

**PROCEEDINGS
OF
CITY COUNCIL
OF THE
CITY OF LOWELL**

For the Regular Meeting of Monday, **JUNE 4, 2007**.

The Meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Myers and City Clerk Betty Morlock called Roll.

Present: Councilmembers Hodges, Pfaller, Shores, Mayor Pro Tem Mathews and Mayor Myers

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Manager David Pasquale, City Clerk Betty Morlock, City Treasurer Suzanne Olin, DPW Director Dan DesJarden, Police Chief Jim Valentine, Planning Commission Chair Maryalene LaPonsie and Lowell Light and Power/Cable TV Boardmember Perry Beachum.

IT WAS MOVED BY PFALLER and seconded by SHORES to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2007 regular meeting as submitted.

YEA: 5. NAY: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY SHORES and seconded by HODGES that the bills and accounts payable be allowed and the warrants issued.

YEA: Councilmembers Hodges, Shores, Pfaller, Mayor Pro Tem Mathews and Mayor Myers.

NAY: None. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

| <u>BILLS AND ACCOUNTS PAYABLE (06/04/07)</u> | |
|--|--------------|
| GENERAL FUND | \$106,246.74 |
| MAJOR STREET FUND | 238.76 |
| LOCAL STREET FUND | 235.83 |
| DDA FUND | 18,974.93 |
| CITY HALL CONSTRUCTION FUND | 250.00 |
| BUILDING & SITE FUND | 174,142.50 |
| AIRPORT FUND | 64.99 |
| WASTEWATER FUND | 29,447.83 |
| WATER FUND | 23,172.20 |
| DATA PROCESSING FUND | 930.07 |
| EQUIPMENT FUND | 3,802.67 |
| LOOK FUND | 31,500.00 |

Mayor Myers questioned the expenditure of \$2,035.20 to Berger Chevrolet. DPW Director DesJarden responded the amount related to a transmission on a fire truck. He noted a local company quoted a price of \$1,000 more.

Myers also inquired regarding a payment of \$10,036.00 to the Michigan Municipal League. City Treasurer Suzanne Olin explained this was payment to the Workers Compensation Fund.

Item #1. **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

A. 221 Amity (southeast corner of Elm and Amity) – John Sterly – construction of a duplex – variance for lot width – public hearing. John Sterly wished to build a duplex on property he owns at the southeast corner of Elm and Amity. Currently, there is an existing duplex on the property. In order for this second building to be constructed, the lot requirement must be met for both existing and proposed structures.

These are the conditions:

- Zoning – R-2 required 8200 square feet of lot area, 100 feet of lot width
15 feet total side yards (6 feet minimum)
25 feet rear yard
30 feet front yard
- Since this is a corner lot under Section 2.13, the principal front lot line shall be the shorter of the two lot lines. The other is the secondary front lot setback requiring one half the setback (15 feet).

A variance would be needed on the following:

- the lot width of 100 feet is required for the proposed and existing lots (currently, both would be 66 feet each).

Though a front yard setback variance was originally requested, it was determined this would not be needed since there is sufficient room to accommodate the required setback.

At its April 23, 2007 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended against the variance on a vote of 5 to 4 based on the established criteria to be met.

Jeff Altoft of 611 W. Main questioned the parking. Zoning Chairman Pfaller stated the plan indicates a two stall garage as well as an off street driveway. Altoft explained he was concerned because of the parking issues with condominiums near Tractor Supply. Many park on the sidewalks. Sterly indicated his plans provide for ample parking. There will be no parking on the street.

Zoning Boardmember Hodges did not believe the property was large enough to build on it. Sterly was confused with this being a corner lot and the definitions. However, he believed the property could be configured in a way in which each parcel could provide for 100 feet.

Sterly proceeded to explain how he believed the project could work. Pfaller was concerned with the setback requirements. Sterly noted there are several others homes in the area

which do not meet the setback requirements as well. He believed the duplexes would fit nicely with the neighborhood.

Zoning Boardmember Myers asked if any boardmembers made a site visit. Hodges and Pfaller responded yes. Myers stated he did as well. It is unfortunate that the existing building on the property was placed to one side of the entire lot. He suspected it was originally done to build on the remaining empty lot. The lot appears as if it is a nicely mowed empty City lot. The foot print of the proposed building is 50 X 34 feet, excluding the garage. Sterly noted the foundation is 32 X 48 feet.

Myers questioned the monthly rent he would charge for the duplexes. Sterly responded \$800 for each.

Myers commented on the additional tax revenue for the City. It is worth more with a structure rather than a vacant lot. Also, the neighborhood is close enough to the business district in which there could be an exception made regarding the lot width. Sterly added, directly across the street is the old Newell Manufacturing building and the old school to the north. He did not believe the area would be appropriate for a single family home. Myers believed the duplexes would serve a good purpose for the neighborhood and provide good rental options.

Zoning Boardmember Mathews questioned the thoughts of the Planning Commission. Planning Chair LaPonsie explained the original discussion involved two variances. The first involved setbacks and the other lot width. The Commission believed the setback variance was not needed because of the average setback of the other homes in the area. LaPonsie noted the ordinance allows for a lower setback if other homes in the area have it as well. The lot width was a difficult decision for the Commission. The members who voted for it believed it was in the right zoning district for a duplex and it appears to be vacant property. The members who were against it had issues with the variance criteria which must be met. Also, the Commission had recently considered changing the lot width requirements in R2 and R3 multiple family homes from 100 feet to 66 feet. However, the majority of the Commissioners felt the width should remain at 100 feet.

Zoning Boardmember Shores stated it is much easier to plan a City if there is a wide open space. However, this is not the case. Part of the lot was developed many years ago when there were no ordinances. As long as the duplexes fit in with the surrounding area and there is ample parking, Shores would support the project.

Zoning Board Chairman Pfaller noted the board denied a similar request from an individual on South Hudson Street within the last six months. He believed the duplex would be close to the corner as well as the building being too large for the lot.

Hodges stated he would be more encouraged if it was a single family home. However, with it being a duplex and not meeting the criteria he would not be in favor of granting the variance.

IT WAS MOVED BY HODGES and seconded by PFALLER to deny the lot width variance request for a duplex at 221 Amity.

YEA: 2. (Zoning Boardmember Hodges and Chair Pfaller)

NAY: 3. (Zoning Boardmember Mathews, Myers and Shores)

ABSENT: 0. MOTION DENIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY MYERS and seconded by MATHEWS to support both lot width variance request for the existing and proposed duplexes at 221 Amity allowing 66 feet each.

YEA: 3. (Zoning Boardmember Mathews, Myers and Shores)

NAY: 2. (Zoning Boardmember Hodges and Chair Pfaller)

ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

- B. 204 S. Washington (southwest corner of Kent and South Washington) – Cherry Wheat – construction of a housing addition in an Industrial District – public hearing. Cherry Wheat proposed to have a 22' x 24' addition built on to her house located at the southwest corner of Kent and South Washington. The property is zoned Industrial and the house is a nonconforming use. Under Section 4.13 D, "no nonconforming use of any land or structure shall hereafter be moved, enlarged or extended".

Therefore, a variance requested has been petitioned. At its May 29, 2007 meeting, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the variance subject to the addition meeting all R-3 setback requirements (the closest residential district to the subject property).

Wheat stated she wishes to build an addition for her mother to live in.

Zoning Boardmember Shores stated the area was almost all residential at one time. She did not believe the addition would be detrimental to the neighborhood and would be in favor of granting the variance. Zoning Boardmember Mathews agreed as well.

Zoning Boardmember Myers asked if she planned on making the addition a self sufficient unit. Wheat responded no, the addition would include a bedroom, bath and sitting area.

Zoning Boardmember Hodges confirmed the setback requirements were met. City Manager Pasquale responded yes. Hodges noted he would be in favor of granting the variance.

IT WAS MOVED BY SHORES and seconded by HODGES to grant the variance request at 204 S. Washington for a residential addition in an Industrial District as long as R3 zoning requirements are met.

YEA: 5. NAY: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

Item #2. **PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING THE KEEPING OF FOWL, RABBITS AND SIMILAR ANIMALS – RECOMMENDATION FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION – PUBLIC HEARING**. As previously discussed, the Planning Commission has reviewed changes in the ordinance regulating the keeping of fowl, rabbits and similar animals. Specifically, the proposed ordinance would allow the following:

- allowing the keeping of these animals outside or an outside enclosure in any residential district if the lot is at least an acre in size
- by special use permit if lot is less than one acre, but at least one-half acre
- two such animals are permitted for each one-half acre
- roosters may not be kept inside or outside in any residential zone district
- any outside structure housing such animals shall not be less than 50 feet from all adjoining lot lines
- setback requirements do not apply if these animals are housed inside.

The Planning Commission, after conducting a public hearing at its April 23, 2007 meeting, recommended the ordinance amendment on a vote of 6 to 3.

Planning Chair LaPonsie mentioned the ordinance would be much more permissive than surrounding townships. Lowell Township does not allow chickens in residential zoned areas. While Vergennes Township allows one chicken per two acres in a residential area. Planning Commission members who did not support the amendment believed chickens should not be allowed in the City, while the remaining members wanted to find a middle ground where individuals could keep these animals on larger lots. It was also noted such animals may be kept inside the home as long as good health standards are met. The Commission did not want to get into policing what goes on inside an individual's home.

Councilmember Hodges noted he has attended many Planning Commission meetings and believed almost every possibility was covered and discussed. The Planning Commission did a great job reviewing the issue. Councilmember Pfaller agreed with Hodges. Councilmember Mathews stated he would also be in favor of the ordinance.

Councilmember Shores stated she did not approve of the ordinance. However, she would support it. The Planning Commission spent a great amount of time on the issue.

Mayor Myers inquired if the ordinance would be policed by complaint. City Manager Pasquale responded yes. Myers confirmed the ordinance was prepared by City Attorney Richard Wendt. Pasquale responded yes.

Myers questioned the statement in the ordinance which refers to one acre lot size while the next sentence refers to a special use permit being granted for a half acre. LaPonsie explained the Commission believed every situation is different. This would provide more control.

IT WAS MOVED BY PFALLER and seconded by MATHEWS to approve the ordinance amending the keeping of fowl, rabbits and similar animals as proposed.

YEA: 5. (Councilmember Hodges, Pfaller, Shores, Mayor Pro Tem Mathews and Mayor Myers)

NAY: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

Item #3. **SIDEWALK BIDS**. On May 23, 2007, bids were received for the construction of sidewalks for South Pleasant, South Center and South West Streets between West Main and Bowes. At its January 16, 2007 meeting, the Council approved \$50,000 in Federal Community Development Block Grant funds for the project. The Downtown Development Authority allocated funds to complete sidewalks in this area within the district at its December 7, 2006 meeting.

As noted in the attached letter of May 29, 2007, Dave Austin of Williams & Works reviewed the seven bids received. The low bid from Cascade Cement of \$49,044 is recommended for approval.

In addition, DPW Director Dan DesJarden and City Manager Pasquale recommend the inclusion of new and repaired walks on Lincoln Lake north of Foreman to complete this area for a cost of \$6,252.52.

Mayor Myers questioned the amount for the additional work. DesJarden explained the unit prices were used from the bid. Cascade Cement would do this work as well. Myers inquired regarding the reputation of Cascade Cement. DesJarden responded the company has done many projects for the City.

Councilmember Pfaller questioned 1043 Lincoln Lake. It appears there is a tree in middle of the path of the sidewalk. Will the sidewalk travel around the tree? DesJarden responded this is negotiable with the property owner. Typically, if it is removed, the policy is to replace it. The sidewalk fund would place \$250 into the tree fund. If the tree is small enough, it may be able to be transplanted back into the private property.

Myers asked involving another section of sidewalk which shows it jogging around a utility pole. DesJarden responded this was done based upon a contractor's decision.

IT WAS MOVED BY PFALLER and seconded by SHORES to approve the low bid from Cascade Cement in the amount of \$49,044 for sidewalk construction on S. Pleasant, S. Center and S. West Streets allocated from the Federal Community Development Block Grant and Downtown Development Authority as well as the addition of sidewalk on Lincoln Lake at a cost of \$6,252.52 from the CDBG.

YEA: 5. NAY: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

Item #4. **LIGHT AND POWER – POWER LINE CLEARANCE POLICY – REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE**. The Arbor committee had the opportunity to review the

proposed power line clearance policy prepared by L&P General Manager Tom Richards. The committee was in general agreement, but Jim Reagan wanted to ensure that a property owner had the options to keep a trimmed tree.

Included in the packet is a report from Julie Stachecki, certified arborist, regarding the 12 trees required to be pruned to meet Light and Power safety standards. It was her opinion that the trees be totally removed.

Richards stated the Arbor Committee has been working on a wide range and comprehensive tree policy for the City. He did not believe the committee was close to proposing a board policy which would address all the aspects of trees and tree management in the City.

Richards explained the utility has its own specific responsibilities. Therefore, a power line clearance policy was proposed which outlines in detail, how the utility carries out its duties to correct electrical hazards caused by the growth of trees into the power lines. It was the consensus of the Arbor Committee to support the proposed policy.

Arbor Committee member Jim Reagan concurred with Richards. His main goal has been to have a tree planting policy.

Councilmember Pfaller questioned if the committee intended to write the policy showing 10 feet from either side of the line which goes to infinity. Reagan was unsure. An independent arborist reviewed the 12 trees and agreed some should be cut down. However, her opinion noted to much trimming done to a tree would ultimately cause death.

Pfaller questioned a paragraph in the policy which states "when a tree is removed from the right of way, the utility will provide a contribution of \$250 to be matched with an equal contribution by the City". Pfaller believed the policy should read the tree shall be replaced from the budget of the department who believes it should be removed. Pasquale explained the committee discussed this issue because it was unclear. The City's contribution needs to be clarified. DesJarden stated he also questioned the same paragraph. He went through the minutes from previous meetings and read nothing in which the Council approved this. Richards stated the policy which was adopted by the Light and Power Board, was specifically that language and was provided during the January 25, 2007 meeting prior to the informational neighborhood meeting. Richards explained he was unsure of what the City Council approved. The proposal made by the Light and Power Board had this specific language in it regarding shared contribution. If the electric utility removed a tree, it would make a \$250 contribution if this was matched by the City. Therefore, there would be a contribution from both sides to replacement of trees in the City.

Pfaller believed the \$250 contribution to the tree fund should come from a department and not be matched. DesJarden felt it would be budget nightmare if the contribution were to be matched. Richards noted, under the policy, the removal of a tree is only done with the approval of the DPW Director or the City Manager.

Myers questioned why this wasn't presented to the Lowell Light and Power Board first before coming to City Council. Richards explained the Board has had the opportunity to comment, but

has not voted. However, each has indicated their support. Lowell Light and Power Boardmember Perry Beachum stated previous Chair Dave Austin had presented this with the intent of a matching \$250 from Lowell Light and Power and the City Council. His feeling was showing some unification of the Council and the Board. There has been communication from Richards regarding the policy. Beachum noted there may be a few minor changes to the policy. However, the majority of it is correct.

Hodges suggested tabling the issue until it is formally presented from the Lowell Light and Power Board.

Shores noted a worksession will be held with the Council and the Lowell Light and Power Board for June 14, 2007. Should this be discussed during the worksession? Myers wanted the Lowell Light and Power Board to review the policy first. Pfaller suggested the Light and Power Board also review the issue in the policy regarding the removal of stumps only in the City right of way and not on private property. Richards responded the utility already has a policy in regard to private property trees and reimbursement for stump removal. He did not believe this was necessary because this is a specific policy to describe City trees and trees within the right of way. Pfaller commented this is a power line clearance policy and if a tree has to be removed whether it is on City or private property, he believed the stump removal should be included.

By general consensus, the Council tabled the issue until the June 18, 2007 meeting.

Item #5. **RESOLUTION TO CONSIDER NEW WATER AND SANITARY SEWER RATES.** As provided previously in the operating budget proposal, the water and sanitary sewer rates have been changed to reflect current operating costs.

While the water consumption rate of \$1.43 per thousand gallons per month remains the same, the readiness to serve rate increases from \$21.99 to \$23.12 per month for residential usage.

For sewer, the residential user rate increases from \$2.91 to \$3.26 per thousand gallons a month. The readiness to serve charge rises from \$16.50 to \$19.91 per residence.

All these rates have been provided through the engineering firm of Tetra Tech after review with City staff.

A resolution was provided to show information on the larger sizes of meters.

Councilmember Pfaller referred to Exhibit A – A1 which shows the commodity charge going from \$1.43 to \$1.50. City Treasurer Suzanne Olin responded it was decided to keep the consumption rate the same at a \$1.43. City Manager Pasquale explained the engineer revised the rates downward in order to keep the rates level for water consumption. Pfaller questioned the same for the sewer which states it is suggested to be raised from \$2.91 to \$3.26 yet on the study it is noted as \$3.02. Pasquale explained this study was completely done last year. Since, these rates have been changed to reflect current costs.

Mayor Myers asked if it was necessary to raise rates to this level. Olin responded this would be approximately a \$61,000 increase for the sewer fund and \$21,000 increase for the water fund. Water Treatment Plant Superintendent George Regan has indicated what capital projects need to be completed on the Water Treatment Plant and Earth Tech for the Wastewater Treatment Plant. This provides for the revenue in which Regan and Earth Tech believe is needed in order to support these projects. Myers was concerned with raising rates at this time.

Councilmember Shores believed all were concerned about the economic times. However, she did not believe this was a large increase. These improvements have to be made on the plants at some point and it is probably a good idea to do it at this time.

IT WAS MOVED BY SHORES and seconded by HODGES to approve the resolution regarding new water and sanitary sewer rates as presented.

YEA: 4. (Councilmember Hodges, Pfaller, Shores and Mayor Pro Tem Mathews)

NAY: 1. (Mayor Myers) ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

Item #6. **LIABILITY INSURANCE PROPOSALS.** Over these past months, City and Light and Power staff solicited proposals for Liability and Property Insurance. Since 1987, the City has utilized the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool. The following proposals were given:

| <u>Agent, Broker</u> | <u>Company</u> | <u>Overall Quote</u> |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Berends, Hendricks, Stuit | Michigan Township Participating Plan | \$ 90,531 |
| Pinnacle Ins. Partners | St. Paul Travelers | \$ 88,212 |
| Michigan Municipal League Liability & Property Pool | Meadowbrook Ins. Group | \$123,199 |

While both Berends and Pinnacle would provide five million dollar coverage, L&P General Manager Tom Richards and I recommend Berends for the following reasons:

- Berends provided a list of municipalities which utilize their products. The City of Grand Haven is quite pleased with their performance. No references were submitted with the Pinnacle proposals. When requested, no cities were listed.
- Berends price includes a new appraisal
- Berends has favorable deductibles
- Coverage for land use takings (a current liability issue)

Currently, the City with Light and Power spend over \$139,000 on liability insurance. Overall, this will save approximately \$50,000.

Councilmember Shores agreed with the recommendation.

Mayor Myers wanted to review the cost. He wanted to be able to have the full amount of information. He questioned the idea of providing an appraisal of the property. Would Berends provide these themselves?

Senior Account Executive with Berends, Hendricks, Stuit Judith Meljan, explained the property appraisals would be hired out to professional property appraisal firms that specialize in public entities. She noted their proposal includes an amount of \$2,000 for the appraisal. There is some concern that some of the buildings are slightly under value.

IT WAS MOVED BY HODGES and seconded by MATHEWS to approve the proposal from Berends, Hendricks, Stuit in the amount of \$90,531 for City liability and property insurance.

YEA: 5. NAY: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

Item #7. **CONSIDERATION 2007 – 2008 BUDGET PRESENTATION AND PUBLIC HEARING.**
The Council will consider the new budget in addition to setting a millage rate.

The following actions are needed for consideration after holding a public hearing.

- Adoption of the budget. With the new liability insurance provider, a total of \$38,444 will be saved to the General Fund. Also, an added \$2000 in passport revenues is anticipated. Thus, the planned fund balance is raised to \$105,477.37 (4.3% of total expenditures).

In reviewing past projected fund balances, the following were:

| | |
|-----------|-------------|
| 2006-2007 | \$60,012.25 |
| 2005-2006 | \$43,582.33 |
| 2004-2005 | \$50,274.91 |

As a goal, the City will attain a 10% fund balance within two years (in excess of \$200,000).

Purchases of a cemetery truck and a Water Department Truck are included within the budget.

- Set Millage Rate – retaining the same 15.83 mills as last year's for operations. Also, 0.25 mills in addition is included for the Lowell Area Historical Museum voted in an election held November, 2002.

Councilmember Pfaller was pleased to see the fund balance over \$100,000. He encouraged City Manager Pasquale and Lowell Light and Power/Cable TV General Manager Tom Richards to continue to work together towards the sharing of services between the City and Lowell Light and Power as well as reviewing the idea of outsourcing some of the accounting services whether it be payroll, workers compensation or insurance administration. This may help save further funds.

Councilmember Shores stated there has been a great amount of work done on the budget. She thanked City Treasurer Suzanne Olin, City Manager Pasquale and the entire staff.

Councilmember Mathews indicated his vote of "No" on the budget one year ago. He questioned why there was not a budgeted amount going into the Equipment Fund. Pasquale explained the Equipment Fund is an internal fund which depends on the other budgets. Whereas, the utility funds involve the outside users to provide funds. Pasquale believed the change in liability insurance would assist the Equipment Fund. This is a major factor and there should be a greater balance. Mathews was still concerned.

IT WAS MOVED BY PFALLER and seconded by HODGES to adopt the 2007 – 2008 budget as presented

YEA: 4. (Councilmember Hodges, Pfaller, Shores and Mayor Myers)

NAY: 1. (Mayor Pro Tem Mathews) ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY PFALLER and seconded by HODGES to set the millage rates for 2007 - 2008 at 15.83 mills plus 0.25 mills for the Lowell Area Historical Museum.

YEA: 5. (Councilmember Hodges, Pfaller, Shores, Mayor Pro Tem Mathews and Mayor Myers)

NAY: None. ABSENT: None. MOTION CARRIED.

Item #8. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**. No comments were received.

Item #9. **COUNCIL COMMENTS**. Councilmember Pfaller noted West Michigan Trails Association was approached by a company who owns the railway between Greenville and Lowell and Lowell and Ionia County totaling approximately 40 miles. This company is offering a sale of the land to West Michigan Trails Association. The first point of business would be to have the area appraised. Belding has committed \$2,000 toward the appraisal of which is estimated to cost \$17,000. Grattan Township has offered \$1,000, Frey Foundation has offered over \$4,500 as matching funds, Vergennes and Lowell Townships and the City of Lowell are also seeking a grant from the Lowell Area Community Fund. Money has also been verbally committed from Kent and Ionia Counties.

Pfaller also went on to state a long grass letter needs to be sent to the lot owner regarding the property at the corner of Amity and W. Main Street.

Pfaller noted he has had several discussions this past week with citizens in regard to the sale of Lowell Cable TV. After some further information was provided in these discussions and receiving a couple phone calls supporting the sale, he believed the City made the proper decision. Pfaller suggested a worksession be established once the funds are received regarding the handling of

these funds.

Mayor Myers acknowledged Ivan Blough has had discussions with each of the Councilmembers with regard to the sale and proceeds of Lowell Cable. He would expect a worksession to be in order and consider the comments presented by Blough. He also wanted to ensure the worksession is open to the public for input.

Myers noted the downtown clock along Main Street is working once again and acknowledged the Farmers Market will be opening soon.

Myers commented on the amount of sand and dirt coming through his garage as a result of the Highland Hill project. He understood there is an emergency declared on the project and work will begin soon to repair the wall. City Manager Pasquale stated he spoke with contractor Steve Shaler this afternoon and work will begin immediately.

Myers stated he received the 2006 Official Proceedings of the Board of Commissioners. The information will be available at City Hall for those who wish to review.

Myers reminded the Council of City Manager Pasquale's review. Information will be provided at the next meeting.

Item #10. **MANAGER'S REPORT.** City Manager Pasquale reported on the following:

1. The following boards and commissions meetings minutes are provided for your information:
 - Parks and Recreation Commission meeting of April 21, 2007
 - Planning Commission meeting of April 23, 2007
2. Please note that a City Council – Light and Power Board worksession is scheduled to be held on Thursday, June 14 at 7 p.m.
3. A meeting was held on Thursday, May 31 attended by various representatives from the Lowell, Ionia and Greenville areas to consider and discuss the possible purchase of railroad right of way (Rail America) for trail usage. There was general interest expressed. The first step in the process is an appraisal paid by the localities. An application to the Lowell Area Community Fund is being pursued for the Lowell area cost.

Item #11. **APPOINTMENTS.** Mayor Myers stated there has been indication from some Planning Commission members who would look to resign. Hopefully recommendations can be made at the next meeting.

IT WAS MOVED BY MATHEWS to adjourn at 9:14 p.m.

DATE:

APPROVED:

Charles R. Myers, Mayor

Betty R. Morlock, Clerk