensive cars do. So, when he comes to a corner he can't really tell what's right there. It gets really dicey at night driving in the subdivision. That, basically, is the whole purpose of lighting; for safety. Especially for walkers; and the subdivision has a lot of walkers, winter and summer. He stated he is totally in favor of this and feels the annual costs of the payments are reasonable. He doesn't think \$1300 is going to sink anybody in a year. It's a one-time thing; he doesn't think this will have to be revisited for at least ten years, at the very least. He thinks this is a reasonable proposition.

Helen Ruffing asked what the annual cost, per year, will be per household.

Clerk Buechler responded, \$44.92. The gas lamps run an average of \$22,000 - \$24,000 per year and is divided amongst property owners according to lot size. It probably averages about \$90.00 per household for gas.

Mrs. Ruffing referred to a meeting about a year or year and a half ago in which representatives from SEMCO and DTE attended. She thought it had already been voted on and that this meeting was just to approve the placement of the lights. She asked if DTE has indicated what they are going to do at the entrance, noting there are currently four (4) lamps at the brick walls.

Clerk Buechler stated they have not. It appears to him that there is an overhead light on North River Road. Lights at the entrance was not part of the plan that DTE gave the Township. It's his understanding they will be removed.

Mrs. Ruffing asked if SEMCO is charging to remove all the gas lights that are broken.

Supervisor Crawford replied, yes; because they have to disconnect the gas line from the broken light to the gas main.

Mrs. Ruffing replied, but they're the ones who opted to not repair them anymore and you can't find anybody to repair them. That's why we're going with the electric.

PUBLIC HEARING, ITEM #1, CONTINUED:

Mrs. Ruffing asked if DTE is guaranteeing to repair or replace the lamp if it is broke or destroyed?

Clerk Buechler replied, yes; it is part of the maintenance contract.

Mrs. Ruffing asked if the Board is considering a four (4) year assessment. Or a two (2) year option? She is in favor.

Supervisor Crawford stated the Board is considering the possibility of a four (4) year assessment.

Mary Ann Dunkle noted that the lights get messy from rain and weather and asked if DTE will clean them.

Supervisor Crawford replied that the Maintenance Agreement doesn't include any cleaning, only operations. He hasn't seen anyone come out on an annual basis just to clean light fixtures. The Maintenance Agreement is to repair a light that isn't working.

Supervisor Crawford also explained that the Assessment would be charged based on Parcel ID Number, regardless of lot size.

Brian Davis asked, since this is improving the efficiency of the lights and the energy of the State, is there any opportunity to do matching funds with the County or the State?

Supervisor Crawford replied, not that he is aware of. What DTE does, when working with a municipal government to put in a lighting district, is provide a discount on the construction. The discount isn't offered to a developer who is installing lights during the construction of a subdivision. He is not aware of any Grant due to energy efficiency.

Mr. Davis stated he thinks it's in the State budget for efficiency and improving the environment. It's just something to consider looking into. He also stated that he knows Angus Road and Sunset Drive are not officially part of the Old Farm Subdivision, but those streets are still dark and the costs would be spread over more users. He asked that the Board consider having DTE include those two roads and the light at the front gate entrance to the Old Farm Subdivision.

Trustee Montgomery asked if residents of Angus and Sunset wouldn't have to submit their own Petitions because they are not part of the Old Farm Subdivision.

Supervisor Crawford replied, yes, because they were not part of the original lighting district. He believes to expand the district, from this point, he feels we would have to start over with a new petition because the geographical area wasn't defined and included in the original petition that was accepted by the Township Board.

William Shanahan - The map is a little confusing to him. Documents indicate that 35 lights will be installed. He sees more than that, as far as the number of locations, on the map. He is unclear as to what the map is indicating. Also, his notes indicate that the four lights at the entrance should have been included and he is surprised they are not. They are gas lights and is part of the original plan.

Clerk Buechler clarified that the green electrical boxes that are located in some residents' back yard are also numbered. This is why the map indicates a number past 35. (#1, #11, #15, #22 & #31 are the DTE junction boxes).

Mr. Shanahan also asked how long the maintenance contract is in effect for?

Clerk Buechler replied the maintenance contract is a five (5) year term; then it continues until there is mutual consent to terminate.

Mr. Shanahan asked if the cost increases after five years.

Supervisor Crawford replied the energy cost has to be reviewed and set annually.

Mr. Shanahan noted, as far as the removal of the gas lamps; there is nothing indicated as far as the underground gas lines that run from lamp to lamp.

Clerk Buechler stated, in talking with SEMCO, it is his understanding that the lines that run along the side of the street are connected to the gas main. The ones on the opposite side of the street are either connected to the main or branched off from the service line. He has also learned that they started using plastic lines in the late 60's / early 70's. Chasing down lines and pulling them up from wherever they junction in is part of the \$600 retirement cost.

PUBLIC HEARING, ITEM #1, CONTINUED:

Supervisor Crawford clarified that SEMCO wanted \$600 to disconnect the service line from the light going to the gas main. SEMCO has to do that type of work. There is a possibility of using a sub-contractor for the removal of the pedestals and existing lights. The gas line, itself, would remain in the ground and abandoned.

Mr. Shanahan inquired about the installation time frame. The letter indicates they will begin summer of 2020, estimating the retirement of two (2) lamps per day due to the age of the system. That estimates to be about four (4) months with no lights.

Supervisor Crawford replied, yes; during the summer months when you have the most daylight.

Mr. Shanahan stated, after that is completed, then DTE will begin to install the lights.

Supervisor Crawford stated it was discussed that perhaps the LED lights could start to go in if there's no conflict with a gas light. Where there is a conflict, maybe SEMCO could make it a priority to remove that gas light 1st for the installation of the electric light.

Mr. Shanahan stated, as far as the costs, they seem, in his opinion, to be reasonable. He was surprised to see the 3 year vs. the 4 year. He would prefer the 4 year over the 3 year.

John Carrier - Lived in Old Farm Subdivision for 11 years. He's noticed the darkness and the darkness when kids are out on Halloween. The light was out in his front yard a couple years ago. He called, not looking to replace it but to get it fixed. With all of them that are out, how do you determine if it's enough light? Is it the same lumens as what they had before? His concern is the kids. He doesn't want an airport either, but he wants to make sure it's lit enough for safety. He would rather not be coming back next year asking for additional lights.

Clerk Buechler replied that DTE is in the business of selling lights. The more lights they sell us, the more money they make; and they said this is enough light for the neighborhood.

Mr. Carrier asked what the process would be if it is later decided that there isn't enough light in a certain spot?

Supervisor Crawford replied, the Township would have to look at each situation. But, if it is found that an area needs more light, perhaps the next years Assessment could just be bumped up to cover the cost of that additional light(s). Because we've not had that experience, he does not know.

Mr. Carrier noted that he took a ride through the subdivision today and looked at the lights. He noted one light that, although it is out and not working, is completely grown over by brush/trees at a vacant lot. Who is responsible for making sure the lights stay clear to make sure the light is doing what it is supposed to do?

Trustee Montgomery stated if it is high grass or weeds, he would think that it would be reported to the Code Enforcement Officer to address.

Rob Horak unidentified resident asked about the Agreement and if there is anything in it about the destruction of property.

Supervisor Crawford replied, restoration is part of any contract with new construction. In fact, SEMCO said they couldn't start this project until next year because of restoration. He also noted that if a sub-contractor is used, at a lesser cost, to remove the retired gas lights and pedestals, the restoration would have to be a part of that contract. He stated that if a resident thinks a pedestal is going to be removed and replaced with a swatch of sod, that's not happening. Restoration, typically, is topsoil and grass seed.

Dawn Horak stated the gas lamp in their yard had a gas leak and killed the grass around it. She is happy to see the gas lamps go just for that reason. But, they had to top it and seed it themselves. When they did the ditch project, they didn't fix their lawn. She did it. She is concerned that when they take the light post & pedestal out that they replace the grass.

Supervisor Crawford stated, with any construction project that the Township has been involved in, he has always told residents if they have concerns to take photos before the work begins and after the work is completed. Then, if you're not satisfied, each one of these projects has a construction manager that the Township can contact and try to resolve the issue.

Steve McPherson - 20 year resident of Old Farm Subdivision. He understands there is a cost. As far as he is concerned, it's fairly reasonable. His concern is safety issues in the community and their subdivision. There are a lot of kids in the subdivision and he would like to see more lighting for their safety. Feels everyone should consider the safety aspect of it and the fact it might keep down on mischief and crime. It's an investment that is well worth it.

PUBLIC HEARING, ITEM #1, CONTINUED:

Mike Berels - The way he sees it, they are SEMCO's property and SEMCO should pay for the cost to remove all those lights and posts. He doesn't see why the residents are paying for any of it. Even if they want to abandon it, it is their responsibility to pull it out. He has a big problem with paying them to remove their property. As far as the lighting goes, his preference is to not have any. He grew up in the sticks and prefers the darkness. As far as safety goes, the biggest problem is people driving too fast up and down the streets, not the kids darting in and out. He doesn't see that lighting will fix that problem. That is all times of day and night. One of the reasons they moved to this neighborhood is because it was somewhat of a twilight light; nothing bright. If he wanted to live in the city, where it is city bright, that's where he would have moved to. He likes the light situation as it is now or even less.

Mr. Derocha reiterated that he has lived in the subdivision for 26 years and doesn't recall ever hearing of a vehicle/pedestrian accident of any sort. Certainly, not in more recent years when the lighting has been poor. At face value, he doesn't see the advantage.

Supervisor Crawford recalled a pedestrian accident, although it didn't involve lighting. He also stated that you have to be proactive about safety. Safety is a concern for everyone, everywhere. We have to be proactive to make sure we keep things safe. If lights is something most people think is necessary to keep the public and children safe, so be it if it is the desire. That is why the petition came forward; people were looking at safety.

Mr. Derocha again stated it could be remedied just from residents turning their outside lights on.

Pat Pearson resident stated she is in favor of the lights. But, she stated she lives on a corner and when her neighbors turn their garage lights on, you can land an airplane. She finally went over one afternoon and asked them to put different light bulbs in because they were so bright and kept their bedroom lit up all night. She doesn't like the idea of everybody turning their garage lights and porch lights on. It's too bright. She also doesn't like smelling gas. She is in favor of the new lights.

Mr. Scholfield and his wife notice that there are a lot of teenagers out, even a midnight. It's not that their out breaking into houses or causing trouble, they are just walking around and talking. These are the kids that might get ran down when someone is coming through the subdivision and there are no lights. So, as a public safety issue, he knows for a fact that there are kids wandering around at midnight. He's not saying call the police in or make the kids stay at home, just put some safe lighting in so the drivers don't have to worry so much about accidentally hitting those kids and having to live with it.

Mr. Spencer stated he and his wife did not sign the original petition because they were worried about the appearance of the cost. Since then, we have both come to believe that this is necessary. The dollar was a part of their issues and concerns; this is for safety.

Mr. Shanahan noted that it is very dark when his daughters are standing outside waiting for the school bus. He has carried flashlights, just so the drivers know they are out there. He stated he leaves his outside garage lights on 24/7. He put LED's in just because he knew he was going to leave them on all the time. He is doing what he can to help light up the area, but still believes the lights are necessary in the subdivision.

Helen Ruffing stated when she attended the meeting with DTE and SEMCO, she thought she remembered Tim Lubbers, of SEMCO, saying they would remove the lights at no charge.

Supervisor Crawford stated that is not what Mr. Lubbers stated in the conversation that he, Clerk Buechler and Treasurer Oprita had with SEMCO approximately 10 days ago.

After hearing no further citizen comments, questions and/or objection, a Motion was made by Oprita, seconded by Bradley, to close the Public Hearing to review Plans and Cost Estimates for the Old Farm Subdivision.
Time, 8:05 o'clock p.m. Vote, Unanimous. **MOTION PASSED. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Supervisor Crawford noted that the next step would be to prepare a Tax Assessment Roll for the residents to review at another Public Hearing, at which time the Special Assessment District will either become final or be declined.

Trustee Montgomery referred to the map provided by DTE Energy. He stated he thinks the reason the map isn't showing lights on the brick walls at the entrance is because they are determining that the overhead street light at the entrance is sufficient to provide adequate lighting until it gets to the light that they are adding. They base it on a necessity of area that the lighting is covering, not just for replacing lights for decorative purposes. The Township doesn't have anything to do with determining where the lights go. It is all done by DTE.

BOARD DISCUSSION, CONTINUED:

Mr. Montgomery stated he thinks when people ask about the lights at the entrance and why they aren't being replaced, it is because DTE is doing what they feel will provide adequate lighting, not additional lights beyond that.

Supervisor Crawford stated he is sure they can ask the question as to whether those lights could be added.

Mr. Montgomery also noted some of the comments from residents wanting no lights at all and cautioned against that based on a safety aspect. Also, from a realtor's perspective, streetlights have an effect on your property value. Clients ask about streetlights and sidewalks.

Trustee Kish questioned the lumens of the light and asked if the bulbs can be changed out to less wattage in case they're too bright. He stated the plans are figured by engineers and being at intersections, they aren't being placed to affect residences, directly.

Clerk Crawford noted that the project is approved if the Assessment Roll is accepted. The Township will be fronting close to \$300,000 for this project.

Board Members also discussed 3 vs. 4 year Assessment Roll. The Board has to take into consideration that the longer the assessment is spread out, the longer it takes to recoup those funds. That money comes right out of the Township's General Fund; and the longer the Assessment is spread, the more interest will be billed to the residents. This is the largest lighting assessment district the Board has ever looked at.

Trustee Kish asked for a show of hands that are in favor of the lighting project moving forward. The majority of the residents present were in favor of moving forward.

Supervisor Crawford noted he received an email from Ms. Brandie Schemansky, stating her opposition to the new lighting system.

Clerk Buechler received a letter of opposition from Mr. Alex B. Mirken; and an e-mail from Mr. T. Allen Francis stating he is in favor of the lighting system.

Motion by Montgomery, seconded by Buechler, to accept the Plans and Cost Estimates for the installation of 35 72-Watt LED Colonial Style Street Lamps/Fixtures; and to adopt Resolutions 3, *Resolution to Prepare Special Assessment Roll*; and Resolution #4, *Resolution Scheduling Public Hearing and Notice of Special Assessment*, setting the Public Hearing date to review the Special Assessment Roll on Wednesday, November 20th, 2019, beginning at 7:00 p.m. Roll Call Vote, 6/0. **MOTION PASSED.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Motion by Kish, seconded by Montgomery, to approve the DPW Superintendent Assistant Job Description, as presented.

POINTS OF DISCUSSION: *

- * This position requires an S2 Water Distribution License
- * The current DPW Superintendent Assistant does not have the required S2 License and is opting out of this position
- * State regulations and requirements

Vote, Unanimous. **MOTION PASSED.**

2. Motion by Montgomery, seconded by Oprita, to approve the DPW Sewer System Forman Job Description, as presented. Vote, Unanimous. **MOTION PASSED.**

3. Motion by Crawford, seconded by Bradley, to accept the Fire Chiefs recommendation to increase Probationary Firefighter, Bo Devroy, Paid-on-Call compensation from \$8.25 per run to \$16.50 per run, effective immediately. Roll Call Vote, 6/0. **MOTION PASSED.**

NEW BUSINESS, CONTINUED:

4. Motion by Kish, seconded by Oprita, to accept the Proposal and Agreement from BMJ Engineers & Surveyors, Inc., to provide professional surveying services to split a Vacant Lot on Keewahdin Road (Parcel ID: 74-20-017-3003-100), at a cost of \$1,800.00; and authorize the Township Supervisor to sign the Agreement on behalf of Fort Gratiot Charter Township. Roll Call Vote, 6/0. **MOTION PASSED.**

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Next Board meeting Ferguson Waterworks will explain radio read water meter option and consideration to approve purchase.
- Budget notebooks distributed: Include 2018 budget, 2019 and lines for 2020.
- Next meeting consideration of BMJ proposal to design Parker Road Water Extension.
- Meeting with Property Insurance Representative regarding coverage of Township owned properties.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD:

Pat Smith, Fire Chief, stated that Jersey Mikes will be holding a Fund Raiser for the Fire Department on October 28th, from 5 p.m. - 9 p.m. 10% of all sales will be donated to the Fire Department. Fire Trucks and approximately 20 Fire Department Personnel will be there doing their training and meeting with the public.

Motion by Kish, seconded by Oprita, to adjourn. Time, 8:36 o'clock p.m. Vote, Unanimous. **MOTION PASSED.**
MEETING ADJOURNED.



ROBERT D. BUECHLER, CLERK
FORT GRATIOT CHARTER TOWNSHIP

RDB/RCC/vo

ROBERT C. CRAWFORD, SUPERVISOR
FORT GRATIOT CHARTER TOWNSHIP