

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WASHTENAW COUNTY  
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

SPECIAL MEETING  
SECOND PUBLIC HEARING  
LOWER HURON RIVER CHAIN OF LAKES IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

HELD VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2022  
6:30 p.m.

Broadcasted from: Dexter Township Hall  
6880 Dexter-Pinckney Road  
Dexter, Michigan 48130

BOARD MEMBERS:  
ANDREW SCHMIDT, Chair  
LAUREN SMITH, Vice-Chair  
EVAN PRATT, Secretary  
MOLLY MACIEJEWSKI  
KATHLEEN ROOT

REPORTED BY:  
AMY SHANKLETON-NOVESS (CER 0838)  
Modern Court Reporting, & Video L.L.C.  
SCAO Firm No. 08228  
101-A North Lewis Street  
Saline, Michigan 48176  
(734) 429-9143/krs

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVENTS:	PAGE:
1. Call to order	3
2. Remote meeting guidelines and protocol	3
3. Approval of agenda	4
4. Approval of Minutes from 6/14/22	5
5. Purpose of public hearing	6
6. Overview of SAD	11
7. Open public hearing	11
8. Public comment	12
9. Close public hearing	32
10. Roll call vote	52
11. Next steps	52
12. Adjournment	54

Dexter, Michigan

Wednesday, July 20, 2022 - 6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, it's 6:30.

MS. KOLOSKI: It is 6:30.

MR. SCHMIDT: We'll call to order this Special Meeting of the Washtenaw County Board of Public Works. This is the second public hearing Huron -- second public hearing regarding the Lower Huron River Chain of Lakes Improvement Project. Welcome everybody. Glad you could come out this evening and participate in local government.

And the first item of business is to get the rules of the road for our remote in-meeting guidelines.

Theo?

REMOTE MEETING GUIDELINES AND PROTOCOL

MR. EGGERMONT: Yes, this is a hybrid meeting, so welcome to all of you in person, as well as welcome to those joining us over Zoom. We have three attendees attending over Zoom right now. And there will be a public comment period during this meeting. Our chair will announce that, and I want to give just some preliminary instructions to our Zoom participants, that they are muted right now, but they will have a chance to speak during public comment, and to do so, if you're joining by phone, you'll press star 9 to raise your hand, and then you'll

press star 6 to unmute once I allow you to do so. If you're joining by computer, you'll press Alt Y on Windows, and Opt-Y on a Mac in order to raise your hand, and then I'll call on you and allow you to unmute, and then please unmute yourself. And I can repeat those as we enter into the remote participant commentary period.

#### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. SCHMIDT: All right, thank you, Theo.

All right, first item of business for us then is approval of the agenda. Is there a motion?

MS. ROOT: So move the agenda.

MR. SCHMIDT: Support?

MR. PRATT: I'll support.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right, thank you, Evan.

Any comments, changes?

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MS. ROOT: Aye.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Aye.

MR. PRATT: Aye.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MR. SCHMIDT: Opposed, same sign.

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: Motion carries. The agenda is

approved.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. SCHMIDT: The next item of business is the approval of the minutes from our special meeting on June 14, 2022. Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

MS. ROOT: I have a correction if I may?

MR. SCHMIDT: Could we get a motion on the floor first?

MS. ROOT: Sure.

MR. PRATT: Yep.

MS. ROOT: I'll motion.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: I'll support.

MR. SCHMIDT: And support. Discussion, amendments?

MS. ROOT: I have a correction. Page 65, although I would love to take credit for discussing about the decline in the various species of invasives, I believe Lauren probably had that discussion.

MR. SCHMIDT: Excellent.

Any other corrections?

MR. PRATT: Nope.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. All right, all those in favor of approval of the minutes from our special meeting from June 14th, please signify by saying aye.

MS. ROOT: Aye.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Aye.

MR. PRATT: Aye.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MR. SCHMIDT: Opposed, same sign.

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: Motion carries. The minutes are approved.

All right, the next item we have is a discussion of the purpose of this evening's special meeting and public hearing, and I'm going to turn things over to Theo Eggermont, who is the Washtenaw County Director of Public Works for a description of our purposes here.

Theo?

#### PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

MR. EGGERMONT: Thanks, Andrew.

So, in a nutshell, the purpose of this second public hearing is to determine if this project should proceed and to confirm the roll. And that is how much is the assessment and who is in and who is out. So, I'll give a little background in where we are in the process, and then explain a little bit more.

So, if you'd like to grab one of these sheets, there's a large process, this is back on the back table, and it explains the process of where we got, but I'll run through it now. We may even have them in color back

there. But the first step is we gather input from residents and from PBWOA municipalities, and we determine what are the things that we may want to consider and is there interest in the project.

So, we've been doing the project for the last five years, and we've gathered input both positive and negative about the project, and we've determined that there's enough support to continue and proceed.

This is a modified project. We decided to remove Zukey, Gallagher, Loon, and Strawberry from it, and part of that is because we had some negative comments and input, and it was a larger project than we were able to take on, considering that we have other project -- another project that is starting out. So, we wanted to do a good job with the projects that we have.

Hamburg is moving forward, and they received a lot of positive support to continue with that project, and so they're going to coordinate those. But the point being, there was, even in areas where we did not think there was support, there was a fair amount of support for this type of project to continue in Hamburg Township through a Special Assessment District there.

So, we've gathered input, and then we went to the municipalities. They passed a resolution to proceed with the project and said, "Yes, we want you to continue

to provide the service to our residents."

Then the Board of Public Works considers it and determines what are the things that we should be doing, is this something that we want to continue to service. They've approved that and sent it to the Board of Commissioners in Washtenaw County, and they've also said yes, this project should continue. Then we create the roll, determine who is in, who is out, re-evaluate, look at all the parcels and confirm they have lake access, are they at the right rate.

And then we hold two public hearings. So, this is the second public hearing in the set. The first one is to gather support or objections and hear from the public. The second one is also to hear support or opposition to the project and allow all of you to voice your opinion and have your input. And then as a part of the second one, we also determine if the project should proceed and if we can confirm the roll, which is the cost of the project and who is in and who is out.

So, the -- we -- the assessment is the same prices it has been in the past. We put forth a conservative dollar amount, and we hope that we can reduce the assessment in the past -- or in the future.

So, in the past we were able to stretch the assessment from we assessed five times and the program ran



for six years. What we do with this project is we will reduce the assessment in the latter portion if we believe that we will have the funds to continue to provide the service at the rate that is needed to provide the service, so.

So explicitly the purpose is to determine if the project should proceed, to hear from all of you and allow for public comment, and then if the Board determines to proceed, they'll confirm or approve a resolution to proceed and to confirm the roll.

It's important to note that this is your chance to protest the assessment, and if you want to take your case to the Michigan Tax Tribunal, you have 30 days to do that, and to do that you have to protest at the meeting. So, if you weren't able to grab a comment card, just raise your hand. Michelle will walk over and grab you a card and you can fill that out and get it to our chair who will call on you to speak, and you'll have three minutes to do so.

So, we want to make you aware of your rights, and that allows you to preserve your right to protest the assessment to the Michigan Tax Tribunal.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: Back to you, Andrew.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you. Thank you, Theo.

Next up we're going to have Lauren from Theo's office talk about the Special Assessment.

OVERVIEW OF THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

MS. KOLOSKI: Thank you.

Hi, everyone. I'm Lauren Koloski. I am the environmental supervisor over at Public Works. This project that will provide lake management -- lake improvements to Little Portage, Big Portages, Baseline, Whitewood, and Tamarack Lakes, located both in Livingston and Washtenaw Counties, to control the reproduction and growth of non-native invasive plants, including, but not limited to Eurasian Water Milfoil and Starry Stonewort.

The project will also work to control the growth of nuisance native plants, including but not limited to, Chara and Variable Pondweed.

The project will focus on maintaining the ecological health and recreational use for the water bodies connecting -- the water bodies and the connecting waters throughout the project area. Additionally, other items may be included which would provide or enhance recreational opportunities subject to the approval of the Washtenaw County Board of Public Works.

This lake improvement project manages the entire ecosystem, and it is not just a weed management program. We are steering it to benefit the native ecosystem that is

there. This is why we provide education to invested residents to help the lake improvement project meet these objectives.

The total cost of the project over the five-year period is estimated at \$1,034,800. The Washtenaw County Board of Public Works has tentatively designed a Special Assessment District against which, or all of the part of the project will be assessed. All parcels included in the Special Assessment District are proposed to be assessed one of the following charges: the basic charge is \$98 per year; the waterfront charge is \$173 per year; the lake access commercial charge is \$271; and the waterfront commercial charges will range anywhere between \$750 to \$3,750. The DNR is included in that basic waterfront commercial charge.

We have residents who have come forward and asked for verification on specific parcels, and we've followed up with them. If we have not followed up with you directly, please let us know as soon as possible. We do need to have these corrections and updates at the beginning of August.

That's it.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

MR. SCHMIDT: All right. Awesome. Thank you, Lauren.

At this time, we will open the public hearing. We're going to ask people to come up and speak. When you come up, please step up to the microphone, give us your name and your address, and we limit comment to three minutes, and we're going to address people who have written in, in person, and remote participants.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. SCHMIDT: And we'll start out with letters. Theo, have we received -- we've received two, and those need to be read into the record?

MR. EGGERMONT: Yep.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: I can start now. So, the first one is from Michael Fournier of 9122 McGregor Road. His letter states:

"When the assessment for weed control started about four to five years ago, the only relief for weeds that choked the shoreline in front of my property was weed harvesting. It was very effective and was only required two times in season. The company, Tupper, did a great job, and was well equipped to navigate close and safely to the docks.

When a new company was hired for

harvesting weeds, the equipment they had was, in my opinion, substandard. It was old, very small, and prone to breaking down. They would not harvest any longer in front of my property. When I was told that that they were not able to control their equipment well enough in the Baseline to Big Portage connector, I didn't see any positive results in my area, although the downside is my pontoon (sic) are subjected to a constant flow by of every chemical applied upstream and does cause excessive pitting and algae buildup on my pontoons.

I think that my area should be exempt from paying this very expensive assessment, especially if the weeds in front of my property are not addressed.

Kind regards, Mike Fournier."

Can you pass that to Amy?

MS. KOLOSKI: Yes.

MR. EGGERMONT: Thank you.

The next letter is a letter of protest prepared for 7/20/22 meeting by Patrice Tupper, 11865 Durston Street, Pinckney, Michigan, 48169:

"I wanted to start off by thanking you

for giving me the -- giving us the opportunity to voice our opinions regarding the Special Assessment District. My name is Patty Tupper. I live at 11865 Durston Street, Pinckney, Michigan, Livingston County. This has been my residence for over 40 years. I would like to express my opposition to continuing the Special Assessment District and their use of chemicals on our (my) lake(s) for the following reasons:

There are other options that are effective for controlling and/or removing weeds from the water, such as weed harvesting, if done timely and (sic) consistent manner. Our SAD did do limited harvesting, but over the last three years it was done inconsistently, weeds were missed and/or not picked up, and when it didn't occur, they (sic) were told they ran out of time, or the equipment broke down. Weed harvesting done correctly would be more effective than chemicals. Weed harvesting would allow us to continue to water our grass and able to swim at our leisure during the

summer heat.

The chemicals are dangerous, not only to the animals that drink from the water often from the river and the lakes, but also to property. We have had damage to our aluminum docks, but others have had other more serious issues.

It concerns me when I read the yellow poster 'Do not use this water for livestock watering - pets & wildlife okay.' One product, Navitrol, was used on July 11, 2022. No watering for livestock...no watering plants or lawns for three weeks. That is a long time, particularly in July.

Using chemicals and killing the weeds for them to sink to the bottom negatively impacts the lakes, creating harmful algae blooms, further limiting our use of the lakes, as well as mucky bottoms.

Lastly, the Huron River is moving through the lakes makes a very strong current, this movement and refreshment of water makes the use of chemicals on the lakes ineffective, especially as you get closer to the dam.

For the above reasons, my husband and I do support -- do not support the Special Assessment District.

Again, thank you for allowing us the opportunity to share our concerns. Very truly yours, Patrice Tupper."

MR. SCHMIDT: Very good. Thank you, Theo.

Next up we're going to go through the cards. Once again, Theo had indicated if you are thinking that you may want to protest at the Michigan Tax Tribunal. It used to be all you had to do is show up and fill out a card. That requirement has now been interpreted that you actually need to speak. I guess not necessarily at length --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

MR. SCHMIDT: -- but you do need to speak. So, we'll start through this. And first up, we're going to ask you to come up to the microphone. Please give your name, your address.

Tom Ehman. Tom Ehman.

MR. EGGERMONT: And I'll have the timer here, and I'll note that the microphone we could not get to work, so apologies for that.

MR. SCHMIDT: Oh. Okay. All right.

MR. EHMAN: Good evening. I'm told I have to



appeal to you folks. I've got two parcels that are on the south side of Dexter-Pinckney Road and aren't contingent with the lakes in any way, nor do they have any deed or other sorts of covenants that allow access to the lake. But Lauren says I've got to tell you about it tonight.

MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

MR. EHMAN: Well, the last SAD all you did is go to somebody by a back door and fill out a thing and not have to appeal that. So that's why I'm here to take care of that.

Secondly, I understand that you're hot to get going on this thing, and I'm not going to discuss any of that, but I would hope that you would make it conditional on the member townships enacting either a water management ordinance or an amendment to their zoning ordinances that would preclude fertilizing within quite a, let's say 300 feet of the shoreline, because it's ludicrous that we're cutting these weeds that everybody's helping to grow. And so not only should there be this ordinance or this amendment to their zoning act, but there should also be some consequences for doing it, and then unless you folks accept something from each of these four member townships, that township isn't going to be part of the zoning, of the assessment district.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Bill Boger.

MR. BOGER: Thank you for not pronouncing it as if it was two Os.

I am William Boger. I lived at 1436 Arthur's Court for 27 years, and I sold the house last October. And so, the person who bought it from me is on the copy of the home warranty deed that I brought with me. Can I give it to you now?

MR. EGGERMONT: That's okay. I'll grab it after.

MR. BOGER: Okay. Will do.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

MS. KOLOSKI: Well --

MR. EGGERMONT: Go ahead.

MS. KOLOSKI: Well, I'm not sure what -- was I supposed to do something or do anything?

MR. EGGERMONT: No.

MS. KOLOSKI: No? Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: Just to clarify, are you looking for us to just correct the roll?

MR. BOGER: Send it to the new homeowner.

MR. EGGERMONT: Okay.

MS. KOLOSKI: Oh, okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: Very good.

MR. EGGERMONT: Got you. And the, yeah, the

township when they update their system, that will come to us as well, so.

MR. BOGER: The warranty deed should do it.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yep.

All right. Next up, Craig Kivi?

MR. KIVI: Thank you for the opportunity to address the Board.

I live at 1248 Louise Street. I have a residence on lakefront that is assessed. That's fine.

I also own two parcels on the north end of Portage Lake which consists of 2,700 feet of natural shoreline. 1,500 feet by Mud Bay, 1,200 feet the far end by Winns Canal. That consists of also eleven acres of wetland, nine acres by Mud Bay and two acres by the Vince canal at the north end. There's no access to these properties. They are declared nature preserves. We are undergoing right now working with an attorney to get them protected in their perpetuity for no development. So, it'd be the first of its kind on Portage Lake.

The national (sic) shorelines in my opinion contribute to prevention of the very kind of algae and weed growth by reducing nutrients and a lot of other services that it provides. It's actually -- I actually see it as being in concert with the treatment program. And I'll just go through a couple things. I know I have

three minutes. I can do it.

The national (sic) shorelines provide removal of toxins, heavy metals, road salt, watercraft fluids, gasolines, oils, antifreeze, grease, household poisons, herbicides, pesticides, solvents, detergents, lawn fertilizer, agricultural fertilizer, livestock and pet wastes, all contribute to weed and algae growth. Nutrients left behind from decaying vegetation, which is what happens when you poison weeds, you don't remove the veg -- you don't remove the nutrients. They recycle back into the water and are used as food for the next growth. The national (sic) shorelines actually remove that, removes some of that.

And there's also, you know, there's a -- there's a bog behind the national (sic) shoreline that is a carbon sequester. I know that's a, that's a very important thing nowadays, but it actually removes carbon from the air, and that's a secondary comment, but if -- nevertheless it's a very important attribute of the property that services the health of the area.

These natural shorelines and wetlands soak up floodwater first. We've got a dam that manages that, but it can't catch up when the rains really flow. So, the first defense is the natural shoreline. They trap sediment stirred up by boat wakes, which is increasingly a

problem. They absorb watercraft waves, increase and stabilize the lake's food web keeping the lake alive. Provide breeding grounds for fish, wildlife, increase population, population diversity of all kinds of wildlife and fish. It's a wildlife refuge for birds, turtles, herons, eagles, ospreys, frogs, fish, et cetera. Regulates the lake temperature. Provides filtered water for aquifers, wells, our drinking water.

Now, you know, why is this important? Because 85 percent of Portage Lake is hard armored. That's a DNR study done in 2019. Or 2009. I'm sorry. And provides no filtering. Seawalls provide no filtering of water, of the lakefront.

So anyways, my hope is that four -- four property IDs, 400-006 and 200-024, that the Board would consider allowing those not to have an assessment. I don't think there's been any treatment in front of them either.

So, I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

MR. KIVI: Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Charles Sebastian.

MR. SEBASTIAN: Thank you to the Board for letting me speak. We own property on Portage Lake, 1320 Nita, and the last four or five years I think we've

treated the lake and the areas, we haven't seen really any noticeable improvement. In fact, we've had an unbelievable outgrowth of Chara in our -- never been there before. It's just -- it's just starting to choke -- I've kayaked all around these different areas, and it's choking everything. So, I don't know, the lady here, she mentioned is she going to treat for Chara?

MS. KOLOSKI: It's a native plant.

MR. SEBASTIAN: Did I -- is that correct?

MS. KOLOSKI: Am I allowed to dialogue?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yeah, we'll -- this isn't really a Q/A part, but we'll take note of this.

MR. SEBASTIAN: Well, so my point is it's gotten worse. So, I don't know what they're treating. I now Milfoil and some other invasive species, but from my perspective it's gotten worse. In fact, we're even getting Milfoil, which we didn't have before. It's not that bad yet, but I'm -- we're seeing it creep in. So, I'm questioning how effective the treatment is going to be.

MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

MR. SEBASTIAN: And I'd like to echo this gentleman's comment about fertilizer. I feel like we're wasting money. As long as we're allowing properties to fertilize their lawns, those nutrients are leaching into

the watershed, and it's not just waterfront. All the canals, there's, you know, huge million dollar homes off from canals that are, you know, they got beautiful country club lawns, which is nice, but that stuff is leaching into the water system, and we can keep spending money trying to treat it, but unless we allow these, you know, people allowing this to happen, I think we're fighting a losing battle. So, that's my comment. Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Ed Linderman?

MR. LINDERMAN: Yes. I was here at the last meeting. I'm Ed Linderman, 8797 Grove Drive in Dexter Township. And I'd like to say that the project is probably a good thing, but the timings terrible. It's almost August. I haven't seen a harvester on the lake yet. I cannot get from my dock to deep water without weeding up my propeller. I cannot get back to my dock from deep water without weeding up my propeller. They're worse than they've ever been; five years into this they're worse. Lauren has kindly sent a scientist to my house. Guess what I have? Starry Stonewart all around under my boats, under the dock. And something I believe is going to be done about that.

But the timing on this is, it's almost August. We take our boats out of the water in September for the

winter. We're going to get three, four, five weeks of maybe clear water to go for a boat ride, and we've already had seven of bad weeds?

That's all I want to say. Thanks.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Dieter Lehnert?

MR. LEHNERT: Lehnert. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. SCHMIDT: Hi.

MR. LEHNERT: Dieter Lehnert, 8693 McGregor Road, Pinckney Township. And most of what I would have said has already been stated. I think the project, I think Ed eloquently addressed the concerns. We also have the Starry Stonewart. And my wife had written to you, Lauren, her name is Karen. And so, I feel like when something gets done with Ed's Starry Stonewart, mine would be handled as well. So that's all I want to say. Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Dave Bone.

MR. BONE: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dave Bone. 9262 Dexter-Pinckney Road.

You've heard it. I'm here simply to protest. I don't want to pay this. It hasn't seemed to work for me. I won't waste any more of your time. Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.



Kerry Clave.

MR. CLAVE: Kerry Clave. I'm from 11750 Woodview Drive, which is off Base Lake. Or not -- it's off the lake. And I also have a business me and my daughter run on McGregor Road. And there's just a couple of things that I'm not sure what we are going to get assessed.

Number one, by reading it, it looks like it's pretty much the maximum. We have 10 dock spots, which to me that is way over assessed because there's other businesses, at least three of them, that have up to 150, 200 dock spots. So, it's going to be a burden on our business for sure.

The assessment to the house, if I have one, I've never even received the letter, so I'm not sure that I'm going to be assessed there, but that I'm not, I don't have a big issue with. I just, I'm trying to see or understand why the, it didn't seem in the last five years that we got much benefit at all out of what was done.

And then the other thing concerning the assessments, a giant part, in my understanding anyway, of the original assessment was R&D, research, and trying to figure out what needed to be done and what should be done, and then finding people to do the jobs. We don't need to do that this time, so why is the assessment as much now as

it was back then? It seems excessive to me.

And other than that, I agree with Tom and other people with the weed -- or the fertilizer on the lawns, it's crazy that we're feeding the lakes all the nutrients and stuff that the weeds need to grow on, and then we're paying to get the weeds taken care of. So, something has to be done about the fertilizing on at least the lake front property, and like Tom said, probably 300 feet back.

That's it for now.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Melissa Winart?

MS. KUNNERT: Kunnert.

MR. SCHMIDT: Kunnert? Oh, okay. K instead of a W. Got it.

MS. KUNNERT: Sorry. I was talking and writing at the same time.

Kerry Clave is my father. Together we own 926 -- well, we lease 9260 McGregor Road. Business owners of NautiMi on the River. He already stated a few things. I just want to state additional, and we probably should have spoken together before we came up here. But I agree that there's been no noticeable improvement from pat treatments.

Another point that he didn't make, though we do have ten dock slips, we actually only lease six of them

for overnight dockage. The rest are for customer traffic to pull up to. So again, that huge difference between the number of dock slips we have compared to the other commercial properties that we're being assessed at at the same level seems a big inequality to us.

Additionally, we're located on the Huron River. I don't believe there is any treatment in our area specifically as it would literally just flow right down the dam. Because we are that close. We're just right there on the Huron River.

So again, I don't believe that there's any point in treating our area specifically, and I don't think that we should have to pay that same level that some of the other marina-type businesses are paying.

Additional to that, there's so many personal properties that are owned on the Chain of Lakes that are private leasing their dockage to friends and family and whatnot that are basically operating the same level of marina that I'm operating at, but they're not being assessed at the same level. And I think that those situations should be addressed as well.

I can tell you many, many people, and I'm not talking about, well, we can talk about an association type situation, and I don't know how they're being assessed, but an association that then has 30, 40, 50 boats there,

are they being assessed the same as a commercial property? I don't think so, and I don't think that's a fair situation.

But then just a private person, say a neighbor who then has two, three, four boats at their property that are just friends or family, and that situation isn't being addressed.

I also am a, my main is the fertilization of people's personal properties. Again, there are communities throughout Michigan with lake areas that have ordinances against fertilization. Any fertilization company that comes out has to get a permit, has to be approved of any chemical that they're using, and if they go beyond that, there's fines and that type of thing. So, I think that that is something that needs to be addressed and put into place.

Kerry had mentioned, also back to our business, the days, dates, that type of thing, when there is treatments, that is a detriment to our business. I can't rent within, you know, feeling good about myself or my business rent kayaks, canoes, paddleboards on those dates to people that don't live on the lake that may not understand that they can't get in the water. And so, then I'm losing out on business revenue on those days and times. So, taxing us and then not allowing me to run my

business just is not something that works for me.

Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would care to speak that hasn't done so already?

Remember that's a prerequisite if you want to be able to protest to the Michigan Tax Tribunal.

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Theo, are there any additional virtual participants?

MR. EGGERMONT: We do.

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, actually. I'm sorry. I shouldn't say additional. I should say are there any remote participants that would like to comment?

MR. EGGERMONT: There are. So, I'll -- so I see one. I see Cheryl. You were first in line. So, I'll reiterate the directions for folks that are joining remotely. If you are joining by phone, please press star 9 to raise your hand, and then star 6 to unmute when I call on you. If you're joining by a computer, Windows press Alt Y, and a Mac press Option Y to raise your hand.

So, I will start with Cheryl, and if the rest would like to speak, please raise your hand first.

So, Cheryl, I'll allow you to talk, and I will have a timer for three minutes. Please start by stating

your name and address.

One second, Cheryl. If you can find the unmute button.

MS. SHUEL: Hi. This is Cheryl Shuel. Can you hear me?

MR. EGGERMONT: Yes, we can.

MS. SHUEL: I own two properties on the north end of Portage, and I will say that in the last five years I've seen no improvement on the weeds; in fact, they're the worse I've ever seen them. And again, we're on the north end, so the wind blows, we understand. I know this is a lake owner association, we're talking your lake owners' problem. I don't think we can all address people that, not me, but other people that are doing, you know, the chemicals because they're going to do TruGreen, they're going to do whatever. So, we're fighting chemicals with chemicals.

My point is, I'm fine with the assessment, but I do agree with everybody saying, like Patty Tupper and Craig and every -- we're fighting chemicals with chemicals. At some point we just need to say unless we can get the homeowners, which again that is bigger than all of us here, to stop using TruGreen and chemicals, we have to worry about the lake. And for us that live on the lake, I'm in agreement with everyone here that it is way

worse than it was five years ago. I can't get out to my dock. I harvest weeds every day. And I just want to say that I think where -- as a group we're missing the point with, we're treating chemicals with chemicals.

So, if we can't control the chemicals around the lake, then what do we do in the lake? I'm back to harvesting. We need to just, if I'm going to spend with two properties seventeen, eighteen hundred dollars in the next five years, I would rather have somebody help clean up my weeds. So that's all I have to say.

MR. EGGERMONT: Could you repeat your name and address?

MS. SHUEL: My name is Cheryl Shuel. S-h-u-e-l. I own two homes at 11060 Algonquin, and I own the other one at 11080 Algonquin.

MR. EGGERMONT: Thank you, Cheryl.

MS. SHUEL: Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: Would anyone else who's attending remotely like to speak? If so, please raise your hand. Again, if you're on a computer, that's Alt Y for Windows, and Mac, Option Y to raise your hand. Or if you move your cursor to the top or bottom of the screen there may be something that pops up and you can either click on more, or there may be a raise your hand button. I'll give folks just a little less than a minute here to

see if anyone else would like to speak.

(Pause.)

MR. EGGERMONT: I'm not seeing any additional remote participants.

MR. SCHMIDT: Excellent. Thank you, Theo.

One more call for in-person comment. Is there anyone else who would like to speak that hasn't done so already?

(No response.)

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

MR. SCHMIDT: All right. At this point we're going to close the public hearing portion of this meeting, and we're going to move on to the resolution regarding this improvement project.

And, let me make sure I have -- okay. So, we can certainly have some discussion. Let's get the resolution on the table though. Is there a motion to approve the Special Assessment Resolution for the Special Assessment Roll for the Lower Huron River Chain of Lakes Improvement project?

MS. SMITH: I'll so move.

MR. SCHMIDT: Is there support?

MS. ROOT: I'll support.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right, it's been moved and supported. Any discussion?



MS. ROOT: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right.

MS. ROOT: We've heard a number of people talk about using chemicals, stuff like chemicals and talked passionately about fertilization and how that's sort of counteracting what we're trying to accomplish here. Is there any talk about that from the company that's actually going to do the work for us about how we could maybe address that fertilization part?

MS. KOLOSKI: Evan, correct me if I'm wrong, but fertilization is only a small portion of the nutrient pollution that's happening on our lake system. We'd have to go to the upper tributaries as well, too, to make sure that all of those are not contributing as well, but to do something like that is a township, I believe a township ordinance that would have to be taken up by the local township, and they'd have to have the ability to enforce it, which I think is a lot of issues with these type of resolutions is the enforcement of them.

MS. ROOT: Okay. So have we tried to approach the townships and talk to them about enforcing the --

MS. KOLOSKI: I --

MR. EGGERMONT: We haven't, and I think that's something that I'm -- I'm certainly open to it. I think it would be an advantageous step for us to take, even

though it may be, it doesn't make up for the whole amount of nutrients, we're never going to, you know, reduce the nutrients --

MS. ROOT: Right.

MR. EGGERMONT: -- completely to where, you know, we have to -- where there's not a large nutrient load, however, that's not to say it's not a productive step.

MS. KOLOSKI: Correct.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: So, I think it's something that we should bring up with the townships. And part of the issue is that it is a township ordinance, so we'll need residents to support that effort, which it's great to know during this public hearing that there is starting to become a critical mass, so.

MS. ROOT: Right, to --

MR. EGGERMONT: We're hearing that concern from residents. We should, I feel like an obligation maybe we should relay that to the municipalities, and since it would benefit the program, you know, see if there's draft ordinance or something from somewhere else that we can provide the municipalities to provide assistance there.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: And I would encourage everyone

to email or, you know, their township supervisor or township trustee or attend a meeting and speak at public comment about the need for an ordinance like this. That will go a long way.

MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh. More questions?

MS. SMITH: I guess I have one follow up just on that exact topic about the fertilizers. I don't know, Theo, if we have, beyond a, you know, casual conversation with the township, is there any ability in our lake management program to kind of force a township's hand? Not necessarily that we want to go that route, but is that even something that's feasible?

My understanding is no, not really.

MR. EGGERMONT: So, we wouldn't have any direct authority over them, but we do provide a, as someone put forward as a recommendation, it would be up to the Board to say, you know, we're not going to provide this service for the township and the residents --

MS. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. EGGERMONT: -- unless you do this. And then we wouldn't renew. So that -- that would be kind of the ultimatum effect --

MS. SMITH: Ultimatum.

MR. EGGERMONT: -- which I personally would not favor, but that's not my decision. I don't vote.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Yeah, Evan?

MR. PRATT: We had a question about treating Chara. I know in the past when -- I know now we have taken these hearings and tried to have a lot less of the hour of scientific presentation and slides and stuff, but I know we've seen presentations in the past where we've been told that Chara produces a substance that maybe is helpful in fighting algal blooms, but where are we at with Chara and how to -- what's the advice we typically get from the scientists and what's the science behind it? I don't remember it all.

MS. KOLOSKI: Well, I love that we're seeing more Chara on the lake. I love it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh no.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. KOLOSKI: Because it provides a habitat for fish, for macroinvertebrates. It provides habitats for mussels; it provides habitats for a lot of organisms that depend on our lake system. And so, we -- we will, you know, monitor it and manage it if it becomes like a major recreational issue, but it typically doesn't top out the way that Starry does. But we support it, and we promote it in the lakes. I mean, it does, it is an algae, so it does compete with algae well, and it does suppress algae.

And in certain circumstances when it's intermingled, Chara with Starry, there's more Chara than there is Starry, we will let that Starry live and stay there until it starts overtaking that native population. The benefits are very beneficial, and we want to keep it on the lake. Because if we take care of the Chara, then what's going to move in is the Starry and the invasives. So, it's native, it belongs there, it's important to the ecosystem, and we would like to see it to continue to grow.

MR. PRATT: So, you're saying if we -- if we treat the Chara, it's just going to get replaced by something else --

MS. KOLOSKI: Correct, yep.

MR. PRATT: -- that is a little deeper, thicker mat type of thing you're saying?

MS. KOLOSKI: Yep. So, the invasives, they -- they grow up, and then they blanket out, so they take out everything that's underneath them. The native plants do not have that characteristic, and they typically keep themselves in check because it's their natural ecosystem. But if we do remove the native plants, the first ones that are to come in are the invasives.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay.

MR. PRATT: Did you have a question? I've got

one more but go ahead.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: No. I well, I -- I know she -

-

MS. ROOT: I have another question. I'm sorry.

MR. PRATT: Go ahead, Kathleen.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: I can go last.

MS. ROOT: I'm concerned with -- what was I concerned with? I totally just went through my head. Oh, I know. A lot of people mentioned that they felt like in the last five years it's gotten worse. So, I mean I'm sure from what I, the little bit that I know, that you have to give it time to work. What do the experts say about, is five years --

MS. KOLOSKI: Right, well --

MS. ROOT: -- too short of a period to see this kind of change?

MS. KOLOSKI: We had, so the, I wasn't around for the first year of the project, but there, minimal treatment the first year. And then the second year, that's when we brought in Progressive? Is that correct?

MR. EGGERMONT: Yeah, I think we had one year of

--

MS. KOLOSKI: Yes, so we brought in Progressive the second year of the project, and so they've been on it since, but I mean we are seeing a reduction in the

treatment of the invasive plants, and you can see that year over year after how much we're treating, how much invasive Milfoil they're finding and treating it. You can see the trends year over year that we are reducing the size of treatment that we make year after year for these invasives.

MR. EGGERMONT: An important caveat that we're reducing the total amount of weeds that we are seeing in the -- the trend line is down --

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: -- for weeds, so. We can, we prescribe treatment. I shouldn't say "we," but the lake scientist prescribes treatment, so you could fudge those numbers if you really want to say we're just going to do less, and then your metric would be down. But that's not what we're seeing.

MS. KOLOSKI: Right.

MR. EGGERMONT: We're seeing the amount of weediness when they actually go out and map is being reduced over time.

MS. KOLOSKI: Which is also why we're bringing in the harvester two times hopefully this year to go after those native plants that we can't chemically treat, and we don't want to eradicate. We just want to give them a haircut so that they still provide those habitats that are

so important to the ecosystem.

MS. ROOT: So that's why some people are saying that they're cutting, they're harvesting, but they're leaving the weeds because we're doing that on purpose, right?

MS. KOLOSKI: We're not leaving the weeds out on purpose, no. You live in a very -- it's a current system, and so the harvesters are restricted in how fast they can go within the system.

MS. ROOT: I see.

MS. KOLOSKI: So, plants do get away.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MS. KOLOSKI: It's inevitable that they will get away while they do try to collect as many as they possibly can. It's a current system.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MR. PRATT: But just because we've got thousands of acres in the program and the net is less biomass of invasives, that doesn't mean that people aren't telling us something that's true at their house.

MS. KOLOSKI: Right.

MS. ROOT: Uh-huh.

MR. PRATT: So, I don't think we want to be dismissive that individual people may not be seeing an improvement and, you know, we certainly want to take note



of those locations.

MS. ROOT: Right. Right.

MR. PRATT: But hearing that -- and again, the idea has been to take the "How did last year go program," and have that a fall program, so that's really a, look for that update for after the season is over, and it's not just a "Here's what we think," but it's also an opportunity for people to say, "Well, that's not what I'm seeing" --

MS. ROOT: Correct.

MR. PRATT: -- and, you know, how can we tweak the program? Lauren has looked for input on how we could do the program differently, or where would we do things differently in the future.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MR. PRATT: It just got to bind up these meetings a lot, and a lot of people, at least our feedback in the past was we were trying to cover too much ground in a hearing that was really more about should the program go forward or not go forward or are the assessments right or no right.

So, I agree with you though, at least of the people here, but again we've got -- because our new, our old district had 25,000-plus people, and the new one is over 1,000?

MS. KOLOSKI: Fifteen. Fifteen hundred people.

MR. PRATT: Fifteen hundred, so. Although you certainly heard several people here say it's not working so good, we're not -- we need to hear from more of the 1,500 to get a better sense of --

MS. KOLOSKI: Right.

MR. PRATT: -- do we have a few isolated spots to work harder at or what.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MR. EGGERMONT: And one of the things I'm hearing tonight from folks is that harvesting should happen earlier.

MS. ROOT: Yes.

MR. EGGERMONT: And so, we'll relay that to our -- to our lake scientists and talk about that internally if that's a good decision or not.

MR. PRATT: Yeah.

MS. ROOT: Okay.

MR. PRATT: Yeah, and the point was raised, "Hey, this isn't really the best time to be talking about treatment." This is a public hearing for the assessments for next year.

MS. ROOT: Right.

MR. PRATT: So, the treatment has been ongoing continuously. This is more about are we going to continue

it after this calendar year; are we going to have the right to do that assessment in December so that we've got money in the kitty to get it, to get going right at the beginning of the seasons next year, just like we get going, you know, every May in the canals and then in the lakes in June once the restrictions on treatments are done. Is that -- am I remembering that correctly?

MS. KOLOSKI: I mean the restrictions change every couple of years on me.

MR. PRATT: Okay.

MS. KOLOSKI: But what we are currently working with now is many lakes have identified Cisco fish on them, so that takes us until the end of June.

MR. PRATT: Okay.

MS. KOLOSKI: We can't treat that. And then also the, our ability to use copper products near the littoral zone is heavily restricted in June and July as well, so that's the product that would treat your Starry Stonewort.

MR. PRATT: And the littoral zone, is that near shore --

MS. KOLOSKI: Yep.

MR. PRATT: -- or away from shore?

MS. KOLOSKI: So, it's right there in your shore. And that's the -- that's the part of the lake

that's missing when you don't have the seawall. So, when you put a seawall in, you take that zone completely out, which is such an important zone to preserve.

MS. ROOT: Right. Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Lauren, you had a couple questions as well?

MS. SMITH: I do, but Molly, do you want to go last? You can go ahead.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: You had another though.

MR. PRATT: That's okay. Go ahead. Everybody should get a chance to go.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: So, no, I just wanted to make a comment, and Evan already hit on it. Somebody said that this was a little bit too late, like we're too late in the season, and this hearing tonight is for what will happen next year.

MS. KOLOSKI: Correct.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Is --

MS. KOLOSKI: Yes.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: So, I just wanted to clarify that.

And then, let's see. I'm thinking most of my other questions were sort of already hit.

Yeah, one thing, Lauren, I'm wondering if you could speak to sort of the cost when there was a concern

about like this, you know, the beginning phases were research and development, and now we're seeing the same cost. It should just be a simple treatment.

MS. KOLOSKI: Oh, sure.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Maybe talk about the permitting and the cost for that.

MS. KOLOSKI: Okay. So, this last year we saw our first increase in permit costs from the State of Michigan, so they did eventually increase those permit costs this last year, and their hopes is to hire additional employees and do research -- resources to get us up to par with other states in the Midwest area. But herbicide costs go up. We've seen some major increases. The herbicide industry has been hit significantly. I think there was a factory in China or Australia that shutdown that were seeing some supply chain issues and herbicide costs significantly increased just this last year.

So, while we do have, you know, I was not involved in the original set up of the project, so the research and development statement is new to me. It's a constant research and development project. We're constantly trying to figure out what we're doing, what we're doing right, what we're doing wrong, what will work better. Last year we used a new chemical called

ProcellaCOR on the lake, and so that was definitely a research project to see if we could use less over time to get at that Milfoil. So, we're constantly learning.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PRATT: And then can I just follow up? That the, but the cost per parcel, is it about the same --

MS. KOLOSKI: It's exactly the same.

MR. PRATT: -- as the last program? Is that right, exactly the same?

MS. KOLOSKI: Yep. There were no increases per parcel.

MR. PRATT: Yeah. And then I guess while we're on dollars and cents, I guess the only other one I had is I guess for Mr. Clave and his daughter, I assume that we can, you know, discuss individually --

MS. KOLOSKI: Sure.

MR. PRATT: -- how they're being charged, and that's probably easier for everybody. Whether when -- you guys don't have to stick around tonight.

MS. KOLOSKI: Yeah.

MR. PRATT: But I think we, if you make sure that we can get ahold of you, we could at least let you know what to plan on.

MS. KOLOSKI: Sure.

MR. PRATT: Because I don't know how different

it is for the businesses. I'm not sure if we factor in slips or not, so.

MS. KOLOSKI: We do, but I'm happy to review it.

MR. PRATT: Yeah.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Or people on the main river channel.

MR. PRATT: Yeah.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: That's something that they would discuss with you individually.

MS. KOLOSKI: Yes.

MR. PRATT: Yep.

MS. KOLOSKI: We can talk about the river assessments, your specific assessments, the different thoughts, because you guys are newer to the area, that specific is?

MS. KUNNERT: Well, the business is new.

MS. KOLOSKI: Yeah.

MS. KUNNERT: The property has been there forever --

MS. KOLOSKI: Right.

MR. PRATT: Right.

MS. KUNNERT: -- but the dockage for that was added after -- has just been added in the last couple of years.

MR. PRATT: Okay.

MS. KOLOSKI: Okay.

MS. KUNNERT: So, I don't think it was --

MR. PRATT: Got it.

MS. KUNNERT: -- assessed that way originally.

MR. PRATT: Got it.

MS. KOLOSKI: Okay.

MR. PRATT: All right.

MS. KOLOSKI: We'll talk.

MR. SCHMIDT: Very good.

MR. PRATT: Yep.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay.

MR. PRATT: This is like --

MR. SCHMIDT: Have at it. I can tell.

MS. SMITH: No, I mean a lot of what I was going to ask has kind of been touched on, but I just thought maybe you could expand upon two items. The allowances and treatment difference, regulations even about the different weeds and the timings for when those things can be treated and harvested even.

And then secondly, I don't know if you have off the top of your head what the summary of treatment that has occurred on the lake so far has been, or these lakes, this lake system.

MS. KOLOSKI: This year or?

MS. SMITH: Uh-huh, yeah, this year.



MS. KOLOSKI: Okay. This year everything that we have done in the lake system is, it is posted online. I won't get the year end summary until November.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MS. KOLOSKI: From Progressive regarding all, like an entire, full summary everything we've done. The last years are posted online. Everything we have treated is online map-wise. So, when you ask about when treatments, restrictions, are you asking for me to elaborate a little bit on kind of what's coming down from the state?

MS. SMITH: Yeah, pretty much.

MS. KOLOSKI: You got it. How do I summarize this well?

MS. SMITH: Sorry.

MS. KOLOSKI: It's okay. Copper products, Lauren, have been significantly reduced over the three years that I've been working on this project. So we are, they have found that those can be detrimental to many species that live in the lakes, specifically the snuffbox mussel, which you've all heard about. And so, regulating the amount of product that we can use in certain areas is protective of those federally endangered species that we are lucky enough to still have on our lake system and to preserve their habitats and their populations. So, a lot

of the stuff that's coming down from the state is stuff that's handed down from the fisheries and wildlife division, DNR, that's where the Cisco fish kind of comes in, and so it's a collaboration effort of all of the different organizations to give these restrictions. We have the Cisco fish. We saw a massasauga rattlesnake over on Moon Lake the other day. We had to stop treatment. We had to report it to the National Wildlife Features Inventory. So, we have those things. There's a flower over on Little Portage we have to look out for as well and suspend any treatment that we're seeing if we were to do Phragmites or onshore development.

But the state is pushing a lot towards preserving that shoreline area. I know Craig can speak to this well, but they're noticing that our removal of those shorelines and putting in those seawalls, a hardening of the shorelines, has destroyed our lake system. And so, a lot of the restrictions that they're going is preserving a lot of those areas that we haven't been taking more care of. But it's, they're all stuff to benefit -- there's a reason why we have a restriction, because it's typically a species or animals or an area that's identified that needs an additional attention.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Great. Thank you for expanding on that.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right.

MS. SMITH: That's all I have, so.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Any others?

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: I just, I guess to sum up a little bit here as well, I think we've all heard that there's a realization that this is a complex problem, that it's not just as easy as running a harvester or dumping some chemicals in the water to solve the weed problem; that there's other contributing factors and that we all -- we all have some actions that we can take to help reduce those contributing factors to the problem.

So, on that note, any other -- any other comments? Any other questions?

MS. SMITH: Actually, I just remembered one thing. Sorry.

MR. SCHMIDT: Please.

MS. SMITH: I was kind of curious about the private slip rentals I think that was mentioned by Alyssa (sic)? I don't know who --

MS. KOLOSKI: She's been here, yes.

MS. SMITH: So, I mean the way that we assess currently is on a per property thing kind of assuming a base use of a lake. I mean, we've heard from Craig that disturbance of the lake bottom is detrimental because it

stirs up all of the nutrients again. I'm curious if we can maybe put this forth for future discussion or talk to lake scientists or maybe other townships about ordinances on how do we manage or how do we more equitably assess individuals who like to overuse the property on which they're given?

Like someone with five boats or who are using five boats pretty regularly is a lot different than somebody with one boat using one boat somewhat regularly. So, I'm -- but they're paying the same amount if they're a private resident.

MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

MS. SMITH: So, I'm just curious if we can have a -- I don't think this is something we can answer tonight. I think it requires a much larger conversation, but I think it's worth discussion.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yeah. Absolutely. Absolutely.

All right. Well, with all of that, any further discussion?

(No response.)

ROLL CALL VOTE

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. At this point, Michelle, will you please call the roll?

MS. KATZ: Certainly. Maciejewski.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KATZ: Pratt.

MR. PRATT: Yes.

MS. KATZ: Schmidt.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

MS. KATZ: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. KATZ: Root.

MS. ROOT: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right. Motion carries.

Thank you, everyone.

MR. PRATT: Yeah, thank you.

#### NEXT STEPS

MR. SCHMIDT: And next up, next steps. Theo, what happens now if someone were so curious as to ask?

MR. EGGERMONT: Yeah. So, you all have approved the resolution, so the project will proceed. So, the, we'll meet in August and we'll discuss what the assessment amount will be. We typically recommend in the first one, which this would be the first of the project, but we charge the full amount. We anticipate that there will be some carry over funds from the prior assessment, so that may alleviate that. There's some -- we'll see where the budget is at that time. And so, then the -- once the Board of Public Works determines the assessment amount, that will go on the winter taxes in 2022 in December, and

then the new project will start in the following year in 2023. So. That'll be the next steps.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right. Thank you, Theo.

At this point we're at the end of the meeting.  
Is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. PRATT: So moved.

MR. SCHMIDT: Is there support?

MS. SMITH: Support.

MR. SCHMIDT: All in favor?

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MR. PRATT: Aye.

MS. MACIEJEWSKI: Aye.

MS. ROOT: Aye.

MR. SCHMIDT: We're done. Thank you very much everyone.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:31 P.M.

STATE OF MICHIGAN     )  
COUNTY OF WASHTENAW )ss.

I certify that this transcript is a complete, true, and correct transcript to the best of my ability of the SPECIAL MEETING, SECOND PUBLIC HEARING, LOWER HURON RIVER CHAIN OF LAKES PROJECT, held Wednesday, July 20, 2022 at Dexter Township Hall, 6880 Dexter-Pinckney Road, Dexter, Michigan.

I also certify that I am not a relative or employee of the parties involved and have no financial interest in this matter.

DATED: August 1, 2022

S/ *Amy Shankleton-Novess*

---

Transcription provided by:

Amy Shankleton-Novess (CER 0838)

Modern Court Reporting & Video, L.L.C. 26

*Evan Pratt*

8/17/2022

---

Evan Pratt, Secretary