

IRVING TOWNSHIP BOARD MEETING – TRANSCRIPT

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 6:30PM

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. Board Members present: Mike Buehler, Jamie Knight, Doug Sokolowski, Dean Bass, Sharon Olson.

Knight, we are going to do a roll call of the board before we get started. Clerk to take roll, Doug Sokolowski, Dean Bass, Jamie Knight, Mike Buehler, Sharon Olson.

Knight, any changes or corrections to the agenda? Sokolowski, on the agenda I just wondering if the public comment could be moved down a little bit further, just so that people can comment and things that we talked. It is your choice. I'm just asking as a suggestion.

Knight, so this new format of the agenda was after that last meeting and Dave recommended it. So that's the only reason that it's the order that it's in. We can try it this way this month, and then we can move it down next. Olson, unfinished business. Sokolowski, we have more unfinished, we have a slide in the deck with things that we're capturing that was brought up in the prior board meeting. We have four things that we need to follow up, take act on, but they don't need to be listed here because we keep those slides.

Knight, okay. I guess next time, just let me know. And I will add it to the agenda. So we're just taking things that a citizen brought up that we don't want to lose track of, and we put it on there. It's carryover items. We're not calling unfinished business. We're just calling things that citizens brought up that we might want to come back and address someday. Olson, like the 911 tower.

Motion to approved Agenda by Knight and seconded by Buehler. All in favor "Ayes." "No" none. Motion passed.

Knight, Clerk's minutes from the October 18, meeting. Hopefully you all had a chance to review them before we got here because they were quite lengthy. Lorraine did a fabulous job getting them done and then editing our changes that we requested.

Knight, motion to approve the minutes as presented for the October 18, seconded by Buehler. All in favor "Ayes." "No" none. Motion passed.

Sokolowski, Jamie, one thing on the minutes we need to rethink how we do this. We should call the synopsis, the minutes. The current minutes become supporting document called the transcript. The reason, we've received a couple emails, that we weren't meeting the expectations, and we weren't compliant with OMA, and with our part-time staff, and other priorities, it's hard to produce in the allotted time. If we go with the current synopsis, we'll call

that the minutes, we don't have the timeframe imposed on us. Olson, doing it this way does meet the mandated requirements.

Knight, I'm confused what you're asking, there's no way that we're going to publish these minutes (18) pages. Sokolowski, right, we are not. The synopsis becomes the minutes. It can be produced and published within eight days. The minutes become supporting document or transcript which requires a great deal of effort. Sokolowski, it's just recent that we've been doing a minute/transcript. I believe that people value it. Olson, we don't have a building that accommodates everybody to attend. We don't record. We don't stream. The transcript is the next best thing we've been making available to the public to record what has taken place here.

Knight, so when we published it in the paper, it is was Synopsis and now Minutes. Olson, yes. Knight and that is fulfilling the requirement to have something published? Olson, yes, and it complies with the OMA standards. Buehler, so the residents want more, they go to the website to read the transcript, or it's available here. Knight, ok, I think it's a good idea.

Knight, any public comment? Please come to the podium.

Mike Thomas Bremer, I am almost a two-year resident of Irving township at this point, the first part of my life up until here, a Thornapple Township resident. I recently got to the river and love it there. Just a comment about your public comment ... at Thornapple, we had one at the beginning and we had a second public comment at the end of the agenda. The last thing on our agenda and most of our meetings look like this, we had a public comment at both ends, in case something came up during the meeting the public could comment. That's not why I am here, but it just came up.

I've been following along what's going on in Irving Township just through the newspaper. I've been very disappointed, I'm sorry to say ... and the articles have just not been very good for Irving Township. I put this put this together and I'm going read this tonight, and this is my public comment. I didn't want to make any mistakes or go past my three minutes, so it's a short read for me.

S

Whereas: In light of the Irving Township Clerk's misjudgments regarding her role/responsibilities and authority as the Irving Township Clerk; and

Whereas: The Clerk provided an Irving Township voting tabulator to an unauthorized organization who then compromised the security/integrity of said tabulator without Board approval; and

Whereas: The clerk signed onto a federal lawsuit alleging improprieties in the voting process of the 2020 presidential election on behalf of the Township without Board approval; and

Whereas: The Clerk has acted irresponsibly of her own volition as in agent/representative of Irving Township and placed the Township in legal and financial jeopardy without Township Board approval.

Therefore, let it be resolved and known that I, Michael Thomas Bremer, a legal resident of Irving Township, respectfully request:

1. That the Irving Township Clerk tender her resignation immediately.
2. That the Irving Township Board accept that resignation with regrets.
3. That the Board begin the process to refill the vacant Clerk position forthwith.
4. That the Board works with the new Clerk to assist in the reestablishment of a second/additional polling place in Irving Township before the next election.

Submitted this 16th day of November 2022. During the Public Comment portion of the Irving Township Board Meeting Agenda. Respectfully, Michael T. Bremer, 2525 Horseshoe Trail, Irving Township.

So that's my comment. I understand that public comment is just that, it's comment. And it's not banter, and I'm not here for banter.

Knight, any other public comment? None.

Knight, unfinished business, ask for update for Lynette regarding internet. She did not have an update available.

Knight, new business. The auditor health check, Doug. We brought this up and talked about briefly last meeting. I've talked to Dan since. If we did this, I know the price tag is a little bit steep at 2500, but he said that if we did this, we control the scope and he could get that down to two. And then on top of that, if we followed the recommendations and took the actions that they recommended in January, it would reduce our costs during the end of the year audit in August. So he couldn't give exact amount because you had to see how much we took care of our books and budget. But I think that the advantage of doing this for us in January, is it positions us with a good foundation for doing our budget for next fiscal year. It positions us in a good position around making sure everything is reconciled, because the only way we can do an accurate budget is to make sure that our finances are totally aligned, and that we understand the expenditures that we incurred this past fiscal year.

Dan is very good about educating us. One of the deliverables of this would be to tell us what processes or procedures we either are missing that we should have, or what processes and procedures we have that should be improved. I think in the long run, it's going to put us in a better position. The question is, do we want to kind of pony up that money now, or pay later. And you know, we can see what the audit cost us this past year, it cost us 6100, because there was a lot of catching up between the changes in treasurers. If we invest 2500, we can reduce that 6100, that would only be 4000, we may breakeven or save some money.

Knight, when would this happen in January? Sokolowski, it should be prior to sitting down and finalizing the budget. Knight, I usually start working on the budget the end of December, Sokolowski, we will get the draft going, and they can look at that even if it isn't finalized. This wouldn't be like an audit, where they go away, and then we don't get the report for a month. He would give us results that day or the very next day.

Knight, is there something that we're worried about in our finances that we need to have this? Sokolowski, we don't know what to do with the ARPA funds. I talked to him in the past, we may, have missed the boat in the sense that we should have set up separate accounts. So now we kind of got our ARPA funds mixed in with other accounts. I think they're going to recommend for us to pull that stuff out, create one ARPA account and track that. We need the help to make sure that we're compliant with our requirements. We haven't done that as a township. And to be honest with you, I'm not 100% familiar with all the ARPA stuff, Dan is. But in just brief conversations with them, he said, we probably should have handled that a little bit better, to keep it separate. Olson, also, just to run a cleaner budget. I think we need to add more line items in our budget. To John Smelker's criticism, we have a miscellaneous in each category, because we don't have the extra category broken down.

Sokolowski, is this necessary? No. Will it put us in a better position at the beginning of our fiscal year? Yes. Otherwise, what will happen, we won't see an audit report until fall. This is a lag indicator for us when we won't see an audit report to September and we're well into the new fiscal year by September.

Olson, I would just like to ask us to support it. Doug came in at the middle of the year. And when we went through the audit, there is a gap from not having a treasurer for a while and that added to the expense, and Doug has never gotten to start with a clean budget and run it as the treasurer with the board. I think being new in government and new to this position, it would be a courtesy and additional education for him and why I to support this action of a pre-audit.

Sokolowski, I think the education could be for all board members. I think we'll all learn something from listening to Dan and what recommendations he makes for us. Knight could Dan come to a board meeting. Sokolowski, I will call and ask him to come before we vote, I can try this evening to be here on the 20th to explain more, and then we think about that, but I wouldn't know what his findings were.

Knight, is just for this year? Sokolowski, yes. He calls it a little bit different. I just call it a health check. He just comes in and tell us where we're at. He tells us what we need to improve. If we follow his advice, I don't think we'll ever have to do this again.

Olson, Carol used to stop in and see them when she was the clerk because her doctor office was right next door. She would pop in there a lot throughout the year and ask and ask questions. This is just another way of accomplishing the same thing that had been happening in the past when they were our auditors before it got switched and then switched back to them.

Knight, I make a motion to engage Siegfried Crandill PC for this health check and not to exceed \$2500. Seconded by Buehler. Roll call: Bass, Buehler, Knight, Sokolowski, Olson.

Sokolowski, I thank the Board. I will work to keep it to \$2500.

Knight, moving on to reports - assessor, fire reports attached. Average response time in the area is 11.8. Service anniversaries, Lyan Welker 17 years, Tobi DeGroot, 4 years. Thornapple total 132 calls, 14 minutes and 30 seconds, which they said is incorrect, because they were being manually entered at dispatch. So, he thought the times are higher than normal. Hastings total of 64 runs. They had an open house for Fire Prevention Week, October 9, which 175 people attended. Hastings had a total of three (3) runs in Irving Township. Cemetery update, no change or zero.

Sokolowski, I brought this up before, but I think as part of our budgeting processes that we also look at how the districting is. When you talk about an 11-minute response time, and I know 14-minute is a mistake, but even 11 minute is ... I know we have challenges with a volunteer fire department. I know we have challenges how communities are laid out with the distance between responses, but to me 11 minutes is a difference between life and death sometimes. I just wondered if we are district properly and if the right department is handling every call.

Knight, if we want to have the Chiefs come and discuss things with us. Sokolowski, I am asking what do you think? Don't you think 11 minutes is excessive? Knight, well yeah. I mean it is, but that's something that the board would have to decide if we want to redistrict. Sokolowski, I just think we should have the Chiefs come in and talk to us about these response times and just see if we got the right districting so that they can respond in an adequate time. I mean if you're on the receiving end and you're waiting 11 minutes for help. Knight, I will reach out to them and see if they can come to our December meeting. Sokolowski, thank you I appreciate that.

Treasurer Report, Sokolowski, just start with a plug for the E letter. If you haven't signed up on our website to receive it, there's copies back there. I think it's useful every month to get it. Do make sure you go onto our website and sign up to receive it.

Going to the Treasury report, I wanted to give a couple updates on activities working on and then we'll go into numbers. The board had approved last month, the electrical work in the township hall. That is now been scheduled for the week of December 5. It will take a couple of days. Hopefully by our meeting on December 20, I'll be able to report that that work has been completed.

As to the land swap, we finally got a closing date the 28th of November. We are waiting on final closing costs. As to the work to be done in the basement, the board had asked for quotes. To date we've had two contractors come in, and we're waiting for their quotes. We have two more contractors that are supposed to come in next week. We will have a total of four quotes for doing the work in the basement. Finally, the board asked for quotes on the IT work. In addition to the quote we received from Clark technical, I now have requested quotes from three other vendors. We have a total of four quotes from them. I made sure that they got the SEC same requirements, so we have an apples-to-apples comparison. We should have those quotes by the time of the December 20th meeting. Those are the updates on our activities.

Going into the actual numbers here, you can see our balances. There are two notes down at the bottom, we are taking \$200,000 out of the Huntington general checking account and put it into the money market. I've mentioned that before, and the transaction has been completed. It just wasn't completed before the end of October. In addition, we have opened a high interest fire account. According to the auditor, I can have an account as long as I keep my money separate. We're going from making .75% to .175%. So, there was enough money in the fire account right now to transfer \$150,000 to the high interest account, and that is done.

Knight, is that indicated on here as an account? Sokolowski, it will be. If you look in the investment savings, you'll see at the very bottom Union, it says zero right now because it didn't have anything. We will track that for you. As of today, our file is ready to be sent to KCI, which is the firm that prints our tax bills. We will be sending out 1538 bills for a total of \$3,300,000. They'll send that out and then obviously the clock starts ticking when they must have that payment in with February 14, being the last date. That's it for that part.

If you see where our receipts have come from, most were based on interest; however, Huntington, we did receive some revenue sharing of 64,000. On the second page of that report, reflects all the tax money that's come in, and we just did receive two last checks. Overall, we are at 99% receipt rate.

Knight, moving on to our bill pay list. Knight motion that we approve the bills in the amount of \$6,805.62. Bass seconded. Roll call, Knight, Bass, Sokolowski, Olson, Buehler. Motion passed.

Board Member Comments, Sokolowski, *hand out passed to each Board Member*, I did an analysis of our expenditures and legal expense over the year, as of September 30, we've incurred \$13,326, and then as of today, another \$5,000, bill. So that brings us up to \$18,000. That means legal expenses in the township is the fourth most expensive line item. Talking to the auditor, he believes that we should not be tracking this money in miscellaneous accounts. We need to establish an attorney fees account and go back to the beginning of the fiscal year and move the monies that have been charged to the miscellaneous accounts to the new account and establish a budget for that new account. Based on just projecting what we will be spending, the budget should be around \$24,000, if we continue in the path that we're currently on. Before I make a motion, I'd like to open it up for comments from other Board Members ...

Olson, these are for the land. Sokolowski, no, these are all our legal charges. If you look at the chart above, it tells you where we've kind of buried those legal charges. It's always in miscellaneous and 18% has been buried under township board, miscellaneous 73% has been buried under administrative miscellaneous, and then 9% under government grant other. We spend an average of \$1,772 a month on legal bills.

Buehler, how does that average compare to the previous three or four years?

Sokolowski, I don't know, I don't have that data. Buehler, can you get that data? Sokolowski, probably it's probably available to any of us. Buehler, we've had two land deals this year.

Sokolowski, I can pull the land deals. I believe the land deals roughly cost us about \$5,000

between the purchase of the cemetery and the purchase of Olson's. There is still a significant chunk left in miscellaneous charges. The big thing here is we are not compliant with the MTA standards. We should have an account 101-1266801. It should be given a budget. We should take the money that has been posted miscellaneous accounts and transfer those funds back there. If you look at account 101-299956, which is administrative miscellaneous fund, we are in 170% utilization of that fund. We are over budget and we need to correct this. Technically, right now, with the way the budget stands, we can't pay any more legal bills.

Bass, well, I think these numbers are so variable, I don't see that setting up a separate fund is going to be any advantage. You might be able to name a separate fund and move money into that fund as needed. But budgeting this way doesn't seem to be ... Sokolowski, a bare minimum, we would have to budget for what we've spent so far of 13,000 plus additional 5000. We're just going to say, \$18,741 so that we can track our legal expenses. We are a board. We can decide. I'm telling you that based on recommendations from the auditor, we should have an attorney fees budget, or at least a line item there just like we have an auditor line item.

Buehler, so we can just add that to our new budget in January that line item. Sokolowski, no he's recognized this is such a large expenditure this year and it is his recommendation we don't. It's the fourth largest expense of the township this year.

Buehler, so what are the steps to make this line? Sokolowski, first, we would have to create the line item. We have to vote on that. We would have to establish a budget for that line item whether we establish going forward or we just establish enough to cover what we spent to date, and that's up to the board. Then, Sharon would have to go through each of these accounts and do journal entries out of these accounts and put it into the 101-266801 account.

Sokolowski, I think we've gotten by in the past with not doing this because we haven't had such a large expenditure. I am speaking totally out of my head, I don't know, because I haven't done the analysis. But in the past years, I believe we didn't have this kind of expenditure, otherwise, the auditor would have made a comment.

Olson, we didn't call the attorneys for everything, we used other resources like MTA. We did more research before calling on attorney's with questions?

Sokolowski, I do know, if we don't fix this legally, we can't pay legal bills right now. We don't have the money in a budget line to do so. Olson, even with all the FOIA's that I have received, I have not incurred any attorney fees. I researched with other clerks and benefited from their attorney's responses to our FOIA without spending township money.

Sokolowski, if anyone doubts this situation, you're more than welcome to call Dan directly and talk with him about it. I've talked to him a couple times. And, you know, anytime we spend money from an account that doesn't have money, technically, we're not following the law.

Knight, I agree that we probably do need to have this in our budget. So, the first motion is to establish this.

Sokolowski, I wrote the motion down. I can read it, if you like, motion to establish an attorney fee, budget line and fund from April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2023. Then journal out of township board, miscellaneous \$2,386, our administrative miscellaneous \$9,676.45, our government grants other \$1,264 and put that into attorney fees budget line. The new budget line should be funded at 23,962 and that assumes that we continue spending the way we are an average of \$1,772. But to Dean's point, we don't have to do that. We can underfund a little bit. But the bare minimum, we need to find that line for \$18,741.95.

Knight, where did you come up with that number? Sokolowski, that is the current \$13,326.45 and the bill we just got today for \$5,415.50.

Bass, I don't know how you can accurately budget here on this. Knight, he just estimated the remaining six months. Sokolowski, the things with Asterix, which I took as being more standard than the outlay or the 3200, or the outlay of the 5000. I took those and I add them together divided by five, which gave us kind of the average. We've ranged anywhere between about 1800. It is \$1770 which is right in the middle. Now this assumes consistent use at the current level, right? If by chance we cut that down, then we've over budgeted, but that's okay. It's when under budget, it's a problem because we technically can't pay the bill until we have the budget to do it.

Bass, I understand you're trying to clarify the money spent for attorney's fees? Is that your goal? Sokolowski, two things, we do need to call that out, but the second thing, and the primary thing is, we need to have a budget line to continue to pay the attorney. We cannot pay this \$5,415 bill without it.

Bass, why can't we move money into the attorney's fee fund? You can't budget an amount of money that's just going to sit there and be tied up.

Sokolowski, we can do that. We can budget right now for the 18,741.95, and then every month, if we need more money that's fine. That sounds like a better deal to me, rather than budgeting a certain amount that, like I say, if that's what's budgeted, it's earmarked for that. And we can't move away.

Sokolowski, all we do, when we get the bill pay every month, we just look at what the bill pay is for that line item and make a motion to add into attorney fee before we vote on the bill pay. So right now, we just need to establish a budget at \$18,741.95 at \$18,741.95.

Knight, we have a motion on the floor. The motion that Doug read with the new budget funded at \$18,741.95. Knight second. Row call, "Yes" Olson, Sokolowski, Knight, Bass, Buehler. "No" none. Motion passed.

Knight, talking about attorney fees ... I have been, and after our meeting with Dave recommended that we have a rules of procedures guideline for the board. He has them almost completed. I know there's some question about having him do that versus MTA. He offered to do it. I thought it would be a good idea to have a legal person do. They're ready to go. If you want me to tell him not to do them ...

Sokolowski, just so everyone knows, we all have access to the MTA legal counsel, Katherine I've been working with her free of charge, because we pay a yearly fee for that. Right? When it comes to the MTA stuff, or this kind of procedural stuff, they may, we might want to think about making them our first stop.

Knight, they do not always offer legal advice. Sokolowski, they would be generic in their legal response, right.

Knight, another thing we need to think about is we need to maybe have a point of contact with the attorney, that not everybody can email the attorney five times a day and get a response, because that's, you know, \$90 an hour. So that's something else that we should think about was having a point of contact. If you have a question that you need to have the attorney then one person asks the question, rather than several people. There was something today that was sent to the attorney that I could have answered without involving the attorney. Sokolowski, yeah, that was me. Okay.

Knight, I mean, that's something that we need to consider something I don't know, if you want to talk about now or bring it up next month.

Sokolowski, I think it'd be good to see the procedures ... what they're recommending, and that will give us a road map that we can edit. If we can get it prior to the 20th, we have time to digest it.

Olson, what we have tried to do is clarify what are we getting billed for. Sokolowski, effective October 19, forward for most line items, they did put the board member on there, and that we didn't request that of them until October 18. I think they're trying to be compliant as best as they can.

Knight, so I will say let Dave know to move forward with that since he has most of the work done.

Olson, so when we get another bill, then we're going to just increase this cost center is that what you were saying? Knight, yep. Sokolowski, we have enough in there right now to pay the current bill that we just received today with 18,000. But then going forward any new bills, ... Olson, and then making these corrections, that cost center will correct the rest of account ledger to current? Sokolowski, yeah, because you're over on several of those cost centers. So by putting that money back in those cost centers, we don't have to address anymore, because it'll be back on budget that we just did by approving this motion. We've

approved moving that money, money out of those accounts, and that will set those accounts straight. Knight, that will pay that bill? Sokolowski, yeah, that \$18,000 will pay that bill. We will need to approve it on the bill pay list.

Knight, more board member comments

Sokolowski, I wanted to ask a question. And we kind of exchanged emails about it. I want to ask a question about the board of review. Present members terms expire on December 31st, new board sworn in after the first of the year.

I was wondering if we wanted to think about opening to the public. People who may be interested in serving on the board to see if we have other people that want to serve the community. The way the timeline works, we could make that selection on December 20, meeting still in time for the new year. We could then swear them in after the first year because you can't have two boards sworn in at the same time. We would swear that new board in the first year. We could do it at the January meeting here. There's training that they must take and the MTA knows that. MTA is offering training in February, so that the new board members could be trained before the March meetings. Maybe we won't get no volunteers, we might be only having these three people there it is serving, but because we have limited opportunities to the board to involve our community, I think that we should really consider when we have these opportunities to make a call for other people.

Now there's a question in my mind about how we maintain consistency in the Board of Review, and I think what we do is take the current three members and randomly select one of them to continue. But if we had others, we would put those two remaining board members and other names in a hat and draw two additional board members. In addition to that, I think that we should also have the capability by law to have at least one alternative or two. I think we should at least appoint one alternate in the event one of the board members can't make it. We can always have three board members.

Knight, I have a lot to say about that. First, the board of review kind of falls under the terms of supervisor's jurisdiction. I have had the same three board of review members for several years. All three of them do a fantastic job. All three of them get their training that they need to get. I have no problems putting advertising out there, but I don't think it's needed. We could appoint, an alternate, but I feel that these three members do a fantastic job, and it would not be right just to pull one of their names out of the hat when all three of them do a great job. That would not sit well. I bet all three of them would say I don't want to be a part of that. It's either us or none. So that's my thought. Like I said they do a fantastic job. I have no problems with them. I think we just need to leave it as is. I am open to other people's thoughts.

Sokolowski, no one is questioning the job they're doing. It's more about the involvement of the other community members. This is a two-year term. It's a paying job. To consistently appoint the same people without giving an opportunity to others, does not seem fair. And, then, as to the role of the supervisor, it's actually the township board that has to vote for each of these

members. The Supervisor's role on the Board of Review is to serve as a secretary for the board review. There is no unique power the Supervisor has over the board review.

Knight, I will make a point of discussion. Bass, I will support the procedure that we've been using. It's worked well for us and I think that people do a good job.

Olson, I don't think that I hear anybody criticizing the work of the board review. What I heard Mr. Sokolowski say was that it's an opportunity to have more members of our community be involved in local government. I guess without asking the current board of review members if they want to continue or not, I mean, do we even know? Knight, I will ask them. Olson, at very least and to his point, you could get at least an alternate. Sokolowski and that would involve one more citizen. We can have up to two, but I don't think we should do that. I think one is fine.

Sokolowski, so then the process will be to bring those three to the board on December 20 to be voted on and then swear in after the first of the year.

Knight, I can swear them in on that day. I can ask for appointment after first of year. Sokolowski, that doesn't create a problem with having, technically, two boards at one time because their term does not expire to December 31.

Knight, I asked Jeff and he said, yes, we could do it in December. Does somebody want to go and look for an alternate? Sokolowski, I mean you guys are more familiar with community. It seems like we get people, not today, but we have had people here in the past two meetings that have expressed interest in participating in local government. Other than running for our jobs, there are no other opportunity we really have other than the board of review. I guess we have fair board too, but that's a little bit different animal. So the only opportunity we have to involve people that want to get involved is allowing them opportunity to serve on that board. And I don't think we should change the whole board at once, that we should at least keep one. I don't even know if we would get anyone interested. Right? If you look at the responsibilities for board of review, it's a heavy commitment, especially in March from a time perspective. It's not a high paying job and it takes a lot of time. It's just more from my standpoint, just like the newsletter and stuff ... actions from us to involve our community. That's really what I'm trying to drive for.

Knight, anyone offer finding an alternate, but I'm not watching all three members. Well, then why don't we make it I'll ask all three if they're willing to make you go. Go ahead.

Public comment, Mike Bremer, Supervisor Knight, I know how important is to, to have a reliable board review. And it's so key. If you've got a set of people who are working already, and to the clerk's notion, she'll remember Jeanette, she doesn't hear any complaints about it. If they're trained, it's like pulling teeth to find someone to be on the board of review. It's a tough job to sit and listen to your friends and neighbors say you're screwing me over and walk him through that process. Sometimes we are and sometimes there's been a mistake, but a seasoned board review can find those errors and help those people. Or, if there isn't an error, it can walk them

through the process and show them why. I think we used the alternate in Thornapple Township maybe twice in the eight years that I was supervisor. We had a couple of board of review days where we only had two board members, one ill couldn't make it and the alternative couldn't get in. And so, if you can legally do your board review with just two, three is way better. I would be happy to be considered an alternative. If you want to have an offer, I offer my services for that.

Knight, we appreciate that.

Sokolowski, so then, I think based on your feedback, Jamie, you don't want to make a change to the current composition of the board, and we will swear them in on the 20th. Is that right?

Knight, yeah, I will confirm with them that they are willing to do a two year commitment and remind of the training every two years in February. Sokolowski, and then we'll add an alternate. Knight, yep.

Bass, I forgot what I was going to say. All right. I don't like this new agenda. I like the old agenda. I think we should keep the fire reports and stuff near the top so these people, if they show up and want to make comments, they can do so and leave the meeting early, without setting too long. Also, I like the second three-minute public input, it gives people an opportunity to sit here and think about things and to see what's happening make comments after we've conducted some our business. I would like to go back to our original agenda. I don't know what prompted this. This seems backwards to me.

Knight, when our attorney was here, he gave me a recommended agenda to follow. Bass, did he you give any reason for that? Knight, no, just based on his recommendation the order. I mean, I'm happy to move the reports back up to the top and add a second public input that is not a problem. Sokolowski, I think what Dave saw was in part of an anomaly. We don't normally get that kind of turnout and that many comments to chew up our time like it did.

Knight, one thing I forgot to put on our upcoming dates Birch Fire Board meeting is on December 1, at 6:30 pm, at Hastings Charter Township. One thing that is going to be up for discussion is our agreement with them. I have printed out a copy of the agreement for everybody. If there's any changes that you would like to be made to it, feel free to come to the Birch meeting. Take time to review it.

Sokolowski, this is a five year contract. Knight, yes. Sokolowski, do we have to do five years? Knight, I don't I don't think so. I mean, I think anything in this can be changed. Sokolowski, Does that mean right now we don't have an active contract with them? Knight from the looks of it, that's what like I said, I just got this from Jim from October 27.

Olson, I wanted to reiterate a conversation we had before the meeting, for the record, that Doug worked as a pole inspector for us and was able to be stationed at the exit and he kept track of how long people were in line. The longest that he heard was 40 minutes. First thing in

the morning, Mike said his family's wait was 10 minutes. So the changes that we've made with adding more workers doing more training having a little more experience, the new voting booths did streamline things. We didn't have people sitting down, stand up and shuffle around chairs. We had the right amount of handicap accessible booths. The tabulator was the slowest part of the process. We do not have any control over. Some people had trouble reading the ballot to vote for just one and marked two. Most of our issues there were over voted. Then, they would want a new ballot, whereby we had to spoil the ballot and issue a new one.

Knight, did we have enough ballots? Olson, I made sure I had enough ballots. That is like my worst nightmare is to run on the ballot. So that doesn't happen, you know, I think that you could make an argument legally, that you should have a ballot for every voter that you have registered, whether they choose to come and vote or not. I tried to run not 100%. I can usually tell from statistics where they run. I want a good buffer for spoiled ballots, duplicates.

Sokolowski, I will tell you from where I was standing, you get to interact with a lot of people. Everyone was so positive about how the flow was this year because we basically came in that door checked in the bony booths right there. They were complimenting.

Knight, December 1, at 6:30 Birch Fire Meeting. December 14, at 6:00 pm Board of Review, Township Board Meeting, December 20, at 6:30 pm.

Knight, I will make a motion to adjourn this meeting. Buehler seconded. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully transcribed for Clerk, Sharon Olson

By, Lorraine Bush, Deputy Clerk

December 30, 2022