



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Call to Order: Supervisor Walls called the February 26, 2013 Special Meeting of the Springfield Township Board to order at 7:00pm at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Roll Call:

Board Members Present

Collin Walls	Township Supervisor
Laura Moreau	Township Clerk
Jamie Dubre	Township Treasurer
Marc Cooper	Township Trustee
Judy Hensler	Township Trustee
David Hopper	Township Trustee
Dennis Vallad	Township Trustee

Board Members Not Present

None

Agenda Additions & Changes:

There were no additions or changes.

Public Comment:

Public Hearing:

1. Special Land Use Hearing-AT&T Mobility

Supervisor Walls thanked residents for coming and explained that the meeting will be recorded and residents who are not able to attend may watch the meeting on cable or through PegCentral on the Township website. The Board will hold a Public Hearing for the wireless communication tower proposed to be built approximately 700 feet north of Scott Road directly across from the entrance to Country Lane Estates (a map was projected on the wall and the site was identified for the audience). Notices of the meeting were sent to all property owners within 300 feet. Supervisor Walls explained what the Board is charged to review in making their determination. The purpose of the hearing is for the public to give input to the Township. He explained the procedure for making public comment at the hearing and the process to review Special Land Use requests. Special Land Use means it is something that requires or is subject to special conditions and is not a use by right. Supervisor Walls summarized the special conditions in general for all Special Land Uses and special conditions expressly for Wireless Communication Facilities.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Supervisor Walls explained that Federal and State regulations on wireless communication facilities have increased. In May of 2012 the State Legislature amended the Michigan Zoning and Enabling Act to put a specific timeframe on actions of any municipality considering a wireless communication facility; a collocation needs to be reviewed within 60 days of the application being administratively complete but if it is a new facility like this one it has to be reviewed within 90 days. For most Special Land Uses the Township would hold a Public Hearing at the time of the concept review and the proposal would go back to the Planning Commission and Township Board for final review. Because of the limitations imposed by the State Legislature, the Township recently amended our Ordinance to combine the concept review and final review and we are holding the Public Hearing at the time of the final review in front of the Township Board.

Supervisor Walls explained that there are specific Township Ordinance regulations for wireless communication facilities. The intent of the regulations is to facilitate adequate and efficient provision for sites for wireless communication and recognize that operation of the systems may require the establishment of facilities in locations not within the predetermined districts. Supervisor Walls described the Ordinance provisions and what the Township Board is charged with in reviewing the proposal and the rights and responsibilities of each licensed provider of wireless communication facilities.

Anthony Amine, 200 E. Beaver Road, Troy, MI 48083, agent for AT&T Mobility, explained that AT&T has needed a tower in this area for a few years and has been looking for a site that would have the least impact to the Township and residents. There have been searches for other options such as other tall structures, different zoning districts and a couple of sites on Ormond Road, but the site proposed is the best location they could find. AT&T is looking for the perfect location that accomplishes two things: it will need to solve the engineering challenge to provide cellular coverage for the residents and for the travelers through Springfield Township and to place a tower as appropriately as possible so as not to impact the Township and its residents. To construct a tower is a substantial investment and cellular providers do not want to construct a tower if it is not needed. AT&T engineers have found that without a doubt there is a coverage need in this area. Mr. Amine explained the proposed location and the current structures and natural features in the area and described the screening that would be provided at the base of the tower. The tower would need to be accessed once a month but the structure would not be inhabited. AT&T also looked at the water tower at Springfield Oaks approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ mile to the northeast of the proposed location and found that AT&T could not attach the antennas to the water tower at a height that would alleviate the necessity for another tower in the area. They also looked at County property near the



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

water tower but the cell tower would need to be approximately 250 feet. There is no perfect location but he believes the proposed location is the site that will have the least impact to the area because of the natural barriers and the tower would be under 200 feet and would not require lighting.

Supervisor Walls opened the hearing at 7:20 and explained that the public can now make comments to the board but it is not typical for the board to answer questions.

Clerk Moreau read into the minutes two communications received from residents prior to the meeting. On February 15, 2013 a letter from Eric and Barbara Mobey, 6504 Country Lane, Davisburg stated their opposition to building a tower in a residential area, obstructing the views and the disruption to the natural features of the area. Clerk Moreau also received an email on February 26, 2013 from Cherub Beard, 6761 Rolling Meadow Dr, Davisburg stating she is in opposition to a cell tower in the neighborhood, states that it is unsightly, she is concerned about cell tower radiation and references other countries that limit cell phone tower expansion due to the radiation. Mrs. Beard stated that Springfield Township has always been concerned with wildlife conservation and this should be a priority.

Steve Lecki, 6756 Country Lane Dr. agreed with the two letters read by Clerk Moreau and expressed concern regarding how this will affect the property values in the area and indicated concern with the traffic on Scott Road during construction and upkeep of this property.

David Case, 6666 Country Lane Dr. indicated that he appreciates the Howard family and having the farm atmosphere. The placement of this tower is directly across the drive from Country Lane Estates. Mr. Case is asking the Township to have AT&T place this cell tower on the County fairgrounds instead.

Rob Borruso, 6875 Meadow Valley, does not see a need for this tower, feels that there is adequate coverage in the area and there is no need for this. In addition, in other areas in the world it is well recognized that there is a risk of exposure to RF frequency and because of that there are limits to where cell towers can be located. In respect to property value impact, he thinks that property values are challenged right now and is finally seeing an improvement and would hate to see them slide again because of the eyesore right outside the subdivision. Mr. Borruso feels that this will be only personal gain for the Howard's and AT&T and would have a negative impact on him and everyone else in the neighborhood.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Lisa Muth, 6885 Meadow Valley Dr., first wanted to let Mr. Howard know that she has the utmost respect for him. Aside from that she is very concerned about the environmental health impact a cell phone tower will have not just on the neighborhood but also on the school that is located nearby. She stated that scientific evidence shows that the electromagnetic radiation caused by cellular phone communication has now become the worst manmade hazard for the human environment. The negative effects of this radiation are being shown by scientists that nothing as of yet has been done to protect or make the public aware of the dangers it can create. A study that has been conducted by George Carlo has demonstrated the unwillingness of the cell phone companies to give the public the results of the negative impact that this technology has on the human body. Unfortunately studies like this one is consistently ignored by the government and cell phone companies claim that cell phones and towers are within the safe limits to the human body. There is no proof that these cell phones or cell phone towers do not cause harm to the human body; they are hiding it. Children have thinner skulls which do not block as much radiation, they have a more sensitive nervous system, they do not have such a strong immune system and they have an increase rate of cell division which is the reason why cell damage spreads much faster. Living closer to a cell tower can cause children, more than any other group of people, to have cancer, loss of memory, attention and concentration disorder, sleep disorder, mental disorders and hyperactivity among other things. Other countries have regulations on how close towers can be to school zones.

Jennifer Bush, 6770 Rolling Meadow Dr., commented that she does not have a problem with the cell tower anethetically, but is concerned about the radiation. I look at that picture and know that directly across from that cell tower, every morning 10 kids gather at the bus stop and they are being exposed to massive amounts of radiation that is completely unnecessarily. I don't want to come back here in 10 years telling you that my neighbor's child has leukemia and that the kids down the street have cancer and we are losing our kids because of this unknown.

Julie Spielman, 6468 Country Lane Dr., commented that she agrees with everything her neighbors have said. She has AT&T service and has good service throughout her house and does not see the need for this tower. She has significant headache issues that no doctor can fix and does not want a tower making it worse. When she bought her house 6 years ago, she was attracted to the rural and natural environment and not letting big box stores coming in and this is a big box item. She stated she is concerned about the condition of Scott Road and stated that the construction trucks coming down Scott Road this will just make it worse. The subdivision has spent a significant amount of



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

homeowner dues on a new sign for the front of the subdivision to increase property values and believes the tower with hurt property values.

Damon Reynolds, 6648 Country Lane Dr., commented he will not portray himself as a scientist or a electrical engineer but he has read enough concerns regarding electrical frequency that he is alarmed. He is concerned that the tower is running 365 days a year 7 days a week 24 hours a day and believes there is enough information on the internet to create concern. He appreciates the Howards and enjoys the farm and he moved to this area for the rural atmosphere and the other benefits that this township provides. He noted the importance of cell phone service but believes area residents accepted the conditions of the rural area when they moved here. He noted that certain circumstances indicate that this township is dedicated to keeping the area rural and noted specifically the condition of Scott Road. He believes there was some movement over the years to try to improve Scott Road but those efforts were declined by the neighbors and the Township to keep that rural aspect of this area. He noted he moved to this area for the neighborhoods and the areas so our children are safe to play and questions the need for this tower knowing the restrictions of the area that they accepted when they moved to their neighborhood.

Supervisor Walls commented that the Township has never declined any improvements to Scott Road.

Mr. Reynolds commented that he wasn't sure if it was the residents that turned it down or the Township but that we accepted the rural area when we moved out here and like it.

Matt Rombach, 6897 Country Lane Dr., commented that it was the rural features that brought him and his wife to the area. He would not like to live across the street from this tower and look at it every day and is also opposed for the health concerns.

Rick Smith, 12651 Scott Road commented that he and his wife are totally against changing the R-1 zoning for a special deal for a cell tower. He believes if a subdivision happens, home buyers will not take to having a cell tower in their backyards. He believes you cannot stop progress but the tower does not belong in an area that is zoned R-1; there are other areas zoned for that use. He believes the only person benefiting from it is the land owner and suggested that Springfield Township should use a parcel of their land for the cell phone tower. Using Township land will bring in money for the fire department, more police coverage, or items for parks and recreation and at least all residents will benefit from having a cell tower. He believes that if the Township approves the special land use it would be "opening a can of worms" for other residents who would want the same deal and then it will snowball.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Todd Norris, 6792 Country Lane Dr., commented that not all residents on Country Lane are opposed to the cell phone tower. He stated there is a need and he understands the placement has been thought out and the area chosen makes sense. He understands that neighbors have concerns over health risks, but none of those have ever been proven.

Mark Sanders 6749 Rolling Meadows Dr., stated he would not like to have the cell tower built there. He agrees with everyone else in the neighborhood. He considered purchasing property on Ormond Road but if that property becomes available, he does not believe it will sell. No one would want to move near a cell tower.

Jim Simmons, 12705 & 12750 Scott Road, commented that he is confused because people are saying this radiation is coming from cell phones and I wear one on my hip and everybody in here has one. He noted that he sees children at the bus stop with their cell phones; not all of them but most of them. He does not know if people are fighting because of the tower or because of the health risks.

John Brooks, 6880 High Pine Dr., commented that he submits that this is more about aesthetics than anything else. He has never seen any documentation on the hazards of a cell tower and submits that almost everybody in here has cell phones. If they are all so concerned than why do they support the cell phone companies? He noted he has AT&T and has no coverage inside his house and must go outside to make a phone call. He is looking forward to having some coverage.

Supervisor Walls showed a picture of a similar tower as what is being proposed and explained that it is a similar tower in a rural environment.

Lisa Muth, 6885 Meadow Valley Dr., responded that she is well aware that we are living in a very technological age and that we all carry cell phones with us, however the difference between carrying a cell phone and a cell tower is vast. You have a right to chose when you expose yourself to the phone and limit the exposure that you have. When you have a cell phone tower it is emitting an electromagnetic field 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year which disrupts the health of every animal, every plant and every person in the immediate area and there is no choosing to turn it off.

Rob Borruso, 6875 Meadow Valley Dr., responded to the comments that everybody has a cell phone that he is concerned about his personal exposure to his cell phone. For that reason he is very careful to distance himself from the cell phone whenever he can. With the cell tower it is a constant bombarding that is entirely different.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Norm Fender, 755 Hall Rd., asked if anyone knows how tall the water tower is at the fairgrounds.

Supervisor Walls answered that it is 107 feet.

Supervisor Walls closed the Public Hearing at 7:54 pm.

Supervisor Walls noted that Mr. Amine indicated earlier that he explored a couple other sites along Ormond Road. The township is aware of one other site because it was a subject of an earlier application but the property owner decided to decline. Supervisor Walls asked what other sites were investigated.

Mr. Amine stated that they identified a property owner directly to the south of the previous site but the engineers did not deem it to be a suitable location. He explained that this is not a perfect science and AT&T can only put the tower where it makes sense. He preferred to put it on top of the water tower but it didn't work and AT&T would be back in front of the Board to request another tower location.

Supervisor Walls asked if AT&T only looked at one other property on Ormond Road. Mr. Amine stated that they identified certain areas and submitted it to the AT&T engineers but they deemed them as not suitable.

Clerk Moreau asked how it was determined that a cell tower was needed. The Township Ordinance requires that some factors are considered when granting a Special Land Use for a wireless tower such as proximity to interstates, areas of population concentration, concentration of commercial, industrial and business and some other factors. The proposed tower is located in and will serve a low density residential area and she asked what is driving AT&T to make this big investment to construct a tower in this area.

Mr. Amine responded that unfortunately he does not have all of that information from a coverage standpoint with him. Typically towers are erected for two reasons; one is coverage capacity, originally carriers first came out they built very large towers they spread them out to cover the area and as more people are using their phones these towers can no longer handle all of the demand. The other is coverage; from a coverage analysis AT&T does not have the appropriate coverage that they want in this area.

Clerk Moreau stated that she can see from the coverage maps provided that there is a gap in coverage but that doesn't necessarily mean that a tower is needed in that area. She asked if it is just a matter of engineers looking at a map and noting the coverage gap or has AT&T received inquiries or complaints from Springfield Township residents?



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Mr. Amine stated that AT&T would not invest this much money unless there is a need. If there wasn't a need I would not be here this evening nor would AT&T be constructing a tower.

Treasurer Dubre asked if AT&T is going to be the one that owns the tower.

Mr. Amine answered that AT&T may own the tower or have a relationship with the owner of the tower. One of the requirements of the township is to make sure that if Sprint, T-Mobile or Verizon wanted to come in and this tower fit their design criteria you would have antennas on this tower.

Treasurer Dubre clarified the reason for the question is that collocation is what we require for the towers; you have to offer the antennas to be placed there first and foremost. It's not relevant if they own it or not. She noted that Mr. Amine stated that he did look on Ormond but the maps that were provided do not show the locations of other towers that she is aware do exist on Ormond. Treasurer Dubre asked if the applicant did indeed look at all tall structures and towers in the area including beyond the township boundaries.

Mr. Amine stated that there are towers to the south that will not work. He stated again if there was not a need AT&T would not be here. It is much quicker and less expensive for AT&T to collocate on an existing tower and that is the preference by far. If the existing towers met the design criteria we would be looking to go on those towers.

Treasurer Dubre asked if there is availability on the existing towers on Ormond Road.

Mr. Amine said AT&T is already on several of the towers and he is uncertain which tower that Treasurer Dubre is referencing.

Treasurer Dubre responded that she is referring to a tower that would be shown on this map as either an existing tower or potentially an active tower for AT&T on Ormond Road.

Mr. Amine said that if it is in the area, the AT&T engineers identified it as one that does not meet the design criteria. Without knowing the specific tower, there are two issues that can limit whether or not AT&T can go on the tower. One is the structure capability, whether it can handle any more carriers. The second is the height issue. For example the water tower is there but does not provide the appropriate height to cover the needed area.

Treasurer Dubre asked Mr. Amine if he has access to maps and information that indicate where other providers are in and near Springfield Township.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Mr. Amine stated there is a database that identifies every tower that is licensed by the FCC. All of the towers that are currently constructed and licensed by the FCC have been identified and if there is a site that would meet collocation requirements we would be going on that tower.

Treasure Dubre stated that she would like to see something that shows that all existing towers have been identified by AT&T and that they do not meet the requirements. The Board needs confirmation that collocation options have been fully explored.

Mr. Amine explained that the map is color coded to indicate which areas have coverage by AT&T. We do not want to overlap coverage but address the gap in coverage.

Treasurer Dubre stated that Mr. Amine's response does not answer her question for the need of the tower. She believes there are options for collocation but they just might not be ideal from a business standpoint to overlap.

Mr. Amine explained the colors and areas on the map. Blue is the best coverage, green is second best coverage, yellow is outdoor coverage and red is no coverage available. If you look at the southern end of the township a lot of it is "in building" and "in vehicle" coverage. The "outdoor" coverage is the area that we are trying to identify and to improve it to either blue or green. The southern end of the township is currently covered and is in the blue or the green color so there is no need for another tower or collocation of a antenna in that area.

Treasurer Dubre asked if AT&T were to place an antenna on the water tower and place an antenna at Ormond Road and White Lake Road where a tower already exist, will that cover the area. She requested a propagation map for this option to indicate what the coverage gap would be.

Mr. Amine stated that the engineers didn't think that would work and that is why he is here. Without specifically identifying that tower he cannot tell if it will or won't work.

Supervisor Walls asked if he were given the address could he provide a new coverage map. The address given is 5971 Ormond Road and 4868 Ormond Road in White Lake.

Mr. Amine said he could get that information.

Clerk Moreau stated that the majority of the comments from residents were about safety and aesthetic. She asked Mr. Amine what efforts were made to have the structure more harmonious with the surrounding landscape.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Mr. Amine explained that sometimes the more you try to hide something the worse it looks. The tower that is proposed is steel gray which is regarded as the best at blending in but there is no way you can hide the tower. However the base of the tower is going to be behind the home and the barn.

Clerk Moreau asked if any other locations on this property were considered so it would not be directly across from the entrance drive to Country Lane Estates.

Mr. Amine explained that because of the setback requirements and the wetlands on the property the current location is the best.

Clerk Moreau stated that in addition to providing more information on the water tower, she would like to review the engineering for the alternate site on the Oakland County property to understand what other locations were considered and how it was determined that a 250 foot tower would be required. Clerk Moreau also thought it is the Board's responsibility to follow up on some of the health concerns that were expressed tonight. She is not concerned about cell towers and acknowledges that they are everywhere; she could not in good conscience have a cell phone if she believed that towers present a danger. However she feels an obligation to see if the applicant can provide research or data to address the health concerns.

Mr. Amine said that he would get the additional information regarding the Oakland County Fairgrounds. Regarding the health concerns, Mr. Amine commented that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits any municipality to deny a cell phone tower due to health issues. The studies that have been done provide no conclusive evidence.

Trustee Hopper first wanted to thank Mr. Amine for addressing the Planning Commission's concerns. Trustee Hopper understands and does not question the coverage gap identified as red spaces on the map. He used to live on Woodland Trail which is within a red space. From the propagation maps provided, the only option that doesn't show a red space is the tower that is being proposed. When I lived on Woodland Trail, cell phone use was out of the question. That looks like the area that AT&T is trying to cover.

Trustee Hensler stated that several people have commented on property values. She has over 20 years experience in real estate, holding a license in Illinois and Michigan, and based on that experience she does not believe that a cell tower in the area is a detriment. I believe the condition of Scott Road is a much greater detriment.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Trustee Cooper asked if it is possible to put a taller tower where the water tower is located at Springfield Oaks. It looks like it would be the same coverage.

Mr. Amine commented that they did talk to the County about building another tower right next to the water tower and that was rejected. The engineer determined that even if the tower was built at 250 feet and it would not provide the same coverage as what is being proposed.

Trustee Vallad stated that over the years he has looked at many RF signal studies and doesn't ever recall a peer reviewed study that showed any health hazards from cell towers. That is all he looks at is peer reviewed studies in his work. Anybody can put a study out there but until it is reviewed by scientist in other parts of the world with different backgrounds, it is not an accepted study in the engineering community. He has considered all the information provided and it addresses the Planning Commission questions. He noted that he reviewed the AT&T studies and it looks like that tower is intended to fill in the hole on I-75 and the tower has to be in a certain position and at a certain height to get the kind of coverage that the engineer says is needed. Unfortunately in order to provide coverage for Springfield Township some towers are going to be in residential areas. Trustee Vallad believes that AT&T did a good job locating the tower from an engineering perspective and found a place where it is least obtrusive.

Treasurer Dubre stated that the Township approved a tower on the I-75 northbound rest area that was never erected. If there are gaps the tower should go there because the residential area isn't ideal.

Trustee Vallad stated that if a tower is erected at that rest area it would not address AT&T's coverage gap.

Treasurer Dubre stated she would not object to approving the rest area tower again and approving a collocation at the water tower. She also believes there are other viable options on Ormond Road with existing towers.

Supervisor Walls explained that by State law, which limits the review to 90 days from the time the application was determined to be administratively complete, the Board must either approve or deny. If the Board does not act by the deadline it is considered automatically approved. That time does not expire until shortly after the March 14 Township Board meeting. We have the ability to table and allow time for us to review some of the information and concerns that have been expressed and to allow the applicant to provide the information that has been requested.



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

Supervisor Walls added that he does not think the landscaping plan as submitted is adequate or meets the Township Ordinance. Something closer to our ordinance requirements could be presented; the landscaping going north on the east side should be extended closer to the existing wooded area. Supervisor Walls also requested a maintenance plan for the landscaping.

Board members determined that AT&T should provide maps indicating existing towers in Springfield Township and within three miles of the Township boundaries. On a second map the Board requested a map of the different proposed sites indicating the coverage of each.

Clerk Moreau moved to table the special land use and the final site plan review of the proposed AT&T wireless communication facility at 12870 Scott Road until the March 14, 2013 Springfield Township Board meeting for the additional materials and details requested in our discussion tonight. Supported by Cooper. Vote on the motion. Yes: Cooper, Dubre, Hensler, Hopper, Moreau, Vallad and Walls. No: None; Absent: None. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

New Business:

2. Parks & Recreation Master Plan

Director Tucker presented to the Board the revised draft of the 2013 Parks & Recreation Plan. Ms. Tucker indicated she will walk the Board through the significant changes to content but will not note grammatical or formatting edits.

Director Tucker noted that the percentages on the bottom of page 9 related to Age Distribution were left in but with the addition of plus signs (+) before the numbers. Supervisor Walls had suggested removing the percentages; however the Park Commission wanted to include these figures. Nancy Strole made the suggestion to add the plus signs to reflect that the groups are projected to increase by that amount. Supervisor Walls suggested that it would make more sense to change the language to “population growth” instead of adding plus signs but did not believe it should be changed at this point.

On page 11, a second paragraph was added under the heading Land Use to address Trustee Hopper’s suggestion that parks and open space within developments should be noted in the plan. The new paragraph states that the hundreds of acres of parks and open space within developments are a result of the Township’s dedication to open space planning. On page 13,



Minutes of **SPECIAL MEETING**
Held **February 26, 2013**

Township of Springfield

Laura Moreau, Clerk

the year of the Township's Master Plan is added. On page 28, "projected budgets" is changed to "annual budgets." On page 32, a new category of parks is added called "Mini Parks" by suggestion of Supervisor Walls. This category identifies the open space areas that Trustee Hopper requested to be included. On page 34, the acreage of Springfield Plains Elementary was corrected. Page 40, the date of tonight's meeting was changed as the date of adoption. On page 41 and 42, Oakland Technical School was added to the chart and the totals were corrected. On page 47 the reference to Township-owned "rental houses" was changed to "structures."

Director Tucker asked if Supervisor Walls had any additional changes or issues that he wanted to double check. Supervisor Walls indicated he had questions about references to the appendices. Ms. Tucker stated that she had a final copy available with all of the appendices. Supervisor Walls asked about Appendix 2 noting that it should be the Executive Summary from the Headwaters Project. Supervisor Walls also confirmed the content of the other items in the Appendix and verified that no changes were made to the Action Plan.

Supervisor Walls moved to adopt the Resolution of Adoption for the 2013 Springfield Township Parks & Recreation Plan. Supported by Hopper. Vote on the motion. Yes: Cooper, Dubre, Hensler, Hopper, Moreau, Vallad and Walls. No: None; Absent: None. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

Adjournment:

Supervisor Walls adjourned the meeting at 9:17 pm.

Collin W. Walls, Township Supervisor

Laura Moreau, Township Clerk

Charter Township of Springfield

RESOLUTION

2013-04

Resolution to adopt the 2013 Parks and Recreation Master Plan

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Department of Springfield Township has undertaken a Five Year Parks and Recreation Plan which describes the physical features, existing recreation facilities and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain recreation facilities during the period between 2013 and 2017, and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing was held on February 12, 2013 at the Springfield Township Civic Center to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Recreation Plan, and

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Department of Springfield Township has developed the plan for the benefit for the entire community and as a document to assist in meeting the recreation needs of the community, and

WHEREAS, after the Public Hearing, the Springfield Township Park Commission voted to adopt said Parks and Recreation Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the Springfield Township Board hereby adopts the 2013 Springfield Township Parks and Recreation Master Plan as a guideline for maintaining and improving recreation for the residents of the Township of Springfield.

AYES: Cooper, Dubre, Hensler, Hopper, Moreau, Vallad and Walls

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

THE RESOLUTION WAS DECLARED ADOPTED.

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
)ss
COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

I, Laura Moreau, duly elected Clerk of the Charter Township of Springfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a Resolution adopted by the Township Board of the Charter Township of Springfield, County of Oakland, Michigan at a Special Meeting held on February 26, 2013.



Laura Moreau, Clerk