

**LEELANAU COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR SESSION – Tuesday, April 19, 2016**

Approved 5-17-16 – meeting recorded.

Proceedings of the meeting are being recorded and are not the official record of the meeting, the formally approved/accepted written copy of the minutes will be the official record of the meeting.

Meeting called to order by Chairman Carolyn Rentenbach at 7:00 p.m. Today's meeting is being held at the Government Center, 8527 Government Center Drive, Suttons Bay, Michigan.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Chairman Rentenbach, followed by a moment of silence.

<u>Roll Call:</u>	District #1	Vacant	
	#2	Debra L. Rushton	PRESENT
	#3	William J. Bunek	PRESENT
	#4	Ty Wessell	PRESENT
	#5	Patricia Soutas-Little	PRESENT
	#6	Carolyn Rentenbach	PRESENT
	#7	Melinda C. Lautner	PRESENT

COMMUNICATIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, PRESENTATIONS AND AWARDS:

County Administrator Chet Janik stated per request he had to give an update on one portion of his update. It is a critical that this be done this evening, he replayed his slide wishing Commissioner Lautner a Happy Birthday and promised her a piece of cherry pie.

Commissioner Lautner noted that she had been at a working conference and stated her appreciation for the birthday wishes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Special Session, January 21, 2016:

#108-04192016 Regular Session

**MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL SESSION MEETING
MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 2016, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.**

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Regular Session, February 16, 2016:

#109-04192016 Regular Session

**MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE THE REGULAR SESSION MEETING
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY WESSELL.**

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Executive Board Session, March 8, 2016:

#110-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE THE EXECUTIVE BOARD SESSION MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 8, 2016, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Special Session, March 8, 2016:

#111-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL SESSION MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 8, 2016, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY WESSELL & SOUTAS-LITTLE.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Regular Session, March 15, 2016:

#112-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE THE REGULAR SEESION MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 15, 2016, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY BUNEK & RUSHTON.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Executive Board Session, April 12, 2016:

Postponed unit May meeting.

Special Session, April 12, 2016:

Postponed unit May meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA, LATE ADDITIONS/DELETIONS:

#113-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY WESSELL TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS WRITTEN. SECONDED BY SOUTAS-LITTLE.

AYES – 6 (Wessell, Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chairman Rentenbach noted that we have a new timing system for public comment. It is a five minute reminder that is pretty visible and there is also a backup timer. She reminded those present that public comment should be addressed to the entire Board and not just to an individual. This is not a public hearing, this is our Board meeting and if you have something pertinent to the Board, then we would like to hear it.

➤ Victor Goldschmidt, Northport. Goldschmidt stated he had three things to discuss. First, he wanted to give a commendation to Planning Director Trudy Galla & Senior Planner Kristin Holappa and requested a round of applause, as they are fantastic. Galla was the one who had the wit to develop the CIP, it is a living document and you have no idea how many man hours went into developing that project. Every township should emulate what the County is doing. You should challenge your townships, by law, they have to have a CIP.

Goldschmidt's second point is regarding energy. He came to the Board, what feels like years ago and stated that we have a major challenge in the Sheriff's Office. He suggested that we bring in some professional engineers; we need to find someone proficient with working with insulation. He walked the building, saw the roof top units, and felt the duct work and he knew that the problem was not simply insulation. It is a multi-faceted problem. The County has gone a long ways and you have a contract now. Goldschmidt said he strongly suggests that the County take an additional step. That you bring in a third party person, who is a certified engineer having done building commissioning, which means overseeing the building designs, the insulation, turning the switch on and making sure that everything works right before they are paid. He will help if he can, to try to secure that person and not charge a cent. He will be sure that he can walk with him or her until the job gets done. He does not want to go through another "Band-aid" job and end up spending more money for all of us. So that is an offer.

Goldschmidt stated that thirdly, early in his career when he was on a Township Board he was accosted by a great lady, Mary Lyons, she was as far left as he is right. They loved each other. He passed a motion at a Township Board meeting and she castigated him severely; she was correct because the motion had nothing to do with the authority he had as a Township Trustee granted in the Public Act. He is sure that you have all thoroughly immersed yourselves into the governing acts what you can do and should be doing. If not, there are exciting books. If it is not in the enabling act saying it is something that you should or could do then you simply cannot do it. He would be more than delighted to help with a small tutorial session, maybe once a quarter on what the Public Act says.

Goldschmidt addressed the audience about a meeting scheduled for the next night that Galla and the Planning Department do every two years. Chairman Rentenbach reminded him that he needed to address his remarks to the Commissioners.

➤ A letter from Karan Josephus was read into the record by the Clerk.
*"Dear Commissioners:
After attending the April 12th meeting, I noticed, and have had several people who were also in attendance at that meeting contact me regarding how the Public Comment section of the agenda is being handled by Chairperson Rentenbach at the Board of Commissioners meetings.*

We noticed that there seems to be an inequality as to how time is allowed for different commenters. If the commenter is making a statement with a different ideology, opinion or subject than that of Chair, the allotted time is adhered to. On the other hand, if the commenter is making comments in favor of her views, more time is allowed. Isn't the purpose of Public Comment to give the Public a platform to share opinions and ideas to help the Commission learn different aspects that may be of value to the discussion? Isn't that beneficial to the Commission? Hopefully you are listening and considering points that you may not agree with!

In addition to the time inequality, we've also noticed that rules affecting Public Comment are not adhered to. Isn't one of the rules when making a public comment that the speaker is to address the commissioners as a whole and not to use individual names? And another to address comments only to the Commissioners? At this meeting specifically, these rules were broken by several commenters and in fact, a few people even turned around to address the audience! Chairman Rentenbach did not correct those individuals, nor made mention of those violations.

We ask that Chairman Rentenbach keep in mind that she is Chairman of the Commission for the WHOLE County... just not her constituents or those who are in line with her ideology. Our government is there for all of the people, not just a few. Please listen to us, adhere to the rules as is the responsibility of the Chair and don't restrict the freedom of speech for some and not others.

Most sincerely,

*Karan Josephus
Bingham Township"*

➤ Bruce Price, Lake Leelanau. Price stated that he is a Boy Scout, he is prepared. He is wondering if that is the Bruce Price rule? Is the timer right – did a Democrat buy it or did a Republican? With that said, this is a great place to live. He wants to thank whoever brought up Line 5, it was a good presentation last week. There was a lot of radical far right who thought it was just a 5" line there and it is two 20" lines, they left early so now they don't know as much about it as he does. For those that think he talks too long, it is too bad you couldn't give him 10 minutes, they might learn something from him because he is a pretty educated guy.

Price said he would not bore you with bringing up his Consumers light bill when he knows that Cherryland is subsidized. In reading back through the minutes, talk about respect. The "coal miner's daughter" made three public comments, two of them beating him up. We have five minutes here, how many public comments can we make? When he came in here tonight, the Vice-Chair of the Republican Party basically says that he wants to go after Price. So after three years, he caught on to what he is doing.

➤ John O'Neill, Cedar. O'Neill stated that he will be speaking primarily about the request from the Prosecutor and the ability to issue civil infractions for construction code violations. He is focusing on Sugar Loaf but it would affect the entire County. Cooks, waitresses, dishwashers, hotel staff, grounds keepers, maintenance workers, ski lift operators, managers – hundreds of local people worked three seasons at Sugar Loaf. They and the guests patronized our local businesses which in turn were able to employ more people. For 17 years the Loaf has been vacant and most of those winter jobs are gone. The loss in dollars is probably in the millions; the loss to local working families is incalculable.

O'Neill said that Sugar Loaf violates our construction codes. It is an attractive nuisance – someone's child or children could be accidentally hurt or killed exploring the ruins. Does this County intend to enforce its ordinances? The civil infraction ordinance proposed by Prosecutor Joe Hubbell is an efficient and effective way to enforce our construction rules. The taxpayers would be spared the cost of going to court. Any problems in the ordinance can be modified by the commission.

O'Neill stated that Commissioners have a duty to enforce local law and a responsibility to set policy that encourages a healthy local economy. He hopes and respectfully urges the Commissioners who voted no or who missed Tuesday's Executive Board Meeting to realize that voting yes will help enforce our construction code, save court costs, and motivate the owner to finally become responsible. He has heard a lot of talk about property rights, but he does not believe that rights in a democracy exist without responsibilities. As he understands it, this can be re-introduced by the Commissioner who missed the Executive Board meeting.

O'Neill said he has to agree with the engineer who spoke, it is important to have a 3rd party look at the work that is going to be done at the jail so that you don't have the problems that you ran into when this building was constructed. No one made sure that things were done properly. In terms of comments, Alan Campbell made a comment when these rules were set that they violated the 1st Amendment. He does believe that respectful comments that are factual that are addressed to particular Commissioners should be allowed. He concluded by thanking Commissioners for the service that they perform.

➤ Commissioner Lautner stated that she wanted to thank the gentleman who brought the well dressed lineman diagram. It makes her think of something very important when it comes to our linemen; it is very expensive to dress out a lineman. Cherryland Electric does not purchase their boots; they do purchase the rest of the equipment. The yard sale signs attached to the light poles, those are very dangerous. The rubber gloves that they wear cannot have a hole pierced in them or they are ruined. A lot of people like to tack things up on the light poles and that should not be done.

REVIEW OF FINANCIALS:

Commissioner Lautner questioned a bill out of the Prosecutor's office and whether Joan Schaub is working in a legal capacity, has her job been elevated? Janik to obtain an answer for Lautner.

ACTION ITEMS:

Safe & Secure Counties Resolution:

#114-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK TO PASS LEELANAU COUNTY SAFE AND SECURE COUNTIES RESOLUTION, #2016-005. SECONDED BY LAUTNER.

Discussion - The Chairman read the Resolution:

Leelanau County Resolution #2016-005
Safe and Secure Counties

WHEREAS, April is National County Government Month; and

WHEREAS, the nation's 3,069 counties serving more than 300 million Americans provide essential services to create healthy, safe, vibrant and economically resilient communities; and

WHEREAS, the National Association of Counties' (NACo) "Safe and Secure Counties" initiative is encouraging counties to focus on strengthening the safety and security of their communities; and

WHEREAS, Leelanau County takes pride in our responsibility to protect and enhance the health, well-being and safety of our residents in efficient and cost-effective ways; and

WHEREAS, in order to remain healthy, vibrant, safe, and economically competitive, America's counties provide public health, justice, emergency and management services that play a key role in everything from residents' daily health to disaster response; and

WHEREAS, we accept responsibility to actively promote programs and services to the public we serve;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Leelanau County Board of Commissions does hereby recognize and appreciate all County and local government employees and volunteers who keep our County safe and secure.

ROLL CALL: Bunek – YES; Lautner – YES, Rentenbach – YES; Rushton – YES; Soutas-Little – YES; Wessell – YES.

AYES – 6 NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Review of 2015 Audit:

Janik gave an update. Each spring the audit team comes here and spends about two weeks doing our audit. This year at the end of that period, Steve Peacock, Principal from Rehmann, contacted Janik with a concern about a property tax issue. At that point, he discussed it with County Treasurer John Gallagher III. Since that time, he has had almost daily conversations with Gallagher and Peacock. Peacock had asked for guidance from this Board, the Board does have a Finance/Audit Committee that met last Thursday. This issue had been discussed with legal counsel, last week we obtained a verbal opinion and now we have a written opinion.

Treasurer Gallagher thanked the Board for the opportunity to come before them to hopefully finalize this discussion for the review of the 2015 audit and the chargeback of the 2015 unsold foreclosed properties. Gallagher noted that as Janik said, they have been working closely with Peacock and our corporate counsel to get this resolved. He is proposing that he bring before the corporate counsel and Peacock a full chargeback and calculation for approval. Once the calculation has been approved, he would like to prepare the journal entries to complete our audit. The journal entries will need to be posted back to December 31, 2015, to post to our accounts receivable. He will come back in May to report the progress they have made along with the billings they have presented. It is as simple as that with this legal opinion; it is very cut and dry. There is really nothing for consideration at this point but to move forward with the chargeback.

Commissioner Wessell stated that he has been troubled by this as there seems to be some inconsistencies between what Gallagher reported to us, what the auditor has reported to us and what we read in the *Record Eagle*. He asked that Gallagher talk about when he first decided to write this off, when he involved the Clerk's office, the accounting staff and Equalization. Did you in fact consult with the auditors and get approval from the auditor's staff on the transaction prior?

Gallagher stated that he had never involved the Clerk's office or Equalization. He proposed this to Rehmann and that is when Peacock came to the conclusion that it needed Board approval and Commissioner Bunek had requested legal review.

Commissioner Wessell questioned when the consulting with the auditor occurred. Gallagher replied it was during the audit process. He had presented them with spreadsheets and a proposed journal entry. They agreed on processing it and they ended up taking the funds as a transfer-in and transfer-out, from the 517 Tax Foreclosure Fund to the 516 Delinquent Tax Fund (DTR). After Peacock's review and the scope of it, he stated it would need Board approval.

Commissioner Wessell questioned if it is unusual that Gallagher would not include Equalization or Accounting in this. Gallagher stated that Equalization would have nothing to do with this. Wessell asked if he had included the Planning Department. Gallagher answered no. Wessell asked if Land Bank was included? Gallagher stated no.

Wessell stated that he attended the Land Bank meeting this morning, it sounded like they were disappointed that they had not been informed a long time ago of this transaction. He does not mean to be disrespectful, but we violated policy, we violated statute, we violated good auditing principals and that troubles him. Gallagher responded that he understands his position. Policy had not been broken; he offered first right of refusal as required by policy to the Land Bank, the Land Bank at their meeting this morning took no action because they would have had to purchase for the minimum bid. They will further discuss the options at the May meeting.

Gallagher stated it was his decision to transfer from the Foreclosure Fund. That was his interpretation of MCL 211.78m(6). There are many Treasurers right now using this Fund to do the same thing that he did. He is asking the State for clarification as to their intention of how this Public Act should be used. We now have a legal opinion that states that he is to chargeback all of the units for the taxes, and that is what he is intending to do. He does not know if he did in fact violate statute because there are a lot of Treasurers using it for the same purpose that he did this year. Gallagher read Public Act 211.78m(8):

"(a) The delinquent tax revolving fund shall be reimbursed for all taxes, interest, and fees on all of the property, whether or not all of the property was sold.

(b) All costs of the sale of property for the year shall be paid,

(c) Any cost of the foreclosure proceedings for the year, including, but not limited to, costs of mailing, publication, personal service, and outside contractors shall be paid.

(d) Any costs for the sale of property or foreclosure proceedings for any prior year that have not been paid or reimbursed from that prior year's delinquent tax property sales proceeds shall be paid." There is some discretion in this Public Act and that is why he is

asking the State for clarification. He does not believe that there has been an issue there. As far as accounting, he asked the auditors for guidance on how to handle this. He does not know how else you expect him to do this; he asked them for advice and support. We are on the right path now and will have this resolved. No property was transferred and no money exchanged hands, no bills were sent out. This was a proposal that has grown out of proportion, in his opinion, for political gain.

Commissioner Bunek questioned if this chargeback will create a hardship for these taxing units? Gallagher stated that in his conversation with Suttons Bay Schools, because they are "in calculation", the State shall reimburse them for operating millage. In addition, because they have just paid off their sinking fund, they have funds in reserve, so they should have money available. He has not spoke with the rest of the taxing units to know their financial circumstances. Bunek stated that he believes that Suttons Bay Village has nine mills, which would be a significant amount. Gallagher concurred.

Commissioner Lautner questioned if the property is now in the ownership of the Treasurer. Gallagher stated yes. She asked will he be putting it back out for sale again.

Gallagher stated potentially, yes. Before it goes out for sale it will be brought before the Board. It could be potentially transferred to the Land Bank or it could be put into the next auction cycle. Lautner questioned if they could be sold as individual lots as opposed to one unit; some of these units include air condos which are in a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Commissioner Rushton questioned if there is clear title on the property. Gallagher stated yes. Rushton question how long did it take to get clear title? Gallagher answered that it took five years of bankruptcy proceedings plus three years in the foreclosure process. The court proceedings by court order have given him a clear title.

Commissioner Rushton stated as far as billing back to the entities, she read that there are options and arrangements that can be made for the repayment, much like a consumer loan. Chargebacks are done annually for different reasons.

Commissioner Soutas-Little asked if there had been any attempts to sell the property? Gallagher stated that the previous developer was actively selling the improved properties, the unimproved properties were listed but because of the PUD, the requirements on the properties and the assessments, it made them less desirable. Soutas-Little asked if Gallagher had tried to sell them. He replied no.

Commissioner Wessell stated that he wanted to react to something that Commissioner Rushton said. He believes that the auditor had said the other night that he had never seen this happen before, but we can talk to him about that. His question is if this was the only piece of property where taxes have been written off. Gallagher stated that we have in the past, in 2014; he believes they had two parcels that sold for less than minimum bid. He believes it was \$4,400.00 less than owed. There was \$184,000.00 in gross proceeds from the auctions and that was used. Gallagher had been speaking with Peacock prior to the meeting; the attorney's opinion would have him charge back for that. Wessell stated so it is fairly typical in a County Treasurer's office for these to be bundled together if you have a net. Gallagher stated as long as it is a positive. The logic is that we are not profiteering off from this business. We are not trying to make gains from the unfortunate business of foreclosing. It makes sense for the Counties and that is the Treasurer's position. That is how it has been taught from one Treasurer to the next. They have used that MCL to offset it. Was that the intent of the law or is it that you charge back parcel by parcel and take the profit and benefit from these gains? There is still \$26,000.00 on the books from the Elmwood Township Timberlee property that is held in Land Bank. He tried doing a chargeback but there is a special assessment and the local units did not have the money. He felt he could wait until the property was sold and then collect out of the proceeds but with this opinion he must collect right away. He is not trying to hide anything.

Commissioner Lautner asked in moving forward, is a Board motion needed to book this as a receivable? Gallagher stated no.

Commissioner Rushton asked if the property that is being held by the Treasurer's office, how much discretion do you have on how long you can hold the property? Is there a time line you use or is there a law? Gallagher stated it depends on how long he wanted to remain in office, but there is no set time. Rushton asked so it is up to the discretion of the Treasurer? Gallagher affirmed along with the Board. Rushton said per the Policy from 2013.

Gallagher stated in addition, while he has the Board's attention, in accordance with the recent allegations that have risen on the PRE billing and funding - he welcomes and encourages Rehmann to do additional audit inquiries within his office to facilitate any and all audit procedures to satisfy the Board's desires. They have already done this twice and he can do it again. Commissioner Rushton stated that this Board appreciates Gallagher's openness and willingness to have an independent auditor come in and review your books so not only this Board but also the general public can be assured that the Treasurer's Department is using sound accounting practices. Gallagher stated that he has all of the answers for the allegations for anyone who wants to review them.

Commissioner Rushton asked about the different type of audits and each is for a different reason. She is wondering what type of audit are we looking at. Chairman Rentenbach stated that Peacock will be coming to the table next to answer that question.

Chairman Rentenbach noted that we did get a legal opinion on this and on the second page it states that you are mistaken in your understanding of this. Gallagher stated that is why he is going to the State for clarification; he wants to ask why the State wrote MCL 211.78m and what it is used for. He wants to understand why the State has issued that MCL and what their intent was. There are conflicting uses among the Treasurer's. He could "cherry pick" a legal opinion that conflicts with Cohl, Stoker and Toskey but it only make sense to go to the Attorney General and find out what is the intent of the MCL. This has implications for all County Treasurers, as this is common practice. This is a practice that the County Treasurer in this County before him used as did the Treasurer before that used, it is not something that he made up. He is not willing to rollover and set precedence for the Treasurer's Association if it is going to cost the entire Association a black eye if he can just go the extra step and ask the State for clarification.

Steve Peacock, Principal auditor for Leelanau County, thanked the Board for allowing him to address the Board tonight and give an update on the 2015 audit. He stated that he is in concurrence with Gallagher in respect to the billing back of the taxes to the local units of government. He has read the opinion of the attorney and they will facilitate review when they receive the appropriate documents for the bill back for these receivables from Gallagher. Peacock stated that Commissioner Rushton is correct; there are three ways according to the attorney that you can collect this. You

can do a direct bill and demand payment immediately, you can offset future tax settlements or you can enter into an installment agreement as long as appropriate interest is charged. That will take some creativeness by Gallagher depending on the abilities of the units to pay this back; you may find some of all three elements.

Peacock noted that Commissioner Wessell asked if they had seen this, Peacock stated that what makes this so unique is the volume and that it was offered for sale at a minimum bid and not sold and then offered at a scavenger bid and still did not sell. Billing back property is not unique but these parcels are unique. They do not see this happen a lot as an audit firm. You have a worthless piece of property – he uses worthless only because there was a zero bid at the scavenger auction and yet you still have the \$850,000.00 receivable sitting on the books. The gross amount of the taxes was \$942,331.00 which comprised a base tax of \$592,787.00, interest of \$324,483.00 and administrative fees of \$25,061.00. Peacock explained that the difference between these numbers was that Gallagher has proposed a chargeback to the units of \$98,445.00 rather than the full \$942,331.00. Now the entire \$942,331.00 will be billed back.

In response to a question from Commissioner Rushton, Peacock stated that what was proposed to the audit team was two questions, can he write off \$843,886.00 of taxes, interest and administrative charges. The second question was, if these are written off is it appropriate to have the Tax Foreclosure Fund make the Delinquent Tax Fund (DTR) whole with a transfer? According to their records, the Treasurer had already moved approximately \$600,000.00 in April of 2015 from Tax Foreclosure Fund to DTR. Gallagher proposed this to the audit team; they may have nodded in understanding, that they understood what he was proposing. Immediately after that conversation, Peacock was called by the audit team and told that this did not look right. Not that it was wrong but that it did not pass the “smell test”. His initial instructions were to check the Board minutes and see if the Board was informed of this and had authorized it. When they did not find authorization, he called Janik and said that they needed to talk. Until the attorney stepped in and gave the opinion on this, they were in limbo on how to report this on the audit. That question is now moot, as there is a legal opinion that states that you cannot write it off. Now today, we are in a situation where the Treasurer’s office has to bill back the taxes.

Peacock stated that as far as PRE’s go, they are willing to help conduct any level of service that is appropriate in the circumstances. Peacock continued in response to the question on the different type of audits, he reviewed the different type of audits. He has asked Janik to let them go in and look at the 2015 transaction, if they believe that something is not appropriate then it would be time to engage in a forensic audit. Each audit has a different level of standards associated with it. Forensic audits are very thorough but they are expensive. At this point, his recommendation is to authorize them to do additional audit procedures with respect to PRE and he will come back in May and report their findings.

Commissioner Wessell stated that in anticipation of this discussion, and in thanking Gallagher for his willingness on this audit, he had prepared a motion.

MOTION BY WESSELL THAT BASED ON THE PROPERTY TAX ISSUES/CONCERNS RAISED BY THE COUNTY'S AUDITORS, THE LEGAL OPINION CONFIRMING THE FACT THAT NO PORTION OF A PROPERTY TAX INVOICE CAN BE FORGIVEN OR REDUCED BY A COUNTY TREASURER, AND THE RECENT ALLEGATIONS THAT THE PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE EXEMPTION AUDITS WERE NOT PROPERLY ACCOUNTED, THAT THE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY'S AUDITING FIRM, REHMANN, TO PERFORM AN ADDITIONAL AUDIT PROCEDURE AND INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE IF THERE WERE ANY INCONSISTENCIES OF PROPERTY TAX INVOICING AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE GENERAL AND PRE TAXES IN LEELANAU COUNTY 2013 TO 2015. SECONDED BY SOUTAS-LITTLE.

Discussion – Commissioner Rushton requested the motion be re-read as she was not sure she agreed with the language. Commissioner Bunek stated that he would prefer to do as Peacock has recommended. If he has to do more than that than he can come back and request to go farther. Commissioner Soutas-Little stated as she listened, he used the words additional audit procedures which was what Peacock had recommended. Bunek stated that the difference was that Peacock had recommended only for 2015, but the motion states 2013 through 2015.

MOTION BY WESSELL AMENDED THAT BASED ON THE PROPERTY TAX ISSUES/CONCERNS RAISED BY THE COUNTY'S AUDITORS, THE LEGAL OPINION CONFIRMING THE FACT THAT NO PORTION OF A PROPERTY TAX INVOICE CAN BE FORGIVEN OR REDUCED BY A COUNTY TREASURER, AND THE RECENT ALLEGATIONS THAT THE PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE EXEMPTION AUDITS WERE NOT PROPERLY ACCOUNTED, THAT THE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY'S AUDITING FIRM, REHMANN, TO PERFORM AN ADDITIONAL AUDIT PROCEDURE AND INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE IF THERE WERE ANY INCONSISTENCIES OF PROPERTY TAX INVOICING AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE GENERAL AND PRE TAXES IN LEELANAU COUNTY 2015. SECOND AMENDED BY SOUTAS-LITTLE.

Peacock stated that he has not seen the allegations so he does not know what years are involved. Gallagher stated most of the allegations are from 2013. Commission Wessell stated then he would want to go back to the original motion. Commissioner Bunek questioned auditing the property tax invoicing, as he thought that that was already solved. Peacock stated that he would need that part of the motion defined to him. If you want them to look at every tax bill in the County and make sure they were calculated correctly, they can do that but it would be time consuming and expensive. They could do a sampling.

Commissioner Wessell stated that the Treasurer has volunteered for an audit on this; he deserves to have a “clean bill of health” on this. It would make sense to dig a little deeper than one transaction and make sure the procedures and the County processes that are in place are the right ones. Peacock stated that in talking with Gallagher he believed that there are about 200 PRE’s to be audited, that is a manageable number.

Commissioner Lautner stated that if you would amend the motion to read to authorize the auditor to proceed as discussed at this meeting with the additional audit procedures that would cover what we need and not get into too much detail. Peacock said if he has a scope problem, he will contact the Administrator and ask for further conversation.

Commissioner Rushton stated that in regards to the language, that the “recent PRE audits were not properly accounted for” when she hears the word “allegations” it is an assumption that something has been done wrong often without proof and she is bothered by that. She thinks it is unreasonable to expect the auditors to investigate each and every property tax. A sampling would be appropriate. She believes the simpler we keep this the better. She asked Peacock to explain the difference between the types of audits. Peacock stated that an internal audit is generally performed by staff within a company or organization, or they can farm it out to an auditing firm. They are generally directed by the Board, they are governed by certain audit standards for internal audits, and they file reports with the Board of Commissioners. Peacock stated that an external audit, which is what they do for the County, is their evaluation of the County’s financial statements to make sure that they are not materially misstated. Those statements that are prepared are the responsibility of the management of the County. Their responsibility is to offer an opinion on those financial statements. This audit meets the requirement that the County is required to file with the State of Michigan every year.

A single audit is when a County expends over half a million dollars of federal expenditures. This is an additional layer of testing that occurs on federal expenditures. There is a series of testing they have to go through, and then they issue a report which goes to the Federal government. Performance based audits are audits of how effective individuals or departments are doing their jobs. Generally it is not a financial audit but as to whether procedures are being done correctly. Forensics audits are extremely thorough, they are done by both accountants and in many cases they are done by law enforcement individuals. Their firm has on staff individuals who have had careers in law enforcement. They are time consuming and expensive. They will give you a complete and thorough analysis of everything that has been examined. He is suggesting an internal audit; if something does not look right then he will come back and recommend a forensic audit.

Commissioner Rushton stated that in her readings, it says that they are litigation support accountants; they can act as experts in a trial. She stated that type of audit is looking for something criminal. She wanted to point that out that these issues are not

on a criminal level. Peacock stated that is why he has cautioned in using the words forensic audit, you are accusing someone of being involved in a criminal activity. He wants to make sure that they spend the appropriate amount of time looking at the transactions so that they are comfortable.

Discussion on the wording of the motion.

#115-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION AMENDED BY RUSHTON TO MOVE THAT THE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY'S AUDITING FIRM, REHMANN, TO PERFORM A GENERAL ADDITIONAL AUDIT PROCEDURE AND INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE IF THERE WERE ANY INCONSISTENCIES OF PROPERTY TAX INVOICING AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE PRE TAXES IN LEELANAU COUNTY FROM JANUARY 2013 TO DECEMBER 2015. SECONDED BY BUNEK.

Commissioner Bunek stated that he has an issue with going back to 2013; he does not know why we are going back three years. Chairman Rentenbach stated that she believes the Treasurer had requested that the go back to 2013 so that the questions about the PRE would be clear. Commissioner Wessell stated that was his intention.

Chairman Rentenbach questioned Peacock if he had an estimate on cost. Peacock stated that he cannot give a definitive number right now; he will get an estimate to the Administrator before they commence any work. He believes it will take a couple of people at least a week plus they will have people they need to interview. He will state at this point a maximum of 100 hours. He will report at the May meeting and every meeting that the Board requests and he will not bill for that time.

**AYES – 6 (Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach)
NO – 0 MOTION CARRIED.**

Sheriff's Office –

Mutual Aid Agreement – National Park Service:

#101604192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK TO APPROVE A GENERAL AGREEMENT CONTRACT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE LEELANAU COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

Discussion – None.

**AYES – 6 (Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell)
NO – 0 MOTION CARRIED.**

Homeland Security Grant, Great Lakes Boat:

Janik updated the Board. Last week the Sheriff had talked about the Peninsula Township boat and based on what the Sheriff had told him and what he has read, the

Peninsula Township Board did vote to put the boat up for sale but then the entire Peninsula Fire Board resigned. The Peninsula Township Board is going to reconvene and address this again. Janik reviewed some of the reasons the Township had decided to sell the boat.

#117-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY WESSELL TO ALLOW THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE TO SUBMIT A GRANT APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FOR THE PURCHASE OF A GREAT LAKES PATROL BOAT. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

Discussion – Commissioner Wessell stated that we cannot wait until we find out about the Peninsula Township boat because the Sheriff Mike Borkovich needs time to work on the grant application and he did say that he would bring it back to the Board before submitting it. Janik noted for clarification that the grant is due April 30, he is asking for permission for the grant application. If the grant is awarded then he would appear before the Board and ask for permission to accept the grant. Commissioner Rushton stated that is what she wanted to say, once the grant is awarded then the Board can decide whether or not to accept the grant. Janik noted that the one thing that County Clerk Michelle Crocker wanted the Board to know is that the way this grant works is that the County would have to pay the full amount up front then they would reimburse us. Rushton questioned how good are they at reimbursing us.

Commissioner Bunek questioned why a bigger, better, faster rescue boat for Leelanau County? Is the Coast Guard not doing a good job? How do we think our County can afford to have its own Coast Guard? You may remember, if you were here last Tuesday Sheriff Borkovich's story of commandeering a boat and bobbing around on Lake Michigan a ½ mile away from the distressed persons until the Coast Guard picked them up with the helicopter; maybe we should be buying a helicopter instead of the \$450,000.00 boat. If he remembers correctly, it seems to him in almost every incident the Coast Guard provided the rescue of the boaters, not Leelanau County. Do we believe we can afford to do the Federal governments' job? Why is Peninsula Township looking to sell their boat, what are the costs that they did not realize that makes them want to sell theirs? How often does Glen Arbor actually use their rescue boat? How much does it cost in insurance, training and maintenance each year, has anyone looked into that? How long will free storage and free harbor dockage continue? Will the County become responsible or have to help pay for the dredging of Leland Harbor, once we have the boat there? He knows the Sheriff has wonderful relationships with harbor masters, he is sure that will continue for the next four years, but will that continue for the next forty years? He does not think that a \$450,000.00 purchase is something that we should be pressured into deciding quickly. We have been told we have to decide it in this meeting, this month. He believes that this purchase will expand the responsibilities of our Sheriff's Office that will result in the need for new personnel in the future. He cannot support the asking for this kind of spending for our County. Please vote no for this grant. If we really believe that the Federal government should

balance its budget, then we should not be asking for \$300,000.00 plus many additional expenses for a boat.

Commissioner Wessell stated that he appreciated those comments but he did hear the Sheriff say that he could do it without additional staff. He looks at a peninsula with 100 and some miles of shoreline. If we save even one life, it is well worth it. It is a grant and it is Federal money, it is going to go somewhere, so why not have it go here and protect the residents of Leelanau County.

Commissioner Bunek questioned what if we lose one life, what if one deputy gets killed out there at a rescue. This is the Coast Guard's job, they are trained for it. Would we be putting our deputies in jeopardy?

Commissioner Rushton stated that both Commissioners Bunek and Wessell make some very good points. Her concern is the reporting of the potential change in hours in the Frankfort office. As far as the Coast Guard, the potential for rescuing multiple victims in large bodies of water it difficult. If you have a boat with 8 or 10 people on it, they will not be able to handle that type of rescue. You only have six minutes, when you have a person not breathing in the water to rescue them. It is all about timing, the sooner we can get to them for a rescue the better their chance of survival. The \$425,000.00 is a lot of money, but we need to look at the length of time that we have it in our inventory. The Sheriff has indicated that it would last a minimum of 25 years, up to 50 years. Yes, there would probably be additional training, having been a part of the fire and rescue departments, she knows that they participate in water rescue events for assistance in these instances. She believes that the time is right because of the grant allowance.

Commissioner Soutas-Little stated that she applauds the comments made by Commissioner Rushton and agrees with them. She had talked with Fire Department personnel in Leland and they are excited about this. They see an opportunity to help with the training, to utilize the training to have an EMT out there to help. It is all about timing. She believes that the comments made by Commissioner Bunek are well stated and understandable, but she feels the opportunity is now. If we can do this for \$125,000.00 as opposed to \$450,000.00 of our County money, then in her opinion it is wise to move forward. We have to accept the grant if we are fortunate enough to be awarded it, this gives us another opportunity to address this issue.

Commissioner Lautner stated that she has many of the same concerns as Commissioner Bunek. The County did have a large body boat some years ago. Our Sheriff had asked to sell the boat, as it was not practical for Leelanau County to have the boat for rescue. She reviewed the reasons for not keeping the boat. She highly respects Sheriff Borkovich; he has so much training from his time with the DNR. She is leery about getting back into the big boat business. We don't know where the next tragedy will be when we have so much water to cover.

Commissioner Rushton commented that she believes that Sheriff Borkovich had stated that they will be selling one of the boats that they have in inventory at this time, Commissioners responded possibly two. Rushton continued that that would help to offset some of the initial cost to the County. She believes that that needs to be considered.

Chairman Rentenbach stated the Sheriff has indicated that he works very closely with the police, fire departments, the Coast Guard and the Park Service. The size of the park boats and that Manitou Island Transit is on the lake between the islands daily in the summer. She described a boating accident that she was involved in. She also is very concerned about the cost and cannot justify it at this time knowing that Glen Arbor Township does have a boat that can go out there and knowing the other support systems that are available.

Commissioner Rushton noted that one other thing that some may not be aware of is that the Coast Guard is not always available. They have a limited amount of response personnel and equipment. They cover a vast amount of area, we may find ourselves in need of the Coast Guard and they may not be available.

Commissioner Wessell reminded that the Sheriff had informed the Commissioners that during windy weather the helicopters for the Coast Guard were not available and that is one of the reasons he wanted the boat in Leland.

Commissioner Soutas-Little stated that the boat will be in the harbor in Leland ready to go.

AYES – 3 (Wessell, Rushton, Soutas-Little)

NO – 3 (Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach)

MOTION FAILS.

9-1-1 Funding:

#118-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE STAYING STATUS QUO FOR THE ANNUAL SNC-500 REMITTANCE DOCUMENT AND HAVE THE 911 DIRECTOR AND COUNTY CLERK COMPLETE THE REQUIRED FORMS AND SUBMIT THEM AS REQUIRED. SECONDED BY SOUTAS-LITTLE.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

9-1-1/Emergency Management – FY 2015 Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Planning Program Grant Agreement:

#119-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER THAT EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT BE AUTHORIZED TO COMPLETE THE GRANT AGREEMENT FOR THE FY2015 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PLANNING PROGRAM AND THAT THE COUNTY BOARD CHAIRPERSON BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT AND ALL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS AGREEMENT. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Planning and Community Development – Capital Improvement Program:

#120-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK TO ADOPT THE 2016-2021 CIP AS A WORKING DOCUMENT FOR LEELANAU COUNTY. SECONDED BY WESSELL.

Discussion – Commissioner Rushton stated that in last week's discussion she had recommended that the program be sent back to the Planning Department to include a long-range maintenance program in addition to the Capital Improvement Program. She thinks it is very difficult for the Commissioners when it comes to budget time when they are not looking at the two items together. Commissioner Bunek stated that Galla had said that she would present this to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission and Galla have done a great job on this.

AYES – 6 (Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Construction Code Authority – Personnel request:

#121-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK TO APPROVE THE UPGRADE OF STAFFING LEVEL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION CODE AUTHORITY, FROM ITS SELF-FUNDED ACCOUNT, FOR THE PART-TIME SECRETARY (0.6) POSITION, TO FULL TIME, WITH A STARTING DATE OF MAY 1ST, 2016. FUNDS TO BE APPROPRIATED FROM FUND BALANCE, ACCOUNT NUMBER 542-000-000-401.000, TO COVER ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE COSTS FOR THE POSITION UPGRADE. SECONDED BY SOUTAS-LITTLE.

Discussion – None

YES – 6 (Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Former Courthouse Property – Clean Soil Deposit location at County Site:

Janik stated that Jeff Hawkins from Envirollogic Technologies is here for an update on the soil at the former courthouse property. Hawkins stated the Commissioners should have received a soil disposition fact sheet with respect to the former County Courthouse redevelopment project. They have gone through the process, and are still working

towards it, in getting approval for the clean-up of that location. Once the material has been removed from the limited area that has been determined that needs to come off of that site, there has been concern expressed with the legacy of this Brownfield site, with the material coming from the site with the excavation of basements and houses that will be built on that property. As part of that, it would be helpful if the County were to find a site that the material could be located permanently on County property. This has been reviewed by corporate counsel. The different sites were reviewed and it was determined that the Pit Road Tower Site would be an appropriate site for placement of the excess soils. It is a controlled site that is not too far from the former Courthouse site.

This has been addressed with Drain Commissioner Steve Christensen and he has expressed concurrence with the use of the Pit Road Tower Site for the placement of the soil. Hawkins is here today looking for approval to utilize the site and include that as part of a deed restriction going forward, similar to the other deed restrictions that are on the property. Any excess soil not used in the construction of the home would need to go to this site at the cost of the owner.

Commissioner Lautner stated we are trading site for site. She has a problem with taking the soil if there is a real issue with it and placing it on County property. If there is not an issue then it is not our responsibility to be dealing with it. Hawkins stated he appreciates that, but this was a measure that was taken in thinking towards the future and the legacy of this being a Brownfield site. Rather than have the material spread all over the County, in conversation with corporate counsel the discussion was to control it at one location. There is a perception associated with the soil. Lautner stated that the developer knew this when they bought the property; it should not be the County's responsibility. Hawkins replied that this was not necessarily the developer's requirement; it was thought it was prudent in the County's responsibility. Chairman Rentenbach stated that because she sits on Brownfield she can explain that they feel it is an insurance policy. They believe it to be clean soil if there is any question about the soil later, it will all be contained in one area.

Commissioner Bunek stated that he had thought from the beginning that it would be better to use County property rather than take it to the landfill or somewhere else. The tower property needs to be filled back in; it serves as a double purpose. Discussion ensued on whether there is a value to the soil.

In response to a question from Commissioner Bunek regarding the soil washing off, Hawkins stated that they had spoken with the Drain Commissioner and he had been comfortable with where they are planning to place the soil. They will use some erosion controls to make sure that there is no issue. Janik explained that there is a spot that has a natural bowl where the soil will go; there may be some that will go in other areas.

#122-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK THAT THE COUNTY ALLOW THE BROWNFIELD REDVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, AS PART OF THEIR TRANSACTION, TO INCLUDE THE USE OF THE LEELANAU COUNTY SOUTH PIT ROAD TOWER SITE FOR SOIL PLACEMENT. SECONDED BY SOUTAS-LITTLE.

AYES – 6 (Bunek, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell)

NO – 1 (Lautner)

MOTION CARRIED.

LEC: Proposed Contract for Design Services with Apollo Engineering, Inc.:

Janik stated that as was discussed last week, there are two contracts, both of which have been reviewed by our legal counsel. One is for the design of the work at the Law Enforcement Center the other is for project management. There will be certified engineers as part of the contract.

#123-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT BETWEEN LEELANAU COUNTY AND APOLLO ENGINEERING, INC., FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE LEELANAU COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

LEC: Proposed Contract for Project Management with E3:

#124-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY WESSELL TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT BETWEEN LEELANAU COUNTY AND E THREE, INC., FOR PROJECT MANAGER SERVICES FOR THE LEELANAU COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY BUNEK.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Wessell, Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Surplus Vehicle Bids:

#125-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO AWARD THE BIDS FOR THE USED VEHICLES TO THE HIGHEST BIDDERS, AS PRESENTED:

#1 – 2011 FORD CROWN VICTORIA, TO FRANK GOODROE - \$2,800.00

#2 – 2009 FORD CROWN VICTORIA, TO FRANK GOODROE - \$2,200.00

#3 – 2001 FORD CROWN VICTORIA, TO GERARD BELANGER - \$951.00

SECONDED BY BUNEK.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

November 15, 2015, Motion Modification – Purchase of Patrol Vehicles:

#126-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY RUSHTON TO MODIFY THE NOVEMBER 2015 MOTION FOR VEHICLE PURCHASES AND INCREASE THE APPROVED AMOUNT OF \$99,000.00 TO NOT TO EXCEED \$103,760.98; FUNDS TO COME FROM MOTOR POOL FUND #661. SECONDED BY LAUTNER.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

AMENDMENTS & TRANSFERS:

#127-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE BUDGET AMENDMENT #16-005. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

#128-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE FUND TRANSFER #16-002. SECONDED BY RUSHTON.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

CLAIMS & ACCOUNTS:

#129-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE CLAIMS AND ACCOUNTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$215,756.30. SECONDED BY WESSELL.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

POST AUDIT:

#130-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY LAUTNER TO APPROVE POST AUDIT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,424,627.42. SECONDED BY BUNEK.

Discussion – None.

AYES – 6 (Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell, Bunek)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

SPECIAL REPORTS BY STAFF, COMMISSIONERS, ELECTED OFFICIALS AND AFFILIATED AGENCIES:

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

➤ Steve Mikowski, Lake Leelanau. Mikowski stated the next process will be to employ the Leelanau Road Commission when the Commissioners approve the hauling of the soil by the Road Commission for free for the developer. There was a lot of discussion about a boat, but he never heard a word about a report from the Coast Guard on how they would integrate that boat into what we are doing here. Was the Coast Guard contacted, did they offer any suggestions or did we ask for any suggestions? Five hundred thousand is a lot of money; once the money flows, it will happen. Whether it is right or wrong it will happen and then the operational cost will hit us between the eyes. To say that no more personnel will be needed is ridiculous.

➤ Bruce Price, Lake Leelanau. Price stated that one thing he has learned is that when going to an auction, he who makes the first bid, gets the last bid but some people are not smart enough to figure that out. He questioned who sent in the letter? Janik will get Price a copy. Price stated that in his Polish brain, he figures it came from the far right again because others talk longer and then again the far right gentleman that always challenges him talks longer than him. He saw Republicans the other day go on and on. He thinks coming from that party, which he feels it is, they are violating their own rules. Maybe it is because they are a little jealous because they can't get "his goat" because he does not panic. He wanted to say that there was a lot of time put into Line 5 and we should listen to that and if there is another way to do that would be fine. He is a believer that you need to fix things before they are done. He concluded with a political joke.

➤ Karen Zemaitis, Leland. Zemaitis wanted to clarify a statement that was made; she was at the Land Bank meeting this morning, in which she participated as a member. If the perception was that they were surprised by the information they were given on the property at Bayview, she thinks someone's perception was misguided. They were not surprised; they have had many reports on this property. What they were surprised at, was being asked whether we want the property now or not since it had not come before this Board. She just wanted to clarify that.

➤ John O'Neill, Cedar. O'Neill stated regarding the request to submit a grant for the rescue boat. He thought that was a lot of good discussion on both the pros and cons and that perhaps it would cost a lot going forward. We are talking about \$100,000.00 initial investment, but that was not what was on the table, what was on the table was whether or not to submit the grant. If that grant has a deadline, where you can only apply once a year or every six months, you can approve the grant application. That would give you the time to consider more in-depth to see if it's a prudent investment. You were not talking about the purchase of a boat but about the submission of a grant to seek funds to purchase a boat. If that grant was approved, he does not know if the rules allow for this to be reconsidered, but he believes that it would be prudent to seek the funding with the full understanding that you are able to say no if it not a prudent investment.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS – REPORTS ON COMMITTEE/COMMISSION
APPOINTMENTS:

None.

ADJOURN:

#131-04192016 Regular Session

MOTION BY BUNEK TO ADJOURN. SECONDED BY WESSELL.

AYES – 6 (Bunek, Lautner, Rentenbach, Rushton, Soutas-Little, Wessell)

NO – 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Carolyn Rentenbach, Chairman
Leelanau County Board of Commissioners

Sherry L. Nedow, Chief Deputy
Clerk, Leelanau County Board of Comm.