

Call to Order: Supervisor Collin Walls called the March 10, 2005 Regular Meeting of the Springfield Township Board to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Roll Call:

Board Members Present

Collin W. Walls	Township Supervisor
Nancy Strole	Township Clerk
Dennis Vallad	Township Trustee
David Hopper	Township Trustee
Roger Lamont	Township Trustee
Marc Cooper	Township Trustee

Board Members Absent

Jamie Dubre	Township Treasurer
-------------	--------------------

Others Present

Greg Need	Township Attorney
Leon Genre	Planning Director
Charlie Oaks	Township Fire Chief

Agenda Additions & Changes:

Supervisor Walls noted that there is one additional communication from the Road Commission which is a copy of a notice to property owners for Hillman, Morning and Long Point regarding a paving meeting. That meeting will take place at the Springfield Township Civic Center on March 22, 2005.

Supervisor Walls asked to add under Old Business, Item #6, False Alarm Ordinance.

Under New Business, add Item #7, Prescribed Burn Agreement.

There were no objections to the additions and changes.

Public Comment:

Dr. Paul Haduck, 8705 Waumegah, commented that he is the elected Waumegah Lake Riparian Representative. He is seeking clarification in regard to an article in the Clarkston News dated March 5, 2005 regarding the last Board Meeting in which there were comments made concerning the “track record of mismanagement,” “approving a mess,” and “not working with the Township.” Dr. Haduck said, as a taxpayer, he is dismayed that he was not invited to the

meeting and to have these things show up on the newspaper and people asking him about them blindsided him. Dr. Haduck said Supervisor Walls has been at the majority of the meetings and Dr. Haduck thought they followed the statute of the law, the projects are complete and under budget and he was wondering if this was a misquote. If something was done wrong or inappropriately he would like that brought to his attention. Seeing it in the newspaper was an insult and he felt disrespected. Supervisor Walls said he would get a full copy of the meeting minutes to Dr. Haduck and, if that does not clarify it for him, a more appropriate time would be a joint meeting rather than a public comment period. Dr. Haduck said that would probably be acceptable and he would like clarification as to why Mr. Kirby was removed from the Lake Board.

Mr. Lou Kirby, the former Lake Board Representative for Springfield Township, referred to the comments made in the newspaper. He has had a chance to review the meeting minutes and he did not see anything in those minutes that fully explained the comments that were made. Because the comments were made in a public forum, he would like a public explanation as to what Springfield Township believes the Lake Board did inappropriately. Mr. Kirby quoted a statement from the minutes by Trustee Hopper as “there has been such a track record of mismanagement, maybe it’s a good start by my replacement.” He noted that Treasurer Dubre referred to some accusations she made and Supervisor Walls said “there are five members on the Lake Board with only one appointed by Springfield Township. It took three of the five to approve this mess, we only get one appointment, not everything that is a problem with Waumegah Lake will be solved by changing one person.” Mr. Kirby said he is asking, after reviewing these meeting minutes, what problems were there? Supervisor Walls said, if there needs to be a discussion in public we will set that on a meeting agenda, this is a public comment period, not a period for the Board to answer questions. Mr. Kirby said he believes it was sneaky and terrible what was done.

Consent Agenda:

Supervisor Walls noted that there are invoices from Impressive Type and Trustee Cooper will need to abstain on the bills portion of the Consent.

- **Trustee Hopper moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended recognizing the abstention of Trustee Cooper in the bills section. Trustee Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre; Abstain from Bills portion only: Cooper. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

- a) Approval of Minutes: February 10, 2005, Regular Meeting with bills and additional disbursements of \$168,570.45.
- b) Acceptance of February 2005 Treasurer’s Report.
- c) Receipt of February 2005 Reports: Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Litigation, Fire, Ordinance
- d) Authorize payment of bills as presented, totaling \$154,547.83.

- e) Authorize Budget Amendments per memo dated 3-1-05 to be attached to minutes.
- f) Authorize 3 Township Representatives to attend the MiCTA Conference, with a cost not to exceed \$700.00 per person.
- g) Authorize Plan Review Fee refund in the amount of \$748.00 to Home Depot.
- h) Authorize purchase of election equipment, per clerk's memo, not to exceed \$6,000.00.
- i) **Receipt of Communications**
 - Oakland County Community Development Week March 28 – April 3, 2005.
 - Comcast Cable letter dated February 25, 2005.

Old Business:

1. 2nd Reading – Amendments to Zoning Ordinance 26
 - **Clerk Strole moved for adoption of Amendments to Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Article II, Article IX, Article X, Article XI and Section 16.02.1.g as published for 2nd Reading, adoption to take effect seven days after publication of adoption. Trustee Cooper supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
2. 2nd Reading – Amendment to Ordinance No. 52, Appearance Ticket Ordinance
 - **Clerk Strole moved to adopt Amendments to Ordinance No. 52, Appearance Ticket Ordinance, as published for 2nd Reading, said adoption to take effect seven days after publication of adoption. Trustee Vallad supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
3. 2nd Reading – Proposed Rezoning: R-3 to R-2, Single Family Residential: 07-26-126-002, 07-26-126-011, 07-26-126-017, 07-26-126-018, 07-26-126-019, 07-27-226-004 and 07-27-226-005.

Trustee Cooper requested to abstain from the vote because this is his property and his fathers-in-law property. There were no objections to the abstention.

- **Clerk Strole moved to rezone from R-3 to R-2 the following properties: 07-26-126-002, 07-26-126-011, 07-26-126-017, 07-26-126-018, 07-26-126-019, 07-27-226-004 and 07-27-226-005 as published, which notice published for 2nd Reading, said zoning change and adoption to take effect seven days after publication of notice of adoption. Trustee Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper and Lamont; No: none; Absent: Dubre; Abstain: Cooper. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

4. Special Meeting Priorities

Supervisor Walls suggested a special meeting date of March 31, 2005, although March 24th would also work with his schedule. Clerk Strole said she may not be available March 31st. The majority of the Board concurred that either date would be acceptable. Supervisor Walls said we would set a firm date when he is apprised of Clerk Strole's schedule. The meeting would take place at 7:00 p.m. He suggested reviewing these by category and by total and indicate the top 4 or 5 by category and the top 10 in total. The Board members concurred.

5. Lake Board Representative Guidelines

Clerk Strole suggested two additions to the list provided by Supervisor Walls. One suggestion is to base decisions on consistency with Federal Clean Water Act and Phase II Requirements, more specifically the Sub-watershed groups watershed management plans and Springfield Township's storm water pollution prevention initiative plan. The second suggestion is to be more specific as to what is meant by "quality" in item #4 of the list. She suggests basing decisions, taking into consideration impacts on natural resources such as water quality, hydrology, flow and wildlife/plant habitat within areas surrounding the lake and downstream from the lake. Supervisor Walls said we need to make sure we don't require something that goes beyond the Lake Board Statute.

Trustee Cooper said, regarding item #3, the representative can help develop a budget but one individual cannot develop a budget. Supervisor Walls suggested deleting the words "Develop and." Trustee Cooper suggested adding item #8, requiring copies of the Lake Board Meeting Minutes. Trustee Cooper said he thinks we should put a maximum term length on the representative where they can be reviewed regularly.

Trustee Lamont said he would agree with a three year term. If a representative leaves in the middle of the term, someone else could be appointed for the balance of the term. He feels that one or two years is too short because the first year will be a learning issue and the second and third years could make a difference.

Trustee Hopper asked if there is something written as to the requirements for a Lake Board? Supervisor Walls said there is but it does not provide real guidelines. Trustee Hopper said he would agree with a fixed term and agrees the first year would be a learning experience. He noted that we are still looking into getting other representation that does not have to be a Township Board Member.

Trustee Vallad said he likes the idea of three year appointments similar to the ZBA and Planning Commission.

Supervisor Walls asked if any Board Member disagreed with the three suggested additions by Clerk Strole and Trustee Cooper? There were no objections to these additions. Mr. Steve Forney, 8715 Waumegah, asked if the Board has reviewed the Inland Lakes Act that establishes

a Board? Supervisor Walls said, yes. He explained that part of what triggered this was, we were aware of an amendment moving through the legislature that changes would be taking place.

Clerk Strole said she would agree with a three year term limit and the additions recommended tonight. Trustee Cooper asked when the three year term would begin? Trustee Lamont said if the law becomes effective March 1st, why not start the term on March 1st. Supervisor Walls said that, in the three lakes where it applies, would both Township representatives terms be the same three years? He feels if there are going to be two Township representatives, he would think there should be some staggering to the terms.

- **Supervisor Walls moved that the Board adopt the Guidelines with the three additions presented this evening and that we determine, where we have a single representative appointment, that would be a three year term effective March 1, 2005 and where we have two appointments, one would be a three year term, one a two year term and we hold off the appointment on the Lake Boards where we have two appointments until at least the May Board Meeting and it becomes a three year term at the end of the two years and after that be a three year term. Trustee Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

6. False Alarm Ordinance

Supervisor Walls said he wanted this to be done so it is not a misdemeanor and to figure out how it would be handled. Clerk Strole noted on page 5, paragraph J.3, the word “to” should be inserted between “211.1” and “211.157.” Supervisor Walls explained that there is a three part form available for this use. Every time there is a false alarm, one copy would be left at the property, one copy would be retained by the Fire Department or Sheriff and the original would be submitted to the Township. The Township would keep track of the false alarms and prepare the invoices. There would be an appeal process available but the cost recovery ordinance would not apply.

- **Trustee Lamont moved to set a publish for 2nd Reading the False Alarm Ordinance as proposed tonight in the letter dated March 6th with a typographical error corrected on page, paragraph 3 to read “being Section 211.1 to 211.157”. Trustee Vallad supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote..**

New Business:

1. Whoopee Bowl Appeal

Mr. Kingsley Cotton, attorney for the Marlowe family (owners of the Whoopee Bowl), said there is not a good reason to tear down a perfectly good building. He is asking the Township to rescind the existing demolition order so he may dismiss his lawsuit and appeal of the demolition order in circuit court to avoid any further costly legal proceedings. Mr. Cotton said the Marlowe's have demolished the part of the building that should have been demolished. The large wooden two-story structure in the rear has been gone for many months now. The owners have also cleaned up the site substantially and according to Lopez Engineering's letter dated March 1, 2005, the remaining structure, which is entirely concrete block, is safe and sound. **[A copy of this letter is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township]**. Mr. Cotton explained that, as a gesture of goodwill and good faith, the Marlowe's would volunteer to tear down the forty foot by forty four foot (40' x 44') one-story structure in the front of the building, which would then leave a two-story concrete block building. Mr. Cotton does not believe that one-story structure is dangerous, unsound or unsafe, but the owners have offered to voluntarily turn it down in consideration of the Township rescinding their demolition order. Mr. Cotton said he is concerned that a municipality may be exceeding its authority when it continues to press for demolition of a safe and sound building. The owner does continue to market the property and does have a financial motivation to sell the property. Mr. Cotton said the Township should consider that the structure would cost at least \$400,000 to replicate and this value means a lot to the Marlowe's in the event that they choose to mortgage or refinance. The property is worth more with the building on it, despite the fact that it needs upgrading. The Marlowe's have no interest in pursuing the appeal they have filed and are here this evening to ask for a decision to rescind the demolition order and the front one-story building would be demolished within 90 days.

- **Supervisor Walls moved to convene into closed session to confer with the Township Attorney. Trustee Hopper supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

The Board convened into Closed Session at 8:35 p.m.

The Board reconvened into Open Session at 8:50 p.m.

Supervisor Walls asked Mr. Cotton if there are door openings between the one-story section proposed to be torn down and the two-story section? Mr. Lopez said there are arches and would not be difficult to be blocked. Supervisor Walls asked what the plans are for the roof based on the indication by Lopez Engineering that it needs to be repaired? Mr. Cotton said, no, they don't have any plans. He is not sure it leaks and while there is work that needs to be done, the engineer saw no evidence of fresh water damage when toured last week. Supervisor Walls asked if there would be willingness on the part of the Marlowe's to paint the building after the

teardown? Mr. Cotton said, that is still an option and they are thinking about an earth tone color. Supervisor Walls asked if the Marlowe's are willing to remove the sign? Mr. Marlowe said they could talk about it.

Supervisor Walls said two semi-trailers have been retained and asked if they could be removed? Mr. Cotton said the trailers are operational and they don't intend to move them at this point. Supervisor Walls asked, is the only spot to load the trailer at the cement block building its present location? Mr. Marlowe said no, they could move that one. Supervisor Walls asked the Marlowe's if they would discuss the removal of the sign with their attorney? Mr. Cotton, after private discussion with the Marlowe's, said, with regard to the sign and despite its historic significance and despite the fact that it is an Oakland County icon, the Marlowe's would agree to remove the sign.

Supervisor Walls said Mr. Cotton indicated that the roof does not leak and there were no plans for repair but Mr. Lopez's letter of March 1, 2005 states "The existing roof must be replaced." Supervisor Walls asked if they are talking about more than one section of the roof? Mr. Lopez said the existing roof has no indication of leaking but in talking with the Marlowe's, they have indicated that they may remove the entire roof and construct a pitched roof over the building. Supervisor Walls asked if it is roof style that necessitates the replacement rather than safety or deterioration? Mr. Lopez said there is no safety issue but the roof will probably need repairing in the spring after the snow melts and you can see all of it.

Supervisor Walls summarized that the Marlowe's offer is to tear down the one-story portion on the front of the building, tear down the sign, paint in an earth tone color at the choosing of the Township, and relocate the one trailer to the rear of the cement block building. Mr. Cotton said, that is correct and they would also block the arches to the exposed building. Mr. Cotton said these tasks could be completed within 90 days and have everything including clean up and painting within another 30 days for a total of 120 days.

- **Supervisor Walls moved that the Township rescind the demolition order on the Whoopee Bowl conditioned on the property owner dismissing their current lawsuit and conditioned upon the property owner tearing down the one-story section and sign located in the front within ninety (90) days, relocating the trailer in front of the cement block building to the rear of that building prior to beginning the demolition, and conditioned on the property owner repainting the remaining structure in earth tone, light brown or beige and be completed within thirty (30) days of the demolition, the entire project be completed within one hundred twenty (120) days from March 15, 2005. Trustee Cooper supported the motion.**

Attorney Greg Need said, demolition should include removal and cleanup of debris. Supervisor Walls said that certainly was implied.

- **Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Supervisor Walls suggested moving Huron Creek up on the agenda as item #2. There were no objections to this change.

2. Huron Creek Residential Development: Final Site Plan

Supervisor Walls thanked the applicant for the completeness of the plan and the work that has been done since it was last reviewed at concept. Mr. Grant Ward said they were rejected by DEQ in June and since then have made some revisions. The Planning Commission has reviewed it a couple of times and he believes he has a good plan environmentally. He made the correction on item 2 of the Exhibit B drawings as requested by Randy Ford of HRC. Regarding the wetland boundaries and the flood plains, they are not a common line but the wetlands are completely encompassed within the flood plains. He addressed the wetland buffers and the wetlands by the units do have setbacks, so the buildable area that they have defined on the Exhibit B drawings exclude the vegetation belts and the wetland areas and the wetland buffers, and any required side yard setbacks. Supervisor Walls asked if they exclude all of the flood plain areas on Exhibit B? Mr. Ward said he is not sure but would check.

Supervisor Walls told Mr. George Day, the attorney for the applicant, that the Board Members are aware that the Master Deed and By Laws draft was done one year ago and changes were not made prior to this meeting, at Supervisor Walls' suggestion, to allow the Board to do the interpretation that may be necessary of the Planning Commission's decision so Mr. Day could make one set of changes.

Trustee Lamont told Mr. Ward that he concurred with Supervisor Walls' comments regarding the changes to the plans since they were reviewed at concept. It appears that all the requests made by Planning have all been addressed and the plan is excellent.

Trustee Hopper said the landscape plan is wonderful and the applicant chose species that will do well once established. One concern he has on the plan is that there was trouble in some locations with perks. In the north property line, or woodland buffer, most of the units have septic and he understands that's where the septic must be located but if the applicant could obtain a perk located out of the woodland buffer he would look more favorably on that. Trustee Hopper said he is glad the applicant is doing a dock for units 7 and 8 plus a wetland crossing; that way it is not leaving anything to interpretation for the homeowner.

Trustee Lamont said the applicant did not address the comment by HRC regarding easements that would prohibit units 1, 3 and 4 from extending any docks, boat launches or other obstructions and asked him to do so now. Mr. Ward said there is 35 to 40 feet on lot 1 of lake frontage that is suitable for a dock. The sensitive area is the dam and the embankment that is adjacent to the dam. Mr. Ward said riparian owners have a right to put a dock in "normal to the shore." Supervisor Walls asked Mr. Ward if he sees a problem with docks being parallel there? Mr. Ward said no. Supervisor Walls said the plans indicate a shared drive on units 15 and 16 and asked if it is the intent that the developer will also put in the dock and the boardwalk for units 7 and 8 and a pathway and bridge for the park area? Mr. Ward said they would put the dock in, the boardwalk in for the dock and they will put a gravel pathway in for units 7 and 8.

There will be an easement for access to the lake. The developer will be putting a pathway across lot 2 and lot 1 going back to the bridge and a pathway going out into the park. Mr. Day said it is also the applicant's intent to remove restrictions that were in the initial draft of the Master Deed that did not permit docks for the riparian owners.

Clerk Strole complimented the applicant on the plan. She asked if, along the shoreline, the vegetation belt is the same as buffer? Mr. Grant said they are different. The vegetation belt around the perimeter is to provide visual isolation. Supervisor Walls said it is his understanding the wetland buffer is included within the waterfront yard on the Exhibit B drawings. Mr. Ward said, yes, and it is also excluded from the units themselves.

Clerk Strole said the northern section is heavily wooded and if there is any way the septic can be kept out of that area, they should be. Mr. Ward said they made the north vegetation belt as extensive as he could and reduced the units as much as possible to maintain that density.

Trustee Vallad commented that the plan is good and everything requested previously has been addressed.

Supervisor Walls said it is indicated that all the utilities servicing this project will be underground and asked if the overhead lines in the unrecorded easements service this project to some extent? Mr. Ward said, yes, and the overhead lines will remain.

Supervisor Walls said he provided Mr. Day with copies of restrictions for various developments that would make excellent guides for woodland protection and waterfront protection. He suggested for the three conservation easement provisions and their preservation, that provisions similar to what we have for private roads and storm drainage be incorporated, which gives the Township the right and option but not the obligation to enforce the provisions if the association or individual unit owner does not. Supervisor Walls said he would like this required if possible. He further suggested that, for landscape plans that must be submitted, the developer appoint an independent third party that would be agreeable to the Township to review and approve those plans.

Trustee Hopper asked if there is any way to restrict fertilizer usage, at least on the lakefront lots, strictly to the front or sides of the house? Supervisor Walls asked if it would be more functional to restrict the use of fertilizer to the buildable area? Trustee Hopper said he has no problem with that. Mr. Ward said perhaps he could not allow certain types of fertilizers to be used within certain areas and thinks that will help alleviate many issues.

Clerk Strole said, the waterfront conservation easement reference on page 22 allows construction within the conservation area, and needs to be addressed. The Design and Construction Standards require a 20-foot buffer beside wetlands, streams, lakes, etc. and they need to be followed to the extent that it is reasonable. She said we need to be more precise in regard to restrictions on fertilizers, and we need to include in the Master Deed and By Laws, provisions with regard to drainage easements, private roads, vegetative buffers, etc. Clerk Strole said she concurs with

Supervisor Walls that the Township should have the ability to enforce provisions of the Master Deed and By Laws and does believe we need markers to delineate the vegetative belt.

- **Supervisor Walls moved to approve the construction plans for Huron Creek and table Exhibit B, Master Deed and By Laws asking the applicants' attorney and engineer to work with comments made this evening, our attorney and Township staff, bring back a revised set of Master Deed, By Laws and Exhibit B for the Board's review and approval. Trustee Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

3. 1st Reading – Amendment to Ordinance No. 29, Omnibus Criminal Ordinance

Supervisor Walls asked the Board Members if anyone believes Springfield Township has a problem that requires the establishment of a curfew? The majority of Board Members said, no. Trustee Cooper said as we start getting more shopping centers we will see the problem coming and should head it off ahead of time. Supervisor Walls said he has no objection to publishing this for 2nd Reading but will not vote for it. Trustee Vallad said he agrees, we do not have places such as movie theaters and that is where the problem lies.

Supervisor Walls asked if there is a way to prohibit anything that blocks a place of business, rather than only listing skateboard, rollerblade, etc.? Mr. Need said, yes. Supervisor Walls asked the attorney to revise Section 5.04 so it is all inclusive and at least change the curfew provisions to be the same as state law. Mr. Need said he would do so.

- **Supervisor Walls moved that we ask the attorney to revise the curfew provision to conform with state law only and to revise Section 5.04 to be all inclusive rather than just skateboard, rollerblades and scooters and after the changes authorize the Clerk to publish for 2nd Reading. Trustee Vallad supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

4. Dissolution of Industrial Development Districts

- **Trustee Hopper moved that the Board initiate action to dissolve all industrial development districts within the Township and further conduct a Public Hearing at either the April or May meeting after notifying all property owners currently located within those districts according to the Township's assessment rolls and publish. Trustee Lamont supported the motion. No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

5. Civic Center Parking Lot and Sidewalk

Supervisor Walls explained that Randy Ford feels strongly that some investigative work and determination of ground water flow should be done prior to actually preparing a plan. The only

significant difference is that Randy Ford switched from 12 Piezometers to six and has added six pavement cores, which, in Supervisor Walls' opinion, gets us closer to making sure we know what is underneath. Mr. Ford did indicate that neither he nor the person he is working with felt there is anyway to salvage the lower lot.

- **Supervisor Walls moved to establish a budget of \$8,000.00 and appoint Trustee Hopper to work with HRC on locations of piezometers and core borings. Trustee Cooper supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

6. Civic Center Landscape Plan

Supervisor Walls said the Park Commission agreed to support this project and continue to coordinate the activities. The proposal from the Fish and Wildlife Services is grasses, and after those are established, wildflowers could be planted. Problems with the site consist of low PH, low nutrients, bad soils, all of which need to be fixed. Supervisor Walls is seeking reaffirmation from the Board to continue, at least in the meadow areas, and allow him to work with Jennifer Tucker to come back with a specific budget for the next meeting and a specific consultant who is committed to working with the Township.

There were no objections to pursuing this from any Board Members.

7. Prescribed Burning Agreement

Supervisor Walls explained that The Nature Conservancy has agreed to do a burn on the property located between Long Lake and the railroad tracks, which the Township owns. They have a prescribed burning agreement which asks the Township to hold them harmless. The Nature Conservancy will supply a One million dollar insurance policy so the Township would only be holding them harmless on anything over one million dollars.

- **Clerk Strole moved to authorize the Township Supervisor to execute the agreement with The Nature Conservancy for a prescribed burn conditioned on any revisions deemed necessary by the Township Attorney. Trustee Vallad supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none; Absent: Dubre. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Public Comment: None

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Supervisor Walls adjourned the meeting at 10:59 p.m.

Collin W. Walls, Township Supervisor

Nancy Strole, Township Clerk