June 27, 1979

The Marquette County Board of Commissioners met as a Committee of the Whole on June 27, 1979 at 7:00 p.m. in the Courthouse Annex.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson May and roll call was held by Joy Schlesis, Deputy County Clerk, with the following roll recorded.


Absent: Comm. Coombs.

Approval of the agenda was given by the general consensus of the board.

Chairperson May opened the meeting for public comment, none was forthcoming and Chairperson May declared the public comment section closed.

Chairperson announced the opening of a Public Hearing on Economic Development Corporation applications. A communication from Daniel Pearce, John Wilser and Peter Schumer requesting that the County of Marquette, act as the governing body in forming an Economic Development Corporation for the county, was read.

Mr. Pearce was in attendance to answer any questions. Comm. Anderson questioned Mr. Pearce on the terms of office of an EDC board. The board shall consist of (9) nine persons, appointed by the Chairperson of Marquette County Board of Commissioners, with the advice & consent of the board, as provided in Act 338 Public Acts of Mich. 1974 as amended. They shall be appointed for terms of six(6) years, except the first ones appointed; at that time 4 shall be appointed for 6 years, 1 for 5 years, 1 for 4 years, 1 for 3 years, 1 for 2 years and 1 for 1 year. Mr. Pearce explained the function of the EDC. He said there is no liability on the part of the county and no cost if done properly.

Thomas Salka, Atty. was present and gave the legality of this endeavor. He stated that if this resolution would be enacted and the Resolution and Articles of Incorporation sent in it would be just the beginning, there would then have to be another hearing and it would get a good deal more complex in the terms of notices that have to be given for purposes of that plan, which would entail a good deal of staff time.

Mr. Pearce commented that an Economic Development Corp. can be established without having a project. It could be established for future applications and just sit dormant until such time the board would receive the first application. The board would not meet until that time.

When a proposed application would be received for EDC, a public hearing must be held with the county board and also with the unit of government in which the project is to take place.

This Corporation would be only a vehicle through which the financing is arranged, the project has to find its own money. It has to sell its own bonds or go to its own bank etc; The responsibility for repayment is the project itself, not the county or the EDC. If an application is approved by the EDC the interest earned by the sponsoring financial institution is tax free. That is the advantage to the lender, by making funds available to the applicant that might not otherwise be available.

After discussion it was moved by Comm. Chestham, supported by Comm. Steele and carried to refer this item back to the Executive Committee meeting on July 9, 1979, for recommendation to the board at their regular meeting on July 11, 1979. Comm. Racine asked to have it placed first on the agenda for the Executive Committee meeting.

John Robertson, from the Dept. of Natural Resources, was present to discuss the DN R's revised hunting and fishing licenses fee schedule proposal. Mr. Robertson reviewed all the benefits derived from the license fees. He stated that in the new license fee proposal there is no revenue to be generated by the fee increase which would go to any kind of program expansion. The amount of increase in monies would allow them to just hold the line.
Mr. Robertson gave a few statistics on where the money for license
fees is being used, such as approximately one million acres of land
now under State ownership has been purchased by hunters and fisher-ans
money and over a thousand boating access sites are located in the state.
Mr. Robertson stated the game and fishing protection fund is made up
of license fees and it is now in a depleted state. He commented that
there are many who use state lands besides the hunter and fisherman,
that do not help financially towards it, such as campers, snowmobiles,
cross country skiers, trail bikers etc.
The original plan met with resistance throughout the State, so they
invited new ideas suggesting better ideas. All persons who wrote and
commented received an acknowledgment.
The new proposed fees were reviewed and some are as follows:

| Sportsmen Fee (limited to 3 basics- deer, sm.game & fish) $22.00 |
| Small Game | 6.50 |
| Res.Deer | -10.00 |
| Res.Bear | -10.00 |
| Fish | 6.50 (Spouse 1.50 at same time) |
| Non-Res. Deer and Bear | $50.00 |
| Non-Res. Sm.Game | -35.00 |

Mr. Robertson informed the board that approximately $206,000,000
is received yearly for Deer license etc and approx. $200,000,000 for
fishing. Commissioners questioned Mr. Robertson in reference to
other means of a tax such as the use of State lands by others then
hunters and fisherman.
Comm. Leone thought there should be more concentration on small rivers
and streams.
Chairperson Ney then thanked Mr. Robertson for addressing the board.

A memorandum from Duane Beard, Controller, regarding the Capital
Projects Priority List for fiscal year 1980 budget, was read. Mr.
Beard suggested four alternative procedures which could be used to
develop a rank numerical order of the top 20 projects. A motion was
made by Comm. Cheatham, supported by Comm. Lowe and carried to move
the Capital Projects priority list from the table for discussion.
After a short discussion, it was moved by Comm. Lowe, supported by Comm.
Cheatham and carried to proceed to procedure #4. Comm. Farrell voted Nay.

After discussion, it was moved by Comm. Farrell, supported by Comm.
Judici and carried to accept the proposed priorities in the three
categories as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Lo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>13 - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following procedure #4 the projects were then listed in ascending order.
Taken from the project review forms, there were several projects listed
in like rank number. There were two #8, (Storm windows-Acoks and Air-
port Snow removal Equipment). It was moved by Comm. Lowe, supported by
Comm. Leone and carried that Storm windows-Acoks be #8 and Airport Snow
There were also ties with #17. It was moved by Comm. Anderson, supported
by Comm. Farrell and carried that Communications Systems Addition be made
#17 and Micrographics #18.

It was then moved by Comm. Farrell, supported by Comm. Lowe and carried
to adopt the following order of priority list for the Capital Projects
for fiscal year 1980.

1. Courthouse Renovation in Total
2. Courthouse Heating
3. Steam Header Connector
4. Modify Boiler Feed pump
5. Replace Courthouse Doors
6. Airport Terminal Door Modification
7. Fire & Smoke Alarm- Crt.Hae./Jail complex
8. Storm Windows-Acoks
9. Airport Snow Removal Equipment
10. Youth Home Energy Costs
11. Marble Scagliata Colma
12. Flat Cabinet
13. Washing Machine-Jail
16. Acoks-Well Pump
18. Micrographics
19. Acoks - seven beds
20. Acoks-Truck w/4 way plow
Chairperson May called for a closed session for item #8, next on the agenda. So persons in attendance would not be asked to wait while the board went into closed session, the remaining items were taken up first.

Comm. Farrell reported on the Government Study Committee "Board Policy on Appointments to County Boards/Commissions". The printed report showed the advantages and disadvantages of not having an Elected County Commissioner sit on various boards or commissions during their term of office. Comm. Farrell stated that as a follow up if this went to the board for approval, there would be a follow-up recommendation to have rotating liaison with these Boards and Commissions by the Board of Commissioners for a six month period. There was discussion with some opposition to the recommendation. The feeling that 6 months as a liaison person to these boards is not enough time.

Comm. Lowe commented on the possibility of holding a meeting with our legislators, on subjects of mutual concern and interest. Comm. Farrell suggested contacting a few of them to decide what subjects could be discussed and to draw up a tentative agenda, so there would be a definite purpose to the meeting. Atty. Thomas Solke, informed the board that according to the open meetings act this would have to be posted even if it just states for instance "A breakfast meeting will be held on etc."

It was moved by Comm. Racine, supported by Comm. Anderson and carried to dispense with items #11 and 12 as the time was late, and proceed to item #8.

It was moved by Comm. Racine, supported by Comm. Juidici and unanimously carried by a roll call vote to go into closed session.

----------------------------------
CLOSED SESSION
----------------------------------

It was moved by Comm. Farrell, supported by Comm. Steele and carried to refer the matter of a possible acquisition of property back to the Environment, Lands and Buildings Committee to hold for possible consideration at a later time.

A discussion was held on the parking problem. It was suggested a possible assigning of lots to employees to make better use of the lots further from the courthouse.

Comm. Racine brought up the subject of a letter given to the Airforce by the DAR at a hearing recently. It was moved by Comm. Racine, supported by Comm. Farrell and carried to refer this matter to the Chair for investigation and to possibly get a copy of it.

No one was in attendance at this time for public comment.

There being no further business to come before the board, it was moved by Comm. Racine, supported by Comm. Krook and carried that the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Joy Schlaus
Dep. County Clerk
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1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll call by the Clerk.
3. Approval of the agenda.
4. Public Comment.
6. John Robertson, DNR, will be present to discuss the DNR’s revised hunting and fishing licenses fee schedule proposal.
7. Rank Capital Improvements Projects. Memo from the Controller on this topic.
8. Discuss the acquisition or lease of property by the County. Referred by the Environment, Lands and Buildings Committee. Information on this topic has been submitted to each Board member by the Controller.
9. Discuss the Government Study Committee’s proposed changes to the Board’s appointments policy.
10. Discuss holding a meeting with our legislators on subjects of mutual concern and interest. When and where should the meeting be held?
11. Progress toward objectives/Standing Committee Reports:
   a. Executive Committee
   b. Personnel Committee
   c. Environment, Lands and Buildings Committee
   d. Finance Committee
   e. Intergovernmental Relations Committee
12. Others:
   a. Board of County Institutions
   b. County Planning Commission
   c. County Commission on Aging
   d. County Board of Health
   e. EPTA Consortium
   g. CUPPAD Criminal Justice Committee
   h. Region XI Area Agency on Aging
   i. RC&D Council
   j. County-Wide Property Tax Reform Committee
   k. Central Dispatch Committee
   l. OEDP Committee
   m. Marquette/Marquette Twp./Chocolay Twp. Sewage Plant Board
   n. County Solid Resource Recovery Implementation Committee
   o. UPTRA
   p. MAC Committees
15. Public Comment.