CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF YPSILANTI MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2009 REGULAR MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Supervisor Brenda L. Stumbo at approximately

7:03 p.m. in the Ypsilanti Township Civic Center Board Room, 7200 S. Huron River Drive, Ypsilanti Township. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silent prayer was observed.

Members Present: Eldridge	Supervisor Brenda L. Stumbo, Clerk Karen Lovejoy Roe, Treasurer Larry Doe, Trustees Jean Hall Currie, Stan and Mike Martin
Members Absent:	Trustee Dee Sizemore
Legal Counsel:	Wm. Douglas Winters, Dennis McLain and John Hancock

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. 7:00 P.M. – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT LEVY, RESOLUTION NO. 2009-30

The public hearing was opened at approximately 7:04 p.m.

Supervisor Stumbo explained the special assessment levy was done every year and was for streetlights and water main improvements.

The public hearing was closed at approximately 7:05 p.m.

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Currie to approve Resolution No. 2009-30, Special Assessment Levy. (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public Comments were received.

(COMMENTS RELATING TO THE REDUCED WORKWEEK FOR AFSCME EMPLOYEES WERE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM)

Cheryl Lynn-Bruestle, AFSCME Chief Steward: "My name is Cheryl Lynn-Bruestle and I would like to address the Board. We have met with the Board, however, I would like to address the Trustees and the members of this audience regarding an issue facing our Union. At the last board meeting on September 15th, the Union expressed its discord to the Board with their decision to reduce our hours to 32 hours per week, upon the immediate ratification of our contract in which we agreed to take concessions brought forth by management's representatives, which did not include agreeing to a 32-hour workweek in

exchange for a no-layoff clause. During the course of these negotiations, the Board's representatives never gave us the impression that by adding a no-layoff clause in our contract would mean automatically taking us down to a workweek of 32 hours. The language that was put in this contract regarding the reduced workweek was to insure that if ever the need arose to reduce the hours in the workforce, it would be kept at 32. The ability to reduce our hours has been part of our contract but there has never been a limit for this reduction. Our Union agreed to concessions asked by management that would take place in 2010 and 2011. There was never any talk of cuts for 2009. The Board got their concessions and then decided to reduce us even further by implementing the 32-hour workweek in 2009 and 2010 for AFSCME employees and went as far to say in their newsletter to the public and I quote. "The Township agreed to a no-layoff clause for 16 months through 2010, in exchange for the negotiated 32-hour workweek". This is not true. To repeat, our Union did not agree, nor was it discussed in negotiations that we would accept a 32-hour workweek in exchange for a no-layoff clause. This additional 20% reduction in our weekly pay upon the immediate ratification of our Union contract, with our agreed upon concessions is a disingenuous act by the Board. We agreed to concessions and the percentage brought forth by Mr. Hancock, the Township's labor attorney. Our Union bargained in good faith and we agreed to the concessions to do our part to get us through these hard economic times we are all facing in this community and in our own families. This Board and Trustees, as I know after talking to Human Resources the other day, are taking no cuts in 2009. The Teamsters union is taking no cuts in 2009. Administrative and Confidential employees are taking no cuts in 2009. No other employees are taking cuts in 2009 except for Golf Course employees, who took a 3% reduction in pay, according to Resolution No. 2009-25 but they also received the lump-sum benefit at the beginning of the year, totaling 2.59% as Board, Trustees, Administrative and Confidential employees all received. It is a gross inequity of the cuts that AFSCME workers are being asked to take in 2009 and over the course of the next few years of our contract. In all fairness, this vote to reduce our hours must be rescinded. Thank you."

Winston Johnson, AFSCME, Council 25 Representative: "Good evening, Miss Honorable Body, the Township Board of Ypsilanti. I come before you in support of Local 3451 and all the comments that you just heard, given to you by Cheryl. I was the Chief spokesperson for the group. My name is Winston Johnson. I'm from Michigan AFSCME Council 25. I represent this group and several other groups out here in the Washtenaw County area. I also represent groups throughout Oakland County, Washtenaw County, Macomb County and Wayne County. Cheryl is right, we had a long set of bargaining and it appears that the intent of the negotiations turned out to be somewhat different than what the parties at the table had intended for it to happen. It's clear that the union has given according to the bargaining team for the employer, its goal of a 3% reduction. We've accomplished that by giving an increase to our pension of 0.9%. We agreed to a pay freeze. We agreed to take 10 furlough days over a ten year period, with the option of paying or getting paid for four of those days. We did some adjustments to the healthcare, which helped the Township postpone a 6% increase. In addition to these cuts that we made or concessions that we

made, we also set the Township up for the future, as it relates to new and incoming employees. We agreed to a reduced wage of \$3.00 per hour for new employees coming in. We agreed to no pay, to a reduced amount of PTO time. We agreed to the Township having the possibility of changing the entire retiree benefit package, as it relates to healthcare. The point I'm trying to make to this honorable body is that when we came to the table we had some tough choices to make. As we look around in us, we know that we don't necessarily live in a vacuum. However, we thought, in good faith, we were working with the negotiating team that was represented to us, that was management's representative and although we may have had a few tense moments here and there and that's common in negotiations, we thought the attitude was cordial and we were able to work out something that we felt would be helpful to the Township. That was giving the employer pretty much what they asked for. We just found a different way to do it and that's to give them the 3% concession. No sooner than..., and when went to our membership, mind you, the membership of Local 3451, we went to them and we indicated to them that we felt that was all that was going to take place. Now understanding there was a clause in there that already gave the employer the opportunity to reduce the hours. If we had certainly known and if it had been indicated to us that that was the employers' wishes or desires, we certainly would have been moving in the wrong directions and we certainly wouldn't have been talking to our membership about trying to support such an action. So in addition to the 32 hours that's been kind of thrown up on us, we asked the question, what is the hurry, what is the rush? We recognize that there's some financial struggles that are going on within the Township, as well as Washtenaw County, as well as the rest of Michigan. But just because you may, and I'm not necessarily indicating that you do have the right, that's still, options are still being sought as it pertains to grievances, possible unfair labor charges or in court. Those options are still out there for the Union to consider. But if in fact you do have the right to reduce employee's hours to 32, is it absolutely necessary that you do that at this time? And not only that, how is that equitable in terms of every other employee within the township? As Cheryl indicated, no one else but AFSCME seems to be hit with this type of reduction, this fast. For the life of myself and our bargaining team and the membership, we don't understand that. We submitted a letter to you that was authored by myself. I hope that all the Township Board Members have had an opportunity to read that. In that letter, we indicated and requested that you rescind this action to reduce every AFSCME employee hours to 32 hours immediately. We think the whole way it was handled was improper, unprofessional and in bad taste and in bad faith. We stand here before you again, requesting and demanding that you rescind the 32-hour workweek for all employees and 16 hour workweek for part-time employees immediately. Thank You."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Thank you, Mr. Winston, Mr. Johnson. Ms. Kaiser." Arloa Kaiser, Township Resident: My name is Arloa Kaiser. I was here at the last meeting and the meeting before that when it was discussed what AFSCME had considered to give up. I was very proud of the union for what they had offered. It was mentioned by someone at the meeting that they were surprised that the

union had given up so much. But what I don't understand is, if you have negotiation people, this was written in a contract and that you all voted for it, why you're so upset if it's spelled out and you voted for this. And it is my understanding is that Teamsters did not give up as much, but they gave up their share. They negotiated. They voted and their sticking to what they negotiated in they're contract. And that's my understanding of negotiations. You make these guidelines, it's put in writing and that's what you should go by and you voted for it."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Ms. Kaiser, I'm not, please Cheryl not yet. Ms. Kaiser, just in the future just address your comments to us."

Ms. Kaiser, Township Resident: "I'm sorry."

Supervisor Stumbo: "That's Ok, I'm learning too, but that's one of the suggestions."

Ms. Kaiser, Township Resident: "To whom it may concern, that is what I believe and it is a negotiation and that's what you do."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Ok, are there any other residents, I mean any other public comments at this time? Mr. Winters."

Bill Winters, Township Resident: (inaudible)

Bill Winters: Township Resident: "My name is Bill Winters. First of all Madam Chair, I commend the Township Board and the Union for the negotiations they just completed. Somewhat puzzling. . . First of all I want to say this, the Board Members as I know them and not only this board but previous boards, have always had a feeling for labor as such. Many of you have backgrounds in that. I too come from a labor background. I've been involved in labor negotiation, Service Representative for UAW Local 157, Van Born Road in Romulus. One of the things here that I'm hearing is that somehow that the Union is saying we may have unfair labor practice charges, we're looking into that. We're looking into legal action. You're saying all these things and saying to you that you ought to make the changes that are in the current agreement. I think the Union has done well and the Township Board in agreement and the items that they have in they're agreement. And looking at some of them . . . and we all know our economic hard times. Look around us. Drive down Factory Street, all over Ypsilanti. Not only in Ypsilanti, but other places. Ypsilanti Township, people are out of work, out of unemployment, but let's keep them in mind also. They are the people who are paying taxes into this state, into this Township and into this county. And they too, have got a real problem. So we don't want to forget you obligation of services to those. But looking at some of the things that you have in the agreement, and it's a good agreement. You have some 13 paid holidays, great. It could be 15, I'm not sure but it's at least 13. Health insurance, paid by the Township, optical, dental, lunch hour, one hour paid, two fifteen minute breaks. So in an eight hour day obviously, it's a six hour productivity day that is

expected from each and every employee. I think we all understand that sometimes it's hard to be back on the job right after fifteen minutes has expired, we all know better than that. So I think that when you look at the paid time off clause as a, it's great! And I commend you for having that in your agreement. Where you can use it for vacation and you can use it for other things as outlined in the contract. I'm somewhat surprised that when you entered into negotiations, that you don't ask the questions that are pertinent to that section that's being changed. And if you did ask them, then I guess then you got your answer. But when you go to the ratification meeting and you make a recommendation and you say well that's what I thought they said. Well I understand today or yesterday, the Township has a new increase in health insurance, some \$200,000. Are they to say, oh we forgot to mention to you that any increases coming down, we're going to come back and asking you to pick up that money. No, they're not going to do that because they know better. My point in this is that, I think that if you have some issues to talk about, if you're going to go to court, go to court, so be it. But you have to remember there's other people in this Township, the people who make it possible to provide the services. We have them to look after and not only that, coming up we have a mileage coming. Police Protection, we all need it. I support it. Fire Protection, we need it. I support it. On top of that, we have another millage on education and we know how much that already is. In my case, it's \$800a year for education alone, taxes. But that's what's going on in this community and you say that you've been taken. I don't believe that because the agreement doesn't say that and it doesn't come close to that based on the benefit level that you have. So, I would say to the Union that you, if you have a reason to want to meet with management for something related to ongoing matters, you do it in the setting. If you want to go public and say, hey, I didn't understand what I was doing. I don't know if that's what you're saying to the public here tonight. As we came in, we didn't know what we were doing. Are you going to say, well the township bamboozled us. Well, are you that easily bamboozled? I don't know who... where you get the idea that you ought to come to the Township and make it public on those issues that should be handled, I believe, in a collective bargaining atmosphere. Thank You."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Thank you. Susan."

Susan Gilbee, Township Employee: "I do believe that was Mr. Winters, the Township Attorney's father that just spoke."

Supervisor Stumbo: Yes, it was.

Ms. Gilbee, Township Employee: "I just want to mention that evidently something is wrong. We're upset because this was presented to us, not as cutting 32hours. This is obvious, right here. We did not agree to that. And there's many people here that have lots of family in this area that are members of UAW and other unions and you should not be surprised that we as a union have come together against this incorrect thing that's being done to us. Also on the news if any of you have been watching it, you might want to note that Mayor Bing in

Detroit wants to cut AFSCME by 10%, only 10%. They have . . . they're \$300 million dollars in deficit and what are we in deficit it?"

Supervisor Stumbo: "I'm sorry?"

Ms. Gilbee: "How much are we in deficit?"

Supervisor Stumbo: "For '010? A million- seven."

Ms. Gilbee: "Well, how about '09, how much are we in deficit?"

Supervisor Stumbo: "We balanced our budget in '09. We haven't taken from fund balance yet."

Ms. Gilbee: "Oh, but we have to cut 20% from our salary. And were not any in deficit and they only want to cut 10% from their AFSCME employees?"

Supervisor Stumbo: "I haven't seen the news."

Ms. Gilbee: "It's right here. I have a copy for anyone who wants to see it. Thank you."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Thank you, Susan"

Carissa Collins Watson, Township Employee: "At this point, I am extremely upset and I'm getting blowed by the minute. The one thing I want to say is I heard the different voices. One of the voices said we shouldn't have to do this here. That's true. We shouldn't have to but at any given moment, we are here. We're here at this point. The one thing I want to say is that I am very upset about the 32 hours. What bothers me the most, what bothers me the most ... why did we have to have it, even right now? Now trust me. Bible believer, I am. I believe that we live for today and we plan for tomorrow. So I believe that when we voted, we voted that if that had to happen, we would be willing to give it up. But if it didn't have to happen, why did it have to happen now? Why did it happen, is my concern because trust me . . . this is no joke and I mean what I'm saying. I'm not trying to be like Job, number one. Okay? I know what it's like to drink out of a tin can because I had to. I know what it's like to eat out of a pie pan because I had to. I ain't trying to go there no more. I'm not trying to go there if I don't have to. And I'm saying for each one of you, who ever voted that we go 32 hours, I want every one of you to tell my why! Why you voted. Why you think. . . I want an answer. I want an answer. I want it tonight. I want to know why. I don't want to hear my Union. I don't want to hear this and that one. They've been even fighting with each other because it's been this one said that happened, this one said this happened. I'm fed up. All the way up. I'm blowed. I'm telling you if I don't sit down I'll be done got ignorant. I want everybody to tell me exactly why we're in the shape we're in. Why we have to pay it. Like she said, higher taxes and lower pay. I want to know why."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Thank you, Carissa. Are there any other comments? Are there any other comments from anyone else in the audience? Okay Cheryl, you can go again."

Ms. Lynn-Bruestle: "First of all, I not use to being a public forum. I'm a very shy and private person so if my voice is cracking again, please excuse me. But as the Union body have mentioned and other people in the audience have mentioned, the reason why there so many people here, there is a problem here. What we negotiated in seven months when we were behind closed doors is not what we are seeing in front of our faces. And to address Ms. Kaiser and Mr. Winters, Sr., I respect your opinions and everyone is entitled to them. I know, Ms. Kaiser that you're a very dedicated watch person for the Township. However, injustices are injustices and inequities and inequities. When we negotiated the contract, we negotiated on the premise that we need a certain percentage to give up. It was what was brought to us and we looked at the pie and they said slice it up anyway you want. We did that. We gave them their concessions. As far as language being in the contract, just to reiterate something . . . the ability to always reduce our hours has always been in our Union contract. I want to make that very clear. The Township has always had the ability to reduce our hours. The reason why we put a 32 hour cap in there is because there had never been one. All the new recent, new AFSCME employee hires have been 20 hours or less. Full-time positions are disappearing. We had to protect what we had. However, when we negotiated this contract we gave our concessions and the language was in place but I have to stress, putting the no-layoff clause in there was not an agreed to take us down to a 32 hour workweek. If that was the case, we would have brought that to our Union body and we would have said to them, we have been told that we've got a choice. If we go for the no-layoffs clause for sixteen months, then that would mean automatically taking us down to the 32 hour workweek or people are going to be laid off. Or apparently what we were told last week, fifteen people are going anyway in '011, according to Ms. Roe at the last Board Meeting. So I just want to make it perfectly clear, the reason why we are here is because we feel what we bargained for in good faith is not what we got in the end because they not only got the concessions from us, they got another 20% reduction because they found out they could do it. We've got 32 full-time employees left and I believe seven part-time. That's what we are reduced to at this point. I don't know how many they plan to get rid of in '011 as they stated but I don't know who is going to be serving the residents. You've got a wonderful workforce here. They are dedicated employees. I've been here over 25 years. A lot of us have been here many, many years. We've raised our families in this community. We've given to this community and we've given to the Board. We've always been, always been open to help out in the community and always been able to work with the Board as far as Union negotiations are concerned. Unfortunately, it didn't turn out that way, this way. We put trust in what we negotiated and it turned out grossly different."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Are there any other public comments."

Mr. Winter: "Madam Chair, I believe the answers being sought by the representatives of the workforce have been answered. I think it was answered it was answered early on when it's been said that it's been explored of unfair labor practice charges being filed against the Township Board, maybe legal action. Those are out there. Those are what you said you were looking at and may happen. So the answer here this evening is that you came here and you've said, as I understand what you said anyhow, is that you may very well file unfair labor practices, you may file legal action. So there is your answer within your own group, your own representatives who said this is what they're looking at. Now if you're looking at it and you say we're going to do if you don't do this. You're not in a collective bargaining situation. So I just think that whatever . . . if you are saying here and you obviously you are, that you are looking into all these things then I think everybody's position has been made clear. I think you should move on."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Thank you, Mr. Winters. Just so the Union knows, we were advised because there's been a grievance filed that it's really hard to discuss some of the things that were brought up here tonight. That's one reason why we can't respond. For a lot of reasons, we would like to as far as what happen in negotiations. Clerk Roe has a paper that lays out the difference between what Board Members and non-union, Teamsters and AFSCME actually receive. You're welcome to have copies of that. We did, I thought we had a very good meeting on Friday with the Union. It was three hours long. There were a lot of things stated. We all agreed that we need to communicate more and we're going to start doing that. Cheryl has agreed to go with us and we are going to go to each department and lay out the economic reasons to each employee so they can ask questions directly, of the three full-time officials. We not doing this as punishment. No one enjoys doing what we're doing. We have some grave concerns for the financial stability of Ypsilanti Township. We have an obligation as elected members, to address those issues. We think we're doing that and however we got to the 32 hour workweek, whatever happened with negotiations behind closed doors, I think there's a reason for it. I think it was fair and equitable to do it to everyone instead of just a select group of people. I think it is fair and equitable to not layoff any people. People are dying out there. They're trying to survive. We have over 2000 foreclosures. Last week, we had 14 Sheriff Foreclosure sales. We all have to sacrifice a little to help and get through these times. We will get though these times and we're going to have to do it together. I believe we will but we don't like doing this. We don't like decrease in pay be 20%. We don't like decrease in our pay by 20%. We don't like doing some of the cuts but we have to do them. We have an obligation to the taxpayers to do that. We get through it. We'll work through it together and we're open, Carissa to meet with each department to go over all the financial reasons. We're just not ... we have to be very careful on how we address them because there is a grievance right now."

Clerk Lovejoy Roe: "The only thing I wanted to say was that . . . and I know Cheryl emphasized a couple of times what was put in the newsletter. In the negotiations, we weren't there but I can honestly say . . . and you can say a lot of

things about me, good, bad, whatever but I have never, ever lied to anybody who works here. That's really important to me in terms of integrity. When I was up in Manistee Lake, my husband's here . . . he can tell you, can you get off that phone ... I'm on the phone and they're calling me saying they (the Union) want to go with a no-layoff clause. My answer, swear to God on my kids lives, my answer was they want that for the 32 hours. That was my interpretation. I doesn't matter what . . . that you interpreted it different because strategies in negotiations are strategies. If that's what we were thinking and that's what this Board all knew before they voted because there was a long discussion on that about the 32 hours. So they knew that and that was my reactions. They want that because of the 32 hours and I think that's a fair deal. For sixteen months, we will be able to save enough money in order to prevent the ... we can do that, we can do that for sixteen months. What happens after that depends a lot on what's happening with the assessments. The clear, most simple answer to why we're in this situation is we took a 20% drop in total revenue to the Township in 2010. Last year, we got an increase, the budget we're running through. We're going to have to do some major changes that we didn't know about because we've had about six major hits here in the last three months. We didn't know about the State Revenue Sharing, the first one. We just got another one on Friday or last . . . we had one in July and we just got another one. We didn't budget for those. We have an increase in OPEB which is to make sure that you get healthcare when you retire. That's been presented. We got one yesterday on, 20% increase. We were told that it would probably . . . we were even warned by some of our team that do you really want to lock that in for two years because we don't know what 2011's going to be. All the projections, everything that you read said that it was going to be single digit increases. All of us agreed, every single Union body has agreed with the exception of the firefighters ... a lot of those outside of their contract that are not in negotiations but they said yes, we'll be a part of the solution to pick up the difference in co-pays so the Township taxpayers did not have to pick up that increase and we also had a little hedge in there to take care of the next 2010 if we were going to get single digit increases. Twenty percent, 19.8 or something, 20% and we're projecting somewhere, it depends on how many employees we actually have working here, somewhere between \$150-\$200,000 loss to next year's budget. Two-thousand-eleven is the projection of a 40% cut. As you can . . . we run the numbers way back in the spring. As you accumulate all those deficits, 1.1, 1.4, 1.6 - if you don't so something, we are facing a 12 million dollar deficit. So we don't have, it's not a choice. I don't sleep at night. This is not easy. It tears on my heart because we have to be the leaders here and make the hard calls. The one thing that we laid out was the graph on, that made it simple and just the General Fund. But we're facing, not as bad in the other funds but deficits in every single one of those - in the Garbage and Solid Waste Fund, in the Fire Fund and the Police Fund. Well, you know in the Police Fund. It's ran out of money the first part of next year. That's why we are going to the voters. The reason we're going to the voters is because the huge cuts that we had in our property values. That's what we run on. That's' what pays all of our paychecks is property values. We had the General Motors hit on top of it and no one projected that. It was \$670. almost \$700 million dollars they invested just a few years ago. That's usually a sign that a plant's staying open. So no one knew

that and then they ramped it up even faster. We thought we were going to have all the taxes until the end of this year. Well, they pulled the 6-speed out, which was the big personal property, which is where we get most of our money. They're projecting everything, they've told us, everything will be gone by December of next. We figured like this year. The Union people are telling us it's probably going to go by June or July. That's what they're telling us. So that's going to be even faster run on that. I did not say fifteen people. In the meeting that we had with the Union on Friday, I said look at the numbers-you figure it out. Those cuts got to come somewhere. You got any ideas. But figure out, what does the average person make and if you going to come up with 1.4 but I did not say it was going to be fifteen people. I've never said that. I said it could be fifteen, it might be ten, it might be none if we can figure out another way to do things. The numbers, the numbers are there. Two-thousand, if you look at the charts, in 2009, we did not . . . the elected officials and the management and the confidential did not get a pay raise. We got nothing in our base which is the key. Winston, you did a good job. You protected that base. Hat's off to you because that is instrumental, that's important. We lost our base. We gave, we said that we'll do that and we did take a lump sum but we lost whatever that 3% would have been for the Board and the confidential employees, we lost that forever. That's not ever coming back. The Teamsters got a 2.5% pay increase and AFSCME in 2009 got anywhere from 1.5% and 3% base pay increase that's there forever. Teamsters have given up their base pay. When there cuts, they've given that up forever. They've taken that hit, I think in some ways that was more to give up because it's forever. If you're going to work here for 10 years, take 1440 times 10, you've lost that forever. It comes up to \$14-\$15,000 over 10 years. They gave up permanently 7 or 8 PTO days and for those who save up and over half our workforce does and cashes that out or takes it out . . . whether you take it at 75 or 100%, that's a lot of money. They gave up basically, almost two weeks salary because they gave up 8... well, two more days would mean two weeks so they gave up 8 PTO days. As soon as you get through this year, depending on what happens next year, the AFSCME unit is the same. Your pay is going to be the same. You didn't take a cut on that and yes the 20% is a lot but when we looked at that, we said-we looked at it seriously and said as long as you can use your time that you are accumulating ... it's the worse cut for the lowest seniority person if you use none of your time bank and you don't use your two 16-hour annual days . . . is a 9% cut. That's a choice that you can make not to use your . . . and the majority of our employees are in the middle so it's more like a 7.5% cut for the most. The top seniority, it only about a 5.6% cut. Detroit is doing 10%. What you failed to say was that they're also doing, Bing's trying to get 26 furlough days. So it's 10% and 26 furlough days amongst other things. We can go into the details of it . . . it's a lot. We have to sacrifice a lot. We have to do it together. There's more that's coming. I mean it's not . . . there more hits that are going to come. They have to because we cannot ... we have to balance the budget and we still have to provide services. The young gentleman that talked about the parks and things like that . . . things aren't going to be the same. You can't be the same. Joe Lawson informed us that Troy laid off more than 50% . . . it got announced today ... more than 50% of the employees there got laid off, are getting laid off. So Troy's not going to be able to do the same things. They're not going to have the

libraries and all the things that they had. I think that residents understand that services aren't going to be the same but our goal is to not to impact the employees the least. You do a great job. Our survey showed it. People are happy with Ypsilanti Township government. It's not because of Brenda Stumbo or Karen Roe or Larry Doe or Mike Martin or Jean or Stan. They're happy because of the services and delivery and what you do every day here. That's what makes them happy. They wrote on there. That was one of the highest things that we have. They did bench marks against the State of Michigan and against other communities and we got extremely high rating on that. That's because of the work that the employees do. I just only hope that we can get through our anger and our frustration and we could at least get back to being a happier family. We're in a crisis and we're going to fight things out like any other family. If we can get through and like Mr. Winters said, go through the legal process. I respect that. You have every right to do that. You have every right to come here, every single meeting if you want and I appreciate that. I mean, it's Public Comments. It shows democracy's at work. It's a great thing. You're working hard and you're trying to represent your own rights and your Union but at the same time, let's work at being civil on a day-to-day basis with each other. Let's agree to disagree and just let the process run itself out. Let's work really hard to continue, like I know that you will anyway, to service the residents but to find other places and ways that we can all work together to get the cuts that we need and make it less traumatic on all of us . . all the employees that are here. The whole Board is welcome to any suggestions or solutions that you have about how we can provide services and save money."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Any other Board comments. Larry."

Larry J. Doe, Treasurer: "The only comment I'd like to make is that I know earlier they said why just the AFSCME group taking cuts. AFSCME local is the only one that had negotiation this year. Your contract expired in April. Teamsters went ahead and opened their contract. Their contract went through December 31st so that's why there's not any cuts with the Teamsters and that why there's cuts with the AFSCME group. You had a contract that opened up in April and we're moving forward with it."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Any other comment?"

Trustee Eldridge: "I will. I appreciate hearing a different version of the negotiations that took place. Obviously, they are very different than what we heard in the first place. I don't think it is asking to expose anything differently. We did it in the Work Session earlier. I would just like Mr. Hancock to explain his position as we went or as the Township went through that negotiation. It concerns me to hear that one side believes they were misled or that the Township wasn't being forth right or honest in those negotiations. That concerns me. I asked you that during the Work Session and you answered that question for me. I just would like you to do it while the AFSCME has their employees here so they can hear it firsthand so we can get away from all the third party conversation. I think it's productive if we sit – ask and answer questions when

everybody's in the room. Take out any of the innuendo, any of the misinformation and move forward as best we can. So I guess I would just ask you to go over what you did in the Work Session so that these people can hear that once again."

John Hancock, Labor Attorney: "Well, I'll try to make it a little less, unless you have some questions about it. We made a number of proposals in negotiations. We made proposals to have them pay part of the increase in healthcare. We made proposals to make them pay part of and more than the pension contribution they were making. There was a whole litany of things that we asked for as concessions. The one thing or the three things that we got in that negotiations is in December of next year that there will be a holiday shut down and they will not be able to use their PTO time during that period. That is a 1% cut. Three days is a 1% cut in what we had. Next year we'll be paying .9% of the increase of the pension. They're not going to be paying our part. They're not going to be cutting our contribution that we had been making. The pension contribution went up approximately 1.4, they're going to be paying .9 of it. The other thing that we got was the 32 hours. We did get a wage freeze but that's not cutting your cost. We did get them to change into a different healthcare that we thought would save us money. As it turns out, it saved us approximately \$25,000 this year. Next year, we're going to get a 19 or 20% increase which eats up all the things we saved at this point in time. The one thing that we put out there the contract already provided for a reduction in hours. We put out a specific proposal that set out a procedure to go through it. It says you do it when there's any economic need. You do it when you've met with the Union. You explain to them the economic need. They negotiated a 32 cap that we could not reduce below 32 hours prior to that there was not cap on that. They negotiated full benefits during that cap. That is they continue to accrue their full PTO even though they are only working 32 hours a week. We negotiated over that. We discussed it. It was never an issue of if, when or when we were going to do it. That never came up. I will agree with them on that. We never discussed if it was coming up. We never discuss if any plans. We negotiated that contract. At the end of negotiations, the Union asked for in return for the things that they had agreed to . . . and the things that they had agreed to was to continue with their longevity, continue with their healthcare with no contribution on their part. increase in the pension. We had asked for 11%. We got .9. They continue with their same wage rate. They continue with their same accrual of PTO. A 14 year employee in this Township, under this contract gets 300 hours of PTO a year, in addition to the 13. Roughly, 20% of their workweek . . . work year could be paid time off if you add the vacations, the PTO which are now rolled into and the holidays. That was all left in place. The three things that we got which we agreed on was the reduction or the ability to reduce if there was economic need to 32 hours. They did agreed to the pension contribution increase and they agreed that next year we would have a three days in December, 2010 which they would not be paid. Those are the concessions. They did get a wage freeze. They didn't get any increases although they continue to receive longevity increases. So, that was the negotiations. It was agreed to. At no point did we tell them we were not going to put it in place. At no point did we give a time table. At no point did we tell them that we were not going do it or we were going to do it because we had the no-

layoff situation. That never came up. It was never discussed, never asked that I'm aware of. So, that's what we agreed to. We laid out, during negotiations the financial situation of the Township in complete detail. We brought in people to talk to them. We had business meetings with them to discuss where our financial need. We spelled out the projections for our revenue. We showed them where there were going to be cuts in state aid. We showed them the increase. We talked about the lawsuits against the Township. We talked about the tax appeals that were happening. We gave them all the financial information that we had at our disposal so they would know from the very beginning what we were facing and what were we facing is the projection that you've already gone through of decreases in revenue and increases in expenses. Is there anything else that you wanted me to expound upon at this point? Thank you."

Trustee Martin: "I have one question. You said that you agreed to expedite at arbitration?"

Attorney Hancock: "What I . . . at the meeting that I had with the Union, I suggested that we move through the steps to the point where they're at the last level and they could go for arbitration at that point in time. I have not met with them since then and when I met with them, they said they were going to go through each one of the steps. As I've since understood, they may have agreed to proceed to the last step or now be ready to go to arbitration. But all we were doing was expediting the grievance procedure. No expedited arbitration. I don't know – we didn't talk about that, just expediting the grievance because there's a series of steps that you have to go through. I said there was no point in going through all of those."

Trustee Martin: "I guess my questions would be to either you or Mr. Johnson. If you agree to move to expedite at arbitration, how long do you expect that process to take to get to arbitration?"

Attorney Hancock: "One, that's not my decision. It's up to the Board whether they want to do that or not. I can't agree to that. You have to let me know if that's what you want. If there was an agreement to that, it would be depending on how soon we could get an arbitrator when he or she was available. I don't have a timeframe on that."

Supervisor Stumbo: "Ms. Hall. Sharon. Mrs. Brown, I'm sorry."

Sharon Brown, Township Employee: "I have a question. The 32 hours, isn't that something that could have waited until the first of the year and give the fellow employees time to put things that they need to, in order instead of doing it and thrusting it up on them that fast."

Supervisor Stumbo: "We could have agreed to implement it later."

Ms. Brown: "And why now?"

Supervisor Stumbo: "Because of the dire financial need of our community. That is why."

Ms. Brown: "Right, but there is dire need of our employees as well to give them that same opportunity instead of just doing it abruptly like that. Isn't there some other areas that could be cut . . s ervices that doesn't really need for the Township to have?"

Supervisor Stumbo: "We're looking at a lot of cuts. We're going through the new budget process and it's public meetings and everyone's invited to attend but we're looking at cuts everywhere."

Ms. Brown: "I'll hold my other questions for later. Thank you."

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2009 WORK SESSION, REGULAR MEETING AND EXECUTIVE SESSION

A motion was made by Treasurer Doe, supported by Trustee Eldridge to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2009 Work Session, Regular Meeting and Executive Session. The motion carried unanimously.

SUPERVISOR REPORT

Supervisor Stumbo stated that tickets were available for the NAACP Dinner on October 10, 2009. She also gave a brief overview of meeting attended by the three full-time officials.

CLERK REPORT

Clerk Lovejoy Roe thanked the staff that worked on the township newsletter. She also stated that the ballots for the November 3, 2009 election will be in next week and stressed the importance of the election and encouraged everyone to vote.

TRUSTEE REPORT

Trustee Currie stated that she attended the annual democratic dinner and the speaker was Congressman John Lewis with theme of working together for the future.

Trustee Eldridge asked Jeff Allen to check into the park issues concerning the overgrown grass. He also stated that he attended the MTA meeting and provided an overview.

ATTORNEY REPORT

A. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LEGAL ACTON IN WASHTENAW COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT TO ABATE PUBLIC NUISANCE FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7343 SPY GLASS LANE

Attorney McLain provided a summary of the nuisance properties located at Verna Street, 1724 West Michigan Avenue, Whispering Meadows, 1610 Outer Lane, Crystal Ponds, Greenbriar Estates, 2079 Bradley, 1500 McCarthy and 880 N. Ford Boulevard.

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Currie to authorize legal action in Washtenaw County Circuit Court to abate the public nuisance for the property located at 7343 Spy Glass Lane. The motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1. 2nd READING RESOLUTION NO. 2009- 29, PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2009-398, ILLEGAL DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS WITHIN 150 YARDS OF OCCUPIED DWELLING (1st reading held at the September 1, 2009 Regular Meeting)

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Treasurer Doe to approve the 2nd reading of Resolution No. 2009-29, Proposed Ordinance No. 2009-398, Illegal Discharge of Firearms within 150 yards of occupied dwelling. (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1. BUDGET AMENDMENT #11

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Currie to approve Budget Amendment #11. The motion carried unanimously.

2. 1st READING, PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2009-399, ANIMAL CRUELTY INVESTIGATORS

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Eldridge to approve the 1st reading of Proposed Ordinance No. 2009-399, Animal Cruelty Investigators (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

3. RESOLUTION NO. 2009-31, APPROVING PUMP STATION CONTRACT AND AUTHORIZING NOTICE

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Treasurer Doe to approve Resolution No. 2009-31, approving Pump Station Contract and authorizing the notice (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

4. RESOLUTION NO. 2009-32, APPROVING WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT CONTRACT AND AUTHORIZING NOTICE

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Eldridge to approve Resolution No. 2009-32, approving Wastewater Treatment Plant Contract and authorizing notice (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

5. REQUEST FROM YCUA TO UTILIZE THE YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP DIVISION RESERVE FOR CONSTRUCTION FUND FOR THE BRIDGE ROAD SOUTH STORAGE TANK FACILITY

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Currie to approve the request from YCUA to utilize the Ypsilanti Township Division Reserve for construction fund for the Bridge Road south storage tank facility

(see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

6. WASHTENAW COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION EASEMENT AGREEMENT FOR HOLMES ROAD PHASE III, FOR STORM AND ROAD DRAINAGE

A motion was made by Trustee Currie, supported by Clerk Lovejoy Roe to approve the Washtenaw County Road Commission Easement Agreement for Holmes Road Phase III, for Storm and Road Drainage (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

7. LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR ADOPTION OF NEXT MICHIGAN DEVELOPMENT ACT LEGISLATION, HOUSE BILLS 5346-5351

A motion was made by Treasurer Doe, supported by Trustee Eldridge to approve the letter of support for adoption of Next Michigan Development Act Legislation, House Bills 5346-5351 (see attached). The motion carried unanimously.

8. SET PUBLIC HEARING DATE OF TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2009 AT APPROXIMATELY 7:00 P.M. – REQUEST OF SENSITILE SYSTEMS LLC, LOCATED AT 1735 HOLMES ROAD IN YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP, FOR AN INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Trustee Eldridge to set public hearing date of Tuesday, October 20, 2009 at approximately 7:00 p.m. – request of Sensitile Systems LLC, located at 1735 Holmes Road in Ypsilanti Township, for an Industrial Facilities Exemption Certificate. The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. SERVICE CONTRACT WITH WASHTENAW COUNTY FOR ASSISTANCE WITH THE YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP WEBSITE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,400, BUDGETED IN LINE ITEM #101.266.000.801.050 AND AUTHORIZE SIGNING

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Treasurer Doe to authorize the signing of service contract with Washtenaw County in the amount of \$3,400, budgeted in line item #101.266.000.801.050 for the assistance with Ypsilanti Township Website and authorize signing of the agreement. The motion carried unanimously.

STATEMENTS AND CHECKS

A motion was made by Treasurer Doe, supported by Clerk Lovejoy Roe to approve Statements and Checks in the amount of \$1,670,132.00. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Clerk Lovejoy Roe, supported by Treasurer Doe to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda L. Stumbo, Supervisor Charter Township of Ypsilanti Karen Lovejoy Roe, Clerk Charter Township of Ypsilanti