

**NORTHFIELD TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Live Transcript of Regular Meeting
October 7, 2015

10/10/2015 This transcription is incomplete. Unlistened-to gaps remain. Several of the best and worst moments have not been transcribed. We'll get there in a day or so. At least two of the segments are missing a couple of sentences in the middle of someone's speech. Some parts, particularly where people talk off microphone, were completely unintelligible. The Huron River Watershed Council presentation has been omitted because it was non-confrontational. The meeting lasted almost three hours. Check back later for updates to this transcript.

October 7th, 2015

Click the blue links to watch a comment or item on Youtube, or to start watching the meeting at that point in time.

[\[02m00s\]](#)

1. [CALL TO ORDER](#)

[\[02m07s\]](#)

2. [PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE](#)

[\[02m28s\]](#)

3. [ROLL CALL](#)

[\[02m50s\]](#)

4. [APPROVAL OF AGENDA](#)

[\[03m26s\]](#)

[motion to adopt: Dignan](#)

[\[03m45s\]](#)

5. [CALL TO THE PUBLIC](#)

[\[05m20s\]](#)

[Craig Warburton:](#)

[\[09m45s\]](#)

[David Gordon](#)

[\[13m50s\]](#)

[David Perry](#)

[\[18m08s\]](#)

[Jim Mulcrone](#)

[\[22m00s\]](#)

6. [CORRESPONDENCE](#)

[\[22m15s\]](#)

[\[Dignan objection\]](#) to Burns' letter being made public]

[\[22m45s\]](#)

[\[Fink points out\]](#) that the boilerplate which disturbs Dignan appears on every piece of paper the Attorney's office produces]

[\[23m10s\]](#)

[Dignan motion:](#) to waive attorney client privilege

[\[23m46s\]](#)

[\[Chockley explains\]](#) Paul Burns opinion, that Bylaws must be followed.]

[\[24m09s\]](#)

[\[Dignan expresses disappointment\]](#) "in this document"... explains his interpretation of the law.]

[\[24m55s\]](#)

[Dignan:](#) "I guess the township board could vote to remove an individual that's on an appointed board..."

[\[25m10s\]](#)

[Chick:](#) "Why would we not want to follow proper procedures as we establish them?"

[\[25m20s\]](#)

[\[Dignan interrupts\]](#), is squelched by Chairperson Chockley]

[\[25m41s\]](#)

[Iaquinto](#): "We don't engage with the general public"

[\[26m00s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): "I would say that we would want to follow the bylaws - my opinion - we want to follow those bylaws. We set those rules, as a group to manage our meetings and our communication with each other. We should be following them so that we all know what the rules are. There are pieces in here, in our bylaws, that involve conflict of interest, voting... Why would we want to not follow our own rules. So there's no teeth. Okay, Mr. Dignan.

[\[26m30s\]](#)

[Dignan](#)" I would agree with you. The county board of commissioners, shortly after you left sitting on that county board of commissioners, went into this issue in depth, because they realized that they truly did not have policies that could govern them in a way if they were to have a rogue member. Now those are elected officials, so it's a little bit different there, because truly there's nothing that can be done other than recall an elected official. Appointed it's a little different but... it's just something that each of us needs to be cognizant of to make sure that we are doing what we can do best to abide by them.

[\[27m25s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): We have a couple other items.... a letter from Cobalt

[\[29m02s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): This whole survey is tabled indefinitely, or set aside indefinitely so we are not dealing with it at this current time.

[\[29m13s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): Was there any clarification from the

township board on who was going to be handling this from here on out, survey questions,

Chick: When they discussed it at the workshop meeting .. it was... the discussion with them was that we were gonna go back to the beginning of the way Cobalt wanted to do it and scrap everything that we've done so far and let Cobalt manage the survey. They are certainly interested in the input that we've gotten to them and they're going to do what they can with it. I also asked the board members if they had some kind of direction or some kind of comments of three things that they wanted on this they should please send that to the Planning Commission. I don't know if we've gotten anything or not. But um, yeah, but we're kinda startin' from phase one with Cobalt again.

[\[30m12s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): my opinion is, if we're gonna do this, start from phase one, it needs to be either at the township board or at the planning commission, and not at both.

[\[30m20s\]](#)

[Chick](#): They want it at the Planning Commission

[\[30m22s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#):

[\[30m40s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): So it is set aside right now for indefinitely til Mr Stanalajczo and I determine it's ready to come back on the Agenda, so it is not close. I would like to mention that I had been talking with individuals and I went to the DDA and I went to the Parks and Rec commission. I met with some of the Northfield Neighbors

[\[31m06s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): I intend to meet with the Seniors and anyone else from the groups that come in and are interested in development to talk about the survey. But again, it may not go anywhere if we, if it's all indefinitely set aside, so anyway, but I'm getting a better understanding of really what the issue is, and it's not necessarily just do we build houses. We have a downtown that's

dying and why is it dying? And are houses going to save it? There's more questions. As I meet with people there are more questions coming up than just do we build houses? So, it's been very educational for me. I appreciate people who have given me input and I'll put together a report at some point to this body.

[\[32m16s\]](#)

[\[Chockley introduces](#) a Michigan Association of Planning program, Master Planning for Resilient Waterfront Communities. The 3 hour program will be held November 4th at the Edsel and Eleanor Ford House in in Grosse Pointe Shores.]

[\[29m22s\]](#)

7. [REPORTS](#)

[\[33m45s\]](#)

A. [Board of Trustees Report](#)

[\[34m16s\]](#)

B. [ZBA](#)

[\[35m10s\]](#)

C. [Staff Report](#)

[\[35m15s\]](#)

D. [Planning Consultant Report](#)

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

[\[35m26s\]](#)

9. [OLD BUSINESS](#)

[\[35m28s\]](#)

A. [Huron River Watershed Council Presentation](#): Green Infrastructure Workshop Results

[\[90m48s\]](#)

10. [NEW BUSINESS](#)

A. Planning Commission Bylaws

[\[91m06s\]](#)

[Planner DuMouchel's presentation](#)

[\[94m28s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): "what is the whole purpose of the bylaws? your interpretation of it, so obviously it's gonna be opinion"

[\[94m39s\]](#)

[DuMouchel](#):

My understanding is that they do not have any teeth, in that nobody is going to be hauled off to jail. But they're an expression, I mean, their violation would certainly be a breach of integrity

[\[95m11s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#):

[\[95m43s\]](#)

[DuMouchel](#):

[\[95m53s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#):

[\[96m02s\]](#)

[DuMouchel](#):

[\[96m15s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): I'm not sure if we can extend state law into something more specific

[\[96m19s\]](#)

[DuMouchel](#): The Michigan planning enabling act transfers the police power of the state onto the planning commission. That's how we get to decide upon matters of health, safety, and welfare. So if the Planning Commission has duly passed a set of bylaws, I wouldn't think that they have no force at all. It's certainly a matter of record.

[\[96m44s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): all I'm trying to get to is that basically our bylaws are how we function as a group.

[\[99m54s\]](#)

[Fink \[interrupts\]](#)

[\[99m59s\]](#)

[Chick](#) "We just agreed on these Bylaws recently. I guess my question is, to look at it backward, what is it that

does this planning commission as a whole feel, that does not allow us to function the way that it should function, , based on what they've got already. What is? I don't think we should - need to tear it apart either. You want to tweak a couple of things, fine, if they have to be tweaked; They've been working for us so far. I don't understand what the problem with the bylaws is that's causing an issue with us functioning the way that we have to function. Specifically.

[\[100m37s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): "We've been working diligently over the last couple of years to reduce redundancies out of our ordinances... It's been almost a year and a half. The board has changed a little. I think it's a valid request.

[\[102m48s\]](#)

[Chick](#): ...

[\[103m10s\]](#)

[Fink \[after Chick, Dignan, and Chockley talk\]](#)

I think that there's actually a bigger policy issue here guys. So, there are a number of areas... there are a number of places in your bylaws where there has been a choice to be more restrictive than state law. And there are times when that is permissible and there are times when that is not. And frankly I think that there's some additional legal research that probably needs to be done here. um. Let's take a look at one particular area of the bylaws under conflict of interest. [\[103m47s\]](#)

[So under the law](#) of conflict of interest...

[unintelligible question off mic] I don't know; I read this.

Chockley: Ms DuMouchel has something on conflict of interest. Oh, on her... I don't know...

[\[104m15s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Can somebody say where it is.

Chockley: I'm looking.

[\[104m27s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Ok. So

[\[104m35s\]](#)

[Fink](#): So under the law of conflict of interest, conflict of interest is related to a pecuniary relationship. pecuniary interest. A financial gain from one person to another. I don't have any issues with A and I don't have any issues with B. Not sure the, no issues with C. D. D is an interesting one. D states a matter that would give rise to the appearance of impropriety.

[\[105m00s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Now, there is nothing in the law that indicates that the appearance of impropriety rises to the level of a conflict of interest. The problem with the statement is not that, and you would all agree that if there's an appearance of impropriety then we ought to address that.

[\[105m26s\]](#) But you further go on to say

[Fink](#): what, uh, what basis you can remove a planning commission member for. And there's statements in here to the Board of Trustees' relationship of removing a planning commission member. Do you... Are you wishing to adopt a set of documents that the Board of Trustees can remove a planning commission member because a group is indicated that they feel that they've given rise to the appearance of impropriety when no impropriety exists?

[\[106m02s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Um, so herein lies the policy consideration. And there's multiple places in the document where the bylaws have gone over and above what is considered uh under Michigan statute and the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. There are places in the bylaws that indicates a vote on a Master Plan Amendment that states that you need six (6) votes

[\[106m40s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Right

[Fink](#): to change the master plan. Uh. These are all fundamental policy considerations. And I frankly don't

remember this conversation occurring a year ago.

[\[106m55s\]](#)

[Fink](#): And so I would argue that it is a very valid exercise. I'm not going to get into the debate of whether or not something should be in a document or out of a document if it's redundant or not redundant. Those are the conversations for you all to have and determine what your goals and objectives are and that's not, that, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is there's some real policy issues in this bylaws and I think everyone on this commission needs to read these bylaws in full and decide if these are the policies that you want to abide by.

[\[107m36s\]](#)

[Fink](#): That's the question. And, and the legal question that has to be answered is in in in the instances where you've gone above and beyond the wha wha the requirements of state law, uh, under the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, is that, is that permissible?

[\[108m01s\]](#)

[DuMouchel](#): I think in this particular question it is. The MPEA says unless the legislative body defines conflict of interest the Planning Commission is required to do so. The enabling ordinance here says that the Planning Commission is required to define conflict of interest

[\[108m16s\]](#)

[Fink](#) [Shouts over Leah DuMouchel]

Rem... Leah! Leah! Leah! Wa! Leah! Leah! Rem... Leah! Wait! Please.

Removing a Planning Commission member, Ok, is a significant step. So whether or not this Board can choose to rise above and define conflict of interest as higher than state statute is one question. The action, the resulting action of the decision of how it's worded, to remove a sitting planning commission member from a board because of the appearance of impropriety if no impropriety exists is a pretty significant action, and my point to this planning commission is that you need to read the bylaws and ask the question, are these the

policy considerations that you need to govern yourselves. Do you want to have to get six votes for a Master Plan amendment? If the answer to that question is yes, it's it's then it's perfectly fine.

[\[109m25s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Then the question needs to be asked, is that allowable? Not just about the conflict of interest section, there are other sections in the bylaws that go over and above statute. So, you know these are, these are, these are, these are [sic] big issues.

[\[109m49s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): The Board of Trustees are the ones after a public hearing aren't they that remove a commissioner for nonfeasance, malfeasance, or misfeasance, right? Is that true?

Fink: Right, but you define misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance as you define that as either A, B, C, or D.

Chockley: Well potentially then one of them then we may need to adjust.

Fink: Precisely my point.

[\[110m10s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Right, but I don't think it's a wholesale, you know, redo of the

Fink: I didn't say that. I. What I'm saying is there are places in the bylaws that create a more restrictive perspective than state law requires. Let's look at it this way. Do you want to have to have six votes approve a Master Plan?

[\[110m40s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Yes. I do.

Fink: K [Fink's Chicago roots are showing]

[\[110m43s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Does everybody else?

Public Member: Point of Order! [unintelligible]

Chockley: It's a rhetorical question. You know, so, at...

Fink: That's my point. The point is that that that [sic] these are policy considerations that need to be researched. And you all need to resolve.

[\[111m03s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Ok. Then we should have people carefully look at these and bring their comments, have something to compare them to. And I think Ms. DuMouchel put together a good list of items here so we should just go ahead and see what is appropriate from her

[\[111m23s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): which is why I suggested that we have Mr. Fink look over our bylaws and make recommendations to us...

[\[111m30s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Mr Fink is not staff to this Planning Commission.

Stanalajczo: Who is staff?

Dignan: [interrupting] Who's staff?

Chockley: Excuse me?

Dignan: Who's staff?

Chockley: Ms. DuMouchel

[\[111m40s\]](#)

[Iaquinto](#): Miss, Mister Fink is also the Township Manager. He is staff to this board.

Chockley: No, he's told me he's not staff.

[\[111m48s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Guys, I'm not gonna get into a, I'm not gonna get

into this kind of debate. I'm here to help you. I'm here to to to [sic] help. Clearly there's some conflict and disagreement as to um as to how you folks want things to run. I'm bringing up some issues that are of importance to the Planning Commission and how you function moving forward. Miss DuMouchel's research on this I took a look at it. It's pretty thorough as well; she did a good job. I don't uh I uh uh uh I didn't uh sort of it wasn't intended to correct her but it's intended to point out that yes, you can, you can, you can pass bylaws over and above statute I do agree with that. It's the question of what's the result, what's the impact of those decisions and I think I don't remember having that conversation a year ago when we looked at the bylaws as to those two areas those areas in there about the budget uh uh that are pretty significant to this board, how that operates,

[\[112m56s\]](#)

but I'm I'm sorry, but I am just not, for those who are on the board, I'm just not going to... I'm here to help. I'm not gonna get into a you know I want this person to do it and I want this. And I I Unfortunately I felt disrespected in that moment, Madame Chair.

[\[113m11s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): I'm sorry. I apologize. Could you provide us a memo listing those items that are problematic.

Dignan: I think that's exactly what Mr. Stanalajczo's asking for. Exactly what he was asking for Madame Chair.

Fink: I I can certainly provide a memo uh areas of items that I think deserve review.

Chockley: Ok

Fink: And are important policy considerations.

Chockley: Thank you. Miss Chick?

[\[113m35s\]](#)

[Chick](#): In order to uh to not have redundancy if there are items that are already Miss DuMouchel has presented

then can we just have those that aren't? So instead of having two people doing the same thing um

[\[113m52s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): I guess I'd like to see things side by side. Is that a possibility? You know, we used to [incomplete] so you could tell, or [incomplete] How are we going to know what's new and what's not new?

[\[114m12s\]](#)

[Fink](#): [interrupts] I I I Sorry

Chockley: Mr Cousino?

[\[114m17s\]](#)

[Cousino](#): I don't see a problem with including a state law in our bylaws. If I'm a citizen trying to find out what this planning commission ... about I don't want to have to look through five different documents and go through do a full library research to find out what's going on. I'd like to know how it's defined at the state and how we abide by that as well. And whatever our provisions that are different from that are...

[\[114m42s\]](#)

[Cousino](#): I don't see why this I've been on this board for how many years? Four or five years now. I don't think... conflict of interest has never come up once. Uh, several of the same staff members were here at the time we did this thing. This did not come up then. I don't know why it's coming up now versus then, now.

[\[115m01s\]](#)

[Cousino](#): There's obviously something going on in the background that some of us don't know about. It's frustrating on my side and I'm sure it's frustrating to a lot of people out in our citizenry.

Dignan: Madame Chair

Chockley: Mr Dignan

[\[115m18s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): I mean I can address if if the board members here forget the reason that some of this was brought up

is because this planning commission has not been operating by its bylaws. We've been operating outside of our bylaws for years. We have. We haven't done what's required. We haven't done what we asked our own policies to be. The standard that we've held ourselves up to, we haven't lived up to that standard for years. The question came up when Mr. Stanalajczo stepped up to take the position of secretary. He says I have some duties that are defined by the operating policies of this board that I have to fulfill. That's what he came to this board and said. And it seems to be that like it's been the biggest conflict in the world from day one when he mentioned that. That is true. We don't operate by these bylaws. If we're not operating by them, then throw them out. If we wanna operate by them, reform them. We need to go through them and we need to go through them thoroughly and we need to make sure that if it says it in here [gestures emphatically at page] are we doing it. If we're not doing it, do we wanna do it or do we not? [shouting] If we don't wanna do it take it out. If we do wanna operate with each other that way, then by golly we have to live up to that and do what it says we do.

[\[116m37s\]](#)

[Fink](#): [interrupting] Madame Chair

Chockley: Mr Roman, please

Roman: I agree but uh somebody has to do the footwork, come up with the specifics as to what we're addressing in our bylaws and what needs to be looked at. So far, I haven't seen anything but the document that we received for tonight, which has very minimal changed on it. So, if somebody is so inclined to do that I'd be willing to look at it. I personally don't have an issue with most of the things in here and I don't see a total gut job. To answer [incomplete] is just refer to state law and take these and throw 'em out - that's not the answer for me either. So there's a lot of talk, there's a lot of talk about we're not following things, haven't been for years, I'm sure it comes down to a few specific items, if you would be so inclined to point those items out I think it would be a much more productive meeting for us

all [incomplete]

Dignan: [Interrupts, shouting] It's been pointed out numerous times before

Roman: But to say let's just throw everything out and refer to the state law.

Dignan: [Interrupts, shouting] I pointed them out while I was secretary

Roman: I haven't seen them.

[\[117m48s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): Madame Chair

Chockley: I beg to differ but we should

Dignan: [talking over Chair] No No Madame Chair I'd like the table

Chockley: Alright

Dignan: I would, because I did point them out; I pointed them out to you and you agreed with me [points with finger] and it goes down to the duties of the secretary, and you go oh well we don't do it that way. That's what you told me. We don't do it that way. What we do, and I [incomplete] and that hasn't changed,

[\[118m13s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): from that day. Mr. Stanalajczo has decided to pursue that issue in much more detail. I mean, it it it, we have not, when you get straight down to the area that I'm speaking of, I am, you know, and some of it comes down to signing of all completed site plans, signing and recording approved minutes, and uh submitting attendance records, this has not been done by the secretary of this board, uh, reading upon request, correspondence from the planning commission meetings, we're still not doing that, um, calling and noticing special meetings, now we're that particular item is done by staff and that's delegated responsibility, and um, you know, restating motions, we actually ask, Lisa does some of that, but some of these things, this is policy, this is policy that we govern ourselves by and we're not following it.

[\[119m19s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): And that's one. Another one that I'll raise right now happened tonight, when you shut me down when a member of the public was speaking.

Chockley: You should not be, you should not be doing that

Dignan: That is not true

Chockley: while a member of the public is speaking

Dignan: Under article 8 section 13.1 under citizen participation, commission discussion of any raised issue may result in questions directed back to the individual or representative of an organization or group addressing this commission, and that is under the section of citizen participation. [shouts] I absolutely have the right to direct a question to them

Chockley: Not while he is speaking

Dignan: By our... according to our bylaws, I have that right.

[\[119m57s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Then we'll have to change that.

Dignan: Well, [shouting] exactly Mr. Stanalajczo's point.

Chockley: I'm reading the Robert's Rules of Order and we should not be interrupting our speakers as they come up here.

Dignan: [head reared back, nose in the air, a stereotypical male-dominance pose] [very loud] Ms. Chockley, Again that is what Mr. Stanalajczo brought up. That is why we are doing this. You said, well that needs to change. That's why we're asking that we go through this; it's because as we point out these things that are not being governed properly, we're not doing, you find issue with them as well. So

Chockley: I

Dignan: let's do this right.

Chockley: interpreted that differently, that I don't, we don't interrupt our public when they're speaking to us, that was my interpretation

[\[120m39s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): When they're addressing us directly we have that right, by our bylaws. We may not follow them but by our bylaws

Chockley: I will admit there are things in the bylaws that we have not done for years that I brought up with Mr Lewan. We were going to get a stamp. There's a whole lot of administrative stuff that has not happened for a long time. And that needs to be corrected and done properly and according to our bylaws. So, Mr. Roman?

[\[121m10s\]](#)

[Roman](#): I have, I just have a point to make that I'm open to look at any particular item on the whole document. If these things were know over a year why are we sitting here tonight without any highlights on the copy? From somebody?

Chockley: Well the two items...

Roman: I thought

Chockley:

Roman: I understand. But now we're looking at I'm coming to the meeting prepared to look at what was presented to me in the package and now we have many numerous things on there and I'm not opposed to looking at them but obviously we can't look at them tonight. So somebody's gonna have to produce what they would like to see in it and what they would not like to see in it. And we would have to review it again. I mean, to be productive. Sitting here bickering if it's not for anybody's advantage.

[\[122m10s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Madame Chair

Chockley: Mr Iaquinto hasn't spoken

[\[122m13s\]](#)

[Iaquinto](#): That's one of the reasons why I am in favor of Mr Fink doing the review. He has the history with this planning commission and has listened to us for several years on what issues we are bringing forward that definitely need to be changed. Where Mrs. DuMouchel does not have that history right now.

[\[122m36s\]](#)

[Fink](#): Madame Chair, please, please allow me
Chockley: Yes, please

[\[122m40s\]](#)

[Fink](#): I do I'm not going to get in the middle of this, folks. Y'know, I'm not going to be the brunt of the additional conflict on this board. That is not my intent. Um. I would if the commission would indulge me for five minutes and I will not take more than five minutes

[\[122m59s\]](#)

of your time, I will go through the document and indicate to you the areas that I think might need to be looked at that I've already done and then you all should have the conversation amongst yourselves. It's not, it's not that, it's not that big a deal to go through and say are these the areas are these, is this good language for us ... Give me five minutes and I'd like to do that. Cause I'm not sure that I want to go through this bylaws in this moment and at this point and create a whole document and kinda get in the middle of, y'know, conflict here when I'm not exactly sure what the direction is. So

[\[123m40s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Ok I'd like to move, I would like to move that Mr Fink go ahead and do this right now

Dignan: Support

Chockley: so we can hear his comments.

Chockley: Ok, motion by Chockley, Support by Dignan, to hear Mr Fink. Any discussion on that. Mr Roman?

Roman: I would much prefer to see something presented at a later time

Cousino: In writing

Roman: And, also from our Planning expert, Ms. DuMouchel. I would like to see her take, right from page one to page thirteen, and without using other examples of other Townships, just go straight down ours, correct what is over and above, if necessary, let's do it that way. That's what I would like to see. I don't want to put Mr. Fink in any position tonight.

Dignan: Madame Chair?

Chockley:

Dignan: I agree with Mr Roman and I withdraw my support.

[\[124m37s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Ok. The motion is, well, I will withdraw my motion. Ok, Mr. Stanalajczo

Stanalajczo: well, first of all, in all this conversation, I wanna address Mr. Cousino's idea that there's something backing, backdooring, something going on behind the scenes. I was not on this planning commission when this was adopted. When I got appointed to this planning commission, the first thing I asked uh Marlene for is a copy of the bylaws [Chockley: which I gave you] so that I could actually look at them and see how it is we are supposed to be conducting our business. At that point in time I read through it and there's stuff down in here that it seems that whoever adopted these from last year there was a little tweaks but this is probably the same document from 1994. So to say that it was adjusted or amended, it it it seems to me that it was written with a lot of things in it that you look at doesn't make any sense. Section 4.14 adopt rules... well, the whole point of the bylaws are the rules that we are adopting. What's that section doing in there?

[\[125m44s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): All I'm saying is I would like to have the thing reviewed and we should be able to review this and not just go, well, it's been working just exactly the way it is ad just pass the thing when there needs to be, some sections that just need to be adjusted.

Chockley: Ok

[\[125m58s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): To make us run better. That's all. There's nothing backdooring about this, or behind the

scenes. I simply asked Mr Fink if his comments, asked him if, if either him or somebody on the staff could actually go through some of this stuff and review it for us, present it to us.

[\[126m16s\]](#)

[Stanalajczo](#): He volunteered that he would look at the stuff and do that for us. And that's all I was asking for him to do. Not get in the middle of anything. He's an expert. He's a lot more expert than any of us sitting here... The times he's been doing stuff. And I would like to have him reviewing some of the stuff and give us interpretation of it. That's all I was asking for.

Chockley: Can we have a... Mr Dignan

Dignan: I'd like to make a motion that we ask Miss DuMouchel to work with staff on coming up with a line, as Mr Roman had said he'd like to see, a line by line review of both our bylaws and ah if staff has contributions to make to that, that they be included as well, and that once that information has been gathered, to bring it back to this board to then review, discuss, and decide what path moving forward.

Stanalajczo: I'll support that.

Chockley: Ok, um, we're gonna have to have uh Miss Lemble restate that motion

[\[127m33s\]](#)

[[[Main Camera's autofocus dies right about here]]]

[Lemle](#):

Iaquinto: [interrupting] Larry one of the things you mentioned in there

Chockley: I uh

Iaquinto: This is part of the discussion

Chockley: I need to hear it restated first. Ok

Lemle: that DuMouchel work with staff on a line by line review of the bylaws and after that information has been gathered, it be brought back to the commission for review

Chockley: review, discussion, and

Dignan: I want to make sure that included in there was,

not that I don't think it would be but, staff contributions to that I want included as well.

[\[128m10s\]](#)

[Fink](#): May I

Dignan: That's a motion. That is part of the motion.

Fink: Is there discussion?

Chockley: Now we're going for discussion. Mr Iaquinto

Iaquinto: Part of Mr Roman's statement was that I as a commissioner don't need to see the comparisons of other communities either, so, please remove that and just base it on our community.

[\[128m45s\]](#)

[Roman](#): That was just a suggestion on my part.

Chockley: So, any more discussion on this motion.

Fink: squeaks in background

Chockley: Alright, let's rollicall

Fink: I just have a quick comment.

[\[129m04s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Ok Mr Fink go ahead

Fink: um um I'm happy to sit down with Leah um I I I think it's her role and responsibility to go through it line by line.

Chockley: I do to

Fink: All I wanted to do was give you a quick overview of areas that I think you should take a look at um because they're critical policy issues and I will be happy to send a half page memo because that's about what it's going to amount to or a literally five minute quick overview of areas of key policy issues in the bylaws that I think you need to review because they dictate pretty significant items of how you function. That, that was the purpose, and uh, somehow this whole thing got kind of shifted but I mean that's my, that's my purpose, that was what I would like to do for you as my role, I'd already given you two areas that are important to review. There are some others.

[\[130m14s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Ok Roll call vote

Stanalajczo: [calls roll for votes]

[\[130m31s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Ok. Alright, minutes of September 16th

[\[130m40s\]](#)

11. MINUTES: [September 16, 2015 Meeting](#)

[\[133m11s\]](#)

[motion](#):

[\[133m27s\]](#)

12. [POLICY REVIEW AND DISCUSSION](#)

[\[133m38s\]](#)

12.a. Added by Iaquinto during Approval of Agenda
: Discussion of September 16th presentation by
Planner

[Iaquinto](#): My point that I would like ... it that before it and it has been customary to all of us that before any presentation go onto this board that we have a chance to review it. And so number one, the presentation - you couldn't read it, so I would have appreciated a copy beforehand in our packet so that I could have prepared and read through properly to understand it, so I could have been engaging in that conversation because without having the opportunity to do so it was like a mute [sic] point without having the information beforehand when Mrs. DuMouchel was speaking, she was speaking extremely fast and it was difficult to understand and comprehend what she was saying. So consequently having it beforehand be able to read it be able to decipher it and it would have been very well appreciated. So my statement is that it has been the practice of this board for any presentation that's gonna go on that we have a copy of it prior to the proceeding. Any other statements from any other ...

[\[135m00s\]](#)

[Chick](#): I think it should have been part of the Agenda. I mean it was just announced at the meeting that she was

giving a presentation. Cause I had asked to see it before the meeting and it wasn't available to us. And so yeah, in my opinion, it should have been on the Agenda as a presentation.

Iaquinto [interrupting] Or I feel

Chick: It was hard to see for us. I know they moved it closer.

[\[135m20s\]](#)

[Iaquinto](#): I mean I feel it that things can wait then if you don't have an opportunity to review it just like has been stated here today we all try to come to be prepared for this meeting and it works against us not having the information prior to the meeting. So, please let's all ask to follow that and if it's not supplied to us beforehand I'm gonna ask that it not happen at that meeting. Cause I have asked before. So thank you.

[\[135m53s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Any other discussion while we're here. Mr Roman

[\[135m56s\]](#)

[Roman](#): I think I agree. I think it's fair; it's only fair to everybody, not only the commissioners but the people in the public... It reflects the same thing there's a general lack of getting completed information to us, you know, prior, so I think that's a definite point to need to be worked out.

Chockley: Thank you for comments. Mr Dignan?

[\[136m25s\]](#)

[Dignan](#): Madame Chair, I,I,I concur. I mean, we do have a packet deadline. Is that correct?

Chockley: We do.

Dignan: Then, I, I

Chockley: It's around, it's wednesday

Dignan: Right. I think we need to kinda stick close to that packet deadline and truly if it's not there then,

y'know, cause even if it's available the day before that doesn't mean I have the time to go through it that day. I,I,I, y'know,

Chockley: That's correct

Dignan: It's just we all have other jobs as well outside of this and family and stuff ... thank you.

[\[137m03s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): I agree with that. It was a de... it was not on the agenda as a discussion item. And so, to present material as a discussion item, it would have been helpful to have it earlier, I would agree, [unintelligible] cancelled the meeting; I think it was our only topic that day, on the agenda. So it was an attempt to move things along but

[\[137m29s\]](#) sometimes things take a little longer than we expect to get ready for. So we could potentially cancel the meetings that we're not quite prepared for a week ahead of time. Now we, would, y'know... We only have between Wednesday, today, and generally a week or less to prepare for the next meeting depending on what was sitting on the agenda, so it can be challenging to get things to move along quickly. And y'know I, Miss DuMouchel put a lot of time into that and it was her opinion of these surveys which I found valuable and in retrospect to even to think about and go back over those surveys myself and see if I drew the same conclusions

[\[138m20s\]](#)

So, we can all think about that. We weren't making a decision that night but I do, I will put myself out there to make sure that we are ready ahead of time, a week ahead of time. If we're not we will pull things from the agenda so you have time to look at things.

138m41s

On the other hand, Mr. Lewan would come and give us presentations on topics that we asked him to talk about - how many houses per acre you could get in eighty acres. You know, we asked him to do those kind of presentations. I don't think we necessarily saw them ahead of time.

[\[139m02s\]](#)

[\[Iaquinto\]](#) - interrupting: We didn't ask for a presentation]

We knew they were coming

[\[Iaquinto: That's the difference\]](#)

But we didn't see ahead of time, y'know, if there's some concern about the contents

[\[139m13s\]](#)

of some of these presentations,

[\[Iaquinto: There again it's \[unntelligible\] practice to have](#)

Chockley: It's a good practice but I think that mostly there was concern about the content afterwards. And that was, that was unfortunate. But it was her professional opinion and I for one want to hear our professionals tell us what they think about things. So Anyway. But I will not put things on the agenda if we can't be ready for them ahead of time.

[\[139m46s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Mr. Dignan:

Dignan: Madame Chair I'd ask you to remember that you're one seventh of the opinions of this board.

Chockley: I am one seventh. That is correct.

Dignan: And, and, and while I certainly respect Miss DuMouchel's professional opinion, um, you know, again,

Chockley: I had the one slide the day of, I believe it was the day of

[\[140m26s\]](#)

or maybe the night before. I don't know, something like that.

Yes, go ahead Miss DuMouchel

[\[140m35s\]](#)

[DuMouchel](#): The first thing I would like to say is that I am very sorry for taking you guys by surprise. That was not at all my intent to be not communicative or not transparent or any of that. What I thought I was doing

was responding to the portion of the RFP that said that whoever you hired had to be up to speed on matters quickly and get there and have it in hand. So that was the reason that I did the research which was done even before the contract was signed. That was, that was on my [unintelligible] not your work. The presentation was put together to relay the results of what I thought was information that the township had long had. So my intent was not to startle, surprise, or frighten anybody and I'm very sorry that I was not familiar enough with protocols here to have done it more smoothly.

Chockley: Ok, thank you.

[\[141m29s\]](#)

Ok, any other comments. Miss Chick?

[\[141m35s\]](#)

[Chick](#): I have a few comments recently from residents about uh the planning commission not responding to questions that they bring to the commission, um, at the meetings. So they get some of [...] what the board has done, and ... Uh,

[\[142m58s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Mr Cousino, go ahead

Cousino: If that were the case, if a response is given, is it the official response fo the commission that's given back to the resident or is it just some of the opinions from this board answering back to the resident. [...] So it's not an official response back

Iaquinto: so as an example, ...

[\[144m24s\]](#)

[Chockley](#): Any other comments?

[\[144m27s\]](#)

13. [CALL TO THE PUBLIC](#)

[\[144m34s\]](#)

[Craig Warburton](#)

[\[147m53s\]](#)

David Perry

[151m20s]

David Gordon

[153m48s]

Howard Fink

[157m00s]

Jim Nelson

[159m35s]

14. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS

[159m43s]

Roman: [apology - why?]

[160m56s]

Cousino [apology - why?]

[161m05s]

Stanalajczo [no apology. blames the audience]

[163m00s]

Chockley

[163m58s]

Chick

[165m12s]

Iaquinto: [no apology]

The opening document that was passed out to us in the first call to the public, the most important issues to residents, was an interpretation from that document by one resident, Mr. Gordon. So I wanna state that that is an interpretation by that individual and not by any scientific result.

Secondly, I felt that the presentation that happened by Mrs. Olsson, as she mentioned multiple times being a Ann Arbor Township Planning Commission member, was a biased interpretation to us, in a dictation of another community's direction that they have gone. There were some good points in her presentation but I felt that her

mentioning that multiple times and the stringent interpretation she's asking us to derive is for an anti-total-zero growth policy.

Thirdly, the presentation that went on by our planner at the last meeting, again I stated that I felt it is proper to have presentations to us beforehand especially on an item such as that and I felt that Mrs. DuMouchel should have gone ahead and looked at our community a little bit more and gotten a taste of our planning commission a little bit more and direction before putting forth that presentation. Thank you.

[\[167m07s\]](#)

Dignan: [apology - followed by lecture]

Thank you. I mean if there was any offense taken by any planning commissioners, I apologize. It's not the intent. Um. I think we all, we, um, since I've been on this board, have had very passionate, very lively debates, discussions. At times, y'know, people have raised their voices at times but I think at the end of the day um I don't think I've ever left here angry with our fellow planning commissioners. I um even if I adamantly disagree with them. um. I believe that each one of us is truly doing what we passionately believe is the right thing um as we should. When we are appointed to these positions we are asked to rise above community sway, to rise above community politics, to rise above those things. And for each of us with our diverse backgrounds and our various experiences, to do what we believe is in the best interest of the township, um, I believe that we do do; I believe we do that, I believe that each of us takes that responsibility very seriously. We sometimes get very vocal groups that want to heavily influence and persuade us and while I welcome information from anyone that we can digest and look at, um, y'know, our job is to do what we believe is best, based on our experiences, our, um, knowledge, and what we believe is in the best interest of the township. Sometimes the community doesn't remember that we're different than your elected officials who are accountable to you when you when they go to the polling places. There's a reason we have staggered appointments. So that not one Board, one Board of

Trustees has the ability to load the planning commission with a bunch of Board Members. They're appointed over the course of many years. That allows us as much as possible to be a non political body. That does not mean that our own individual opinions and influences come into play when we are acting in what we believe to be the best interest... of the community. Um. With that I'd like to thank my fellow commissioners for your service. I do wanna state that I think it's very important to us that we have the head executive of this township available to us at our meetings. I think it can lend a lot of information that we don't have access to if he's not here. um. It's important to remember he's accountable for everything that happens in this township to the township board. His job is to be accountable for everything that happens in this township. I think we need to remember that. Uh. He does have those conversations that we don't have and can lend that information to us. The suggestion that it's out of order for him to speak, as long as this board sees fit to have him here at our meetings and not tell him differently, if the chair recognizes, he has every right to speak at this board, and I don't, I personally don't feel that I would want to restrict his ability to do that at the recognition of the Chair. Um. That is a very important component. He is the head executive of this community and we need to remember that. So, with that, uh, as Mr. Stanalajzo normally says, please keep all of our men and women in service in your prayers, and uh, thank you.

[\[171m22s\]](#)

15. [ANNOUNCEMENT](#): Next Regular Meeting - October 21, 2015

[\[171m53s\]](#)

16. [ADJOURNMENT](#)