



**AGENDA**  
**Committee on Public Services**  
**Monday, October 24, 2016 @ 5:00 p.m.** (note day/time)  
**City Council Conference Room, City Hall 10<sup>th</sup> Floor**

Councilmember Kathie Dunbar, Chair  
Councilmember Patricia Spitzley, Vice Chair  
Councilmember Adam Hussain, Member

**1) Call to Order**

**2) Public Comment on Agenda Items**

**3) Minutes**

- August 5, 2016
- September 13, 2016
- September 16, 2016

**4) Discussion/Action:**

A.) RESOLUTION – Appointment Cynthia Paul; Potter Park Board; Term to Expire December 31, 2017

B.) RESOLUTION - Acceptance of Public Streets in College Fields Development Jones Property Development, LLC

**5) Adjourn**



**MINUTES**  
**Meeting of Committee on Public Service**  
**Friday, August 5, 2016 @ 2:00 p.m.**  
**Tenth Floor Conference Room – Lansing City Hall**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Councilmember Kathie Dunbar, Chair  
Councilmember Patricia Spitzley, Vice Chair  
Councilmember Adam Hussain, Member

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff  
Kathy Miles  
Jon Miles  
Jim Smiertka, City Attorney  
Scott Sanford, Code Compliance Officer  
Bob Johnson, Planning & Neighborhood Development Director  
Dulce Cardenas  
Paulette Carter-Scott  
Olivia Kaatz, Council Member Dunbar Intern

**MINUTES**

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER HUSSAIN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 20, 2016 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

**Introductions**

**Discussion/Action:**

**RESOLUTION – Board Appointment; Dulce Cardenas; 4<sup>th</sup> Ward Member Public Service Board; Term to Expire June 30, 2020**

The Committee reviewed the application. Council Member Dunbar inquired with Ms. Cardenas on her interest in the other committees listed on her application. Ms. Cardenas gave an overview of her education and future plans with a focus towards her recent degree and her interest in the Public Service Board. Ms. Cardenas inquired into what the Committee was looking for in a Board member for the Public Service Board. Council Member Hussain referenced some of the public boards he sat on and emphasized that a member should be accessible and open for discussion. Council Member Hussain then asked her how she had

## DRAFT MINUTES

found out about a vacancy, which she stated her communication with a neighborhood board member who suggested she apply. Council Member Spitzley spoke in support of the appointment. Council Member Dunbar outlined the Boards role and their recommendations to Committee, encouraging her to contact Council Members with any questions.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER HUSSAIN TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF DULCE CARDENAS AS THE 4<sup>TH</sup> WARD TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

### **RESOLUTION – Board Appointment; Paulette Carter-Scott; At-Large Member Park Board; Term to Expire June 30, 2020**

Council Member Dunbar asked Ms. Carter-Scott about the multiple boards listed on her application, and why the Parks Board. Ms. Carter-Scott acknowledged her great interest in history, and the other boards, however recently became involved in health and fitness, changing her interest in a Board now to include Parks. Ms. Carter-Scott went on to speak about visits to parks, City and Council and the amenities she wishes to encourage other residents to utilize. Council Member Dunbar encouraged Ms. Carter-Scott to attend neighborhood meetings to inquiry on their input and provide information to the residents.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER SPITZLEY TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF PAULETTE CARTER-SCOTT AS AT-LARGE MEMBER OF THE PARK BOARD. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

### **DISCUSSION – Glenburne Commons**

Council Member Dunbar gave a history on the area, referenced maps and feedback from the residents in the area to address the nuisance. Council Member Hussain added to the overview by stating his discussions with residents want it taken care of, but has not received any comments from them if they are willing to pay thru a special assessment. Council Member Spitzley acknowledged her conversations have brought forth responses that residents to not want to pay anything for upkeep, and some even believe it is a City park. Council Member Dunbar continued with the history on the property which was built in 1970 and platted as an association with collectible dues to address common areas and maintenance fees. This included an assessment to the association annually. It was unclear when this process and the association ceased to exist, but when it did they stopped collecting dues. Since 1970 until the current date, homes have sold and people are coming in to the research title which says they are part of a recorded association and they are responsible for dues and the area in question. At this time there is no one or association that is claiming responsibility of the dues, maintenance or assessments. In 2000 they agreed to a special assessment to pay the City to mow, however it did not cover the cost, because there were additional expenses to remove debris. This assessment was argued by the residents, Council did not want to do the assessment, and the Mayor pulled the assessment option. This then left it up to the association and homeowners to maintain.

The question before the Committee to review was how to rectify the dumping, overgrowth, and rodents. Options the Committee discussed were assessments, notifying the residents with copies of the recorded documents, covenants so they are bound by the recorded documents since 1972. Council Member Spitzley spoke in support of a letter to the resident but also encouraged a community meeting to explain to the homeowners. Council Member Dunbar did confirm that Council does have the authority to issue a special assessment for health and safety, but the recorded Association by-laws specially say they cannot be excluded even if your property does to touch the parcels in question.

## DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Smiertka confirmed the residents could initiate a special assessment, they could reconstitute the Association with a 2/3 vote, and amend the by-laws to change the rules. Council Member Spitzley asked if the Association is officially dysfunctional or just inactive. Mr. Smiertka confirmed his information that the corporation was dissolved in 1981, so it is an unincorporated association that is inactive. This leaves issues that owners could be liable for everything. Council Member Spitzley then asked if there was an entity that can act or assess to manage it. Mr. Smiertka stated it is not an active association anymore, the legal title is sold in terms of responsibility, and so the liability of the property is the owner. The quickest way to address this if there is not a majority for a receiver, then they appoint by the court. They will then have a receiver who would act as the association and do the assessment. Again this would involve the courts and notification to the residents to occur.

Mr. Johnson read the 1970 property certificate which stated in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, line 5 that say this is private property with pathways for everyone. The current assessment would be \$128.50 per lot today with current costs, and in 1970 it was \$39. The taxes were by paid by the homeowners and part of the assessment. Mr. Smiertka informed the Committee that in his historical search, they located 5 files. There have been prior special assessments; they have assessed individuals or vacant land effectively. Council Member Dunbar asked what would occur if the taxes were not collected. Mr. Smiertka confirmed they could place lien. Mr. Sanford stated that in 2003 they did a special assessment district, which pushed the expenses to 317 parcels. This resolution for a special assessment was passed every year till 2008. In 2005 starting cleaning up the trash. It was up to \$4500-\$4800 for clean up, then an additional \$7,500 for mowing.

Council Member Husain asked if the association is dissolved if the property would go back to the local government entity or a charity. Mr. Johnson stated it would not, and there are only 5 similar situations to this in the state.

Council Member Spitzley asked Mr. Sanford if they pick up the trash can they bill the residents. Mr. Sanford answered they could not because it is not a common area, there has to be something in so the City can bill. In addition it would be billed everyone, and cannot be done to a resolution. It cannot be donated or sold without a 2/3 vote of the association, and 2/3 does not even touch the area.

Mr. Smiertka's opinion was that the best way is to get the association to reactivate. Council Member Dunbar added that if the City petitions for the receiver the residents might not be happy, and asked if anyone wants to develop it, would it be possible. Mr. Smiertka confirmed it would require an amendment of the plat. Council Member Spitzley then asked if they could split and vacate to the adjoining properties, but it was confirmed that too would have to go back to the association to amend the plat with a 2/3 vote. To address the nuisance, it could be declared a public nuisance, and then do a special assessment to remedy. He stated again they could appoint a receiver.

Council Member Dunbar acknowledged the assessment would be a onetime thing, and so a receivership would be the only way to address. Mr. Sanford recommended a resolution similar to the one used in the past. Council Member Spitzley's opinion was not in support of a receivership, but would support a resolution as was done in the past.

Mr. Johnson informed the Committee that there were meetings in the past, and even telling the residents of the history of the site, plat and association, they still said they would not pay.

Council Member Dunbar suggested sending a letter to everyone giving them notice of the resolution of assessment. Mr. Johnson was asked to create and provide a powerpoint or presentation to explain everything to them, and create a link to the history so they can be

## DRAFT MINUTES

prepared for the meeting. The letter can state if they cannot attend the meeting or have no access to the internet they can obtain the documents from the PND office.

Mr. Johnson asked to point out that the City currently owns 5 parcels in the subdivisions, so they too would get assessed. The Lansing Housing Commission owns 50 sites.

Council Member Hussain supported moving forward with the meeting, but requested they address the current nuisance. Mr. Smiertka again stated a receivership would be good, but the process getting there is filing a law suit, serving them, and they will have to appear in court. Council Member Dunbar suggested offering a special assessment as an alternative.

Council Member Spitzley asked Mr. Sanford after the work is done, how is the assessment determined.

Ms. Carter-Scott asked if the residents will be notified before the resolution, and Council Member Dunbar outlined the process for an assessment. This begins with a letter for a notice of hearing, and any supporting documents on the website with a common link.

The Committee was encouraged to reach out to the neighborhoods to get on their next agendas for discussion and explain the options to them. Council Member Dunbar acknowledged she would set up a resident meeting, with Council Staff drafting the letter to the residents. The City Attorney, Code Compliance and the Planning & Neighborhood Development department will create the agenda. This will include proposing the options of assessment, receivership, or reconstitute the association. Council Member Dunbar acknowledged the meetings will run parallel with the special assessment resolution on the clean up. This begins with identifying the assessment district, then notify the residents. Once it is voted on and approved, then the estimated costs will be determined and the residents will be notified. After the work is actually done, then the actual amount of the cost will be adjusted. Lastly the final roll will be set.

After hearing all the options if the residents want to reactivate their association, their current documents of declaration state they will meet the 1<sup>st</sup> Monday of March, but with a % of the association they can call a special meeting.

Council Member Dunbar stated that Sinnaire and Diversified Title should also attend the meeting.

The Committee consensus to have the meeting at the end of August, with a letter sent 10 days before with a link to the information on the website.

Ms. Miles informed the Committee of recent verification of homeless residents at the former Metro Bowl site. Mr. Sanford recommended she contact the LPD when she witnesses issues at the site with unlocked doors and potential homeless residents on site.

### **DISCUSSION- Transportation Infrastructure**

Will be discussed at a future meeting.

### **OTHER**

#### **Lansing Board of Public Service Priorities**

Will be discussed at a future meeting.

### **Place on file**

#### **Communication from Laura Salzer; RE: Parks**

The Committee placed the document on file.

DRAFT MINUTES

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Submitted by, Sherrie Boak,

Recording Secretary

Lansing City Council

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_



**MINUTES**

**Meeting of Committee on Public Service  
Tuesday, September 13, 2016 @ 6:30p.m.  
Tenth Floor Conference Room – Lansing City Hall**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting called to order at 6:35 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Councilmember Kathie Dunbar, Chair  
Councilmember Patricia Spitzley, Vice Chair-excused  
Councilmember Adam Hussain, Member

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff  
Jim Smiertka, City Attorney  
Council Member Carol Wood  
Kathleen Ryan  
Vickie Puetz  
Bill Puetz  
Donald Ward  
Warren Bertram  
Jason Froebe  
John Gibbs  
Nathan Hartley  
Jerry Fox  
Millie Fox  
Jennet Francisco  
Kathy Miles  
Candance Melvin  
Ruth Thole  
Deb Brown  
Eliza Leggions  
Mildred Templeton  
Janice F Bell  
Ericka Covington  
Gloria Stong  
Steven Peck  
Marianna Greco  
Frances Verser

## DRAFT MINUTES

Ben Allen  
Arthur Roberts III  
Terry Black  
Neila Tillman  
Kathy Tobe  
Scott Allen  
Cindy Allen  
Elaine Womboldt  
Cheryl Croyle  
Amanda Moses  
Lawrence Pryor  
Gary Hartsuff  
Patty Hartsuff

### **Introductions**

#### **Discussion/Action:**

Council Member Dunbar recapped for the residents the process beginning with Francis Fin in 1970 when the development began, and when the subdivision was registered deed restrictions were placed on all their properties. Documents on the tables were referenced for all the residents. Council Member Dunbar then read the section from the Declaration, which stated “All references in these restrictions to a lot shall mean and include the lot together with all improvements thereon. The Proprietor desires to impose protective restrictions upon this Subdivision in order to insure its most beneficial development as a residential area, to prevent any use of the land which might tend to diminish its valuable or pleasurable enjoyments and to provide for maintenance and upkeep of the common areas to assure harmony, uniformity, attractiveness and utility of the project.” It was acknowledged by the Committee that over time properties could have sold and the new owners have not been informed of the covenants, which run with the land, no matter who owns the deed. Council Member Dunbar pointed out that there is also a statement that says if the residents didn’t pay the assessment to the association for maintenance for the Common areas they could foreclose on the property as the right under condo association. In the past there was a special assessment for the upkeep of the common area, and in 1970 it was \$37.50, but now it could be close to \$128.

A few residents noted they were the original owners and were involved when there was an association in the beginning. However the association dissolved in 1974 and any funds left with the President and Treasurer at the time.

Council Member Dunbar continued with the history of the development and the establishment of a Special Assessment in 2002, and at the time that one was set up for five (5) years, however there were issues that came up where there was so much dumping of debris, they could not mow without taking that stuff out. Neighbors starting dumping over the fences, so in 2008 when the assessment came up for renewal the City said they would have to add an additional \$20 to cover the cost of removal of debris, due to outcry from the neighborhood, the Mayor and Council decided the City would no longer take care of it or proceed with the special assessment.

A resident pointed out that when the City did mow, it was still over 9” tall cause they only used a brush hog and only mowed twice a year.

Residents asked for details on how the assessment would be divided amongst the residents. Council Member Dunbar clarified that it is based on the parcels, not on what is on the parcel. There re 322 parcels out there. The City cannot enforce or penalize, the Association owns the property. The association has to get a “rite of trespass” for violations, because it is owned by

## DRAFT MINUTES

all of them. Mr. Smiertka added that depending on what is being dumped it could be a civil or criminal complaint.

Council Member Dunbar then spoke about what the Association can do once it is re-establishes, such as collect dues , perform maintenance itself, create the special assessments and collect from everyone evenly. Currently the property is posing a health and safety violation, and it would be best for the association to come up with a proactive way to approach the situation.

A resident then asked how the association is supposed to collect, and Council Member Dunbar again stated the option of reconstituting the association, but the residents also noted the frustration when residents won't pay, therefore they are looking for the City to maintain. Mr. Smiertka informed that the residents should put together their association, and the current By-Law state they have an annual meeting every March, at which time they would need 25% of the association to call the meeting, and change the By Laws.

Council Member Wood asked if as an association they could sell the commons area. MR. Smiertka stated there is a provision in the covenants that states they cannot sell, and no option for conveyance except for public utilities. The residents then asked if it could be donated, and Committee noted that would require a willing recipient. The question then was asked if they could sell to a neighbor, however the issue then becomes increased taxes and assessment for the buyer because they have more land. Any option for building on it was removed also because there is no road access, and it would be added cost to the association for engineering. In the case of a resident not paying, Mr. Smiertka noted that according to the By Laws, there is provision that states the association can place a lien on the property.

The Committee and residents began the discussion on cost, and removal of debris. Council Member Dunbar referenced an email she had received from Code Compliance and stated it would be an estimated cost of \$15,000 a year, with roughly \$46 per property. This assessment would appear on the winter bill, and the City would mow more than once per year, but the Committee could not speak specifically to how many per year.

The resident at 4307 Old Castle informed the Committee that her back yard always has standing water so she is looking for assistance during this process to have that area built up so it does not continue to flood. It appears there is a ditch that runs 5' past her fence.

The residents asked what happen if 20% decide to dissolve the association. Council Member Dunbar confirmed they could dissolve the entity but can't remove the deed restrictions. Mr. Smiertka confirmed the association is set up in the declaration, so it is an entity.

Mr. Hartley spoke in support in having the assessment done and the City maintaining the property. He did note for the Committee that currently all the access points to the property are either partially blocked or completely blocked.

Council Member Dunbar reminded the residents that if they have anything on the common area, not their property, it will have to be removed or it will be taken during the cleanup. Any trees would be considered plants and natural to the common area.

The residents held quick discussions on what they could do with the property once it is cleaned up and mowed. Those ideas included a natural area, trails, gardens, etc.

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Pegic asked if the City can collect the assessment and give the funds to the association to maintain. Council Member Dunbar clarified for the group that once the City collects the assessment in the taxes, they have to allocate the funds.

Council Member Dunbar outlined what the next steps would be, which included the need of 20% of the association to say they want a special assessment again, then call a meeting of the Committee on Public Service. She noted that currently the City and Lansing Housing Commission have enough parcels to have the percentage to choose to have the Special Assessment. Council Member Dunbar stated that based on information she was provided by Code Compliance, the fee for this assessment would be \$46 for a full year of mowing.

A resident asked what a City standard for mowing is; is it twice a month; and does it need to be mowed to 3 inches. There was also a question on the location of fencing and maintenance up to the fence on both sides. Council Member Dunbar confirmed that a fence should be located within 6 inches of the property line, but the City will have to deal with issues of items in common area and structures on property lines once the lines are determined. Therefore, it was noted to the residents that a survey will have to be part of the assessment costs.

Mr. Smiertka noted that the association can, with ownership described, get the required percentage to make the association active again.

A resident asked if the common area, once cleaned and mowed, could be a community garden. Council Member Dunbar noted that would require the association to make the decision, it is private property.

The resident at 4013 Heathgate noted for the record that there are three (3) large holes behind her property that need to be checked.

A resident asked if there could be signs for no dumping and trespassing placed after it is cleaned up and mowed. Council Member Dunbar stated there could be, but it is the association property so they would have to perform and pay for that task. She did note that the Council Members have expense accounts they might be able to utilize to assist with that. If a sign is placed, then when they witness someone dumping, they can call the police and say there is a violation for dumping, there is a sign.

The resident at 4219 Killarney noted there is a black wiring located in the common area behind his house that Code should be aware of.

A resident asked for direction on getting the standing water behind her property taken care of. Council Member Dunbar assured that too will be looked at during the cleanup and could require the County to review for a potential drain, but if fill dirt is required that could be an added cost to the association.

A resident asked the Committee to provide information on how many homes are rented and how many are owned. Council Member Dunbar would research that however noted that whether they are rentals or not, they will still be in the association.

Mr. Hartley invited all the residents to the next neighborhood meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday of the month at Woodcreek.

Council Member Dunbar asked Mr. Smiertka about the legal liability of the area. Mr. Smiertka stated the association would want to form a corporation to protect their liability.

DRAFT MINUTES

Council Member Dunbar stated that the documents on the tables can be forwarded via email to everyone present along with the By Laws for their neighborhood meeting. A survey of the property can also be provided to the Neighborhood association so the residents can note on a plan where obstacles are, and access points are blocked.

Council Member Dunbar outlined the special assessment process which will begin with identifying the issues, then notifying the residents of a public hearing at Council and providing a tentative roll, then phase 3 is the actual work. A final special assessment roll will be done based on the cost of the work performed.

A resident asked if the estimate of \$15,000 was for one time only, and Council Member Dunbar noted her understanding was that it was for the season, which she was not sure how many mowings that involved.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Submitted by, Sherrie Boak,

Recording Secretary

Lansing City Council

Approved:\_\_\_\_\_



**MINUTES**

**Meeting of Committee on Public Service  
Friday, September 16, 2016 @ 3:00 p.m.  
City Hall, Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Councilmember Kathie Dunbar, Chair  
Councilmember Patricia Spitzley, Vice Chair  
Councilmember Adam Hussain, Member

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff  
Chief Yankowski, arrived at 3:16 p.m.  
Eric Ripper  
Scott Sanford, Code Compliance  
Mark Dotson, Deputy City Attorney

**Discussion/Action:**

Council Member Dunbar referenced and outlined the 2004 Resolution as the template. The new resolution would reflect the recent public involvement to proceed. The first three paragraphs were added to reflect that “each property owner in the Glenburne Subdivision, by accepting a deed to property within the Subdivision, is, per the Declarations of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions filed with Eaton County” is a member of the association. It also now reflects that the members of the association jointly “own and are collectively responsible for the maintenance of an 11 acre green space” known as Glenburne Commons.

The Committee reviewed page two of the resolution, beginning with the fist “Be it Further Resolved”, making the change that would now state “the properties which are responsible per the Declarations of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions as follows”, removing “ are especially benefited”. The mowing season dates will be July 2016 to June 2017, and it will not be renewed annually, but will now say “reviewed and adjusted annually”.

Council Member Dunbar pointed out to the group that at the meeting on September 13, 2016 the residents wanted a site plan done to denote the actual property lines. Mr. Sanford stated it was not the City’s responsibility, but the home owners association. Council Member Dunbar reminded Mr. Sanford that the association has no mechanism in place to perform or pay for that, so what would that increase the cost of the assessment to. Mr. Sanford stated it could increase up to \$3,000. Council Member Spitzley suggested adding “Be it Further Resolved,

DRAFT MINUTES

an initial survey to determine the property lines and boundaries will be performed and that cost will be paid for by the residents.” Council Member Dunbar stated she would reach out to Mr. Johnson on the survey costs, and report back to Council staff to place in the resolution.

Council Member Spitzley asked about the process for any encroachments into the common area from the residents. Council Member Dunbar confirmed if there is an encroachment it goes to the homeowners association, and they will have a survey to enforce.

The Committee questioned if the association could reconstitute, and if they did if they could come to the police for legal enforcement based on the By Laws. Chief Yankowski stated it would still be difficult because in the case of abandoned vehicles it is the property owner responsibility to call a wrecker to tow the vehicle. The LPD handles private property different then public property. Council Member Dunbar asked about trespassing in the Commons area with quads and dirt bikes, and the Chief noted that quads are not allowed in the City anyways, so when residents see them anywhere they should contact the Police. The Chief did reiterate LPD will be limited because the property belongs to the homeowners association. Council Member Dunbar asked Mr. Sanford to documents all the items that they find when they clean the site and do special assessment spreadsheet.

Chief Yankowski asked Mr. Dotson if the property is still determined to be private, and it was confirmed. Council Member Hussain asked what steps the Committee could take to put the residents in contact with an attorney because the Committee cannot do the process for them. Council Member Dunbar and Spitzley offered the suggestion of the free legal housing assistance from MSU College of Law.

Mr. Sanford wanted it noted that the City does own parcels in Glenburne and will have a vote in any decision, however is exempt from taxes. Council Member Dunbar then asked if the resolution should include something on tax exempt parcels, she also noted another meeting will be scheduled in the future with the association. Chief Yankowski reminded the Committee that there is a similar situation in the City at Hunters Ridge, where they have an association; however have no funds to take enforcement action on the violations.

**MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER SPITZLEY TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION WITH THE COMMITTEE CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Submitted by, Sherrie Boak,

Recording Secretary

Lansing City Council

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 05/05/2016

Full name: \*: Cynthia A Paul

Other name(s) by  
which you have  
been known,  
including maiden  
names: :

Date of Birth\*: 04/21/1965

Address\*: 922 Durant  
Lansing, MI 48915

Email\*: [cpaul98388@aol.com](mailto:cpaul98388@aol.com)

Gender\*: Female

Ward (1,2,3,4 or  
Regional)\*: 1

Precinct::

Best number to  
contact you: \*: 517-281-4731

Last four digits of  
Social Security #:  
\*:

In what year did  
you move to  
Lansing?\*: 1997

Additional

information regarding experience and credentials: :

Occupational Background: :

Educational Background: :

Please attach a resume if available: : [insresume.docx](#)

First choice for board to serve on: \* Income Tax Board of Review

Second choice of a board to serve on: : Human Relations and Community Services Board (HRCS)

Third choice of a board to serve on: : Planning Board

Fourth choice of a board to serve on:: Saginaw St. Coordinator Improvement Authority

Please comment briefly on why you wish to serve on a particular board or commission. Please be specific

as to your goals  
and ideas about  
how you wish to  
contribute to the  
work of the board  
or commission: :

**Qualifications  
and Eligibility – At  
this time, if you  
do not meet one  
or more of the  
qualifications or  
eligibility  
requirements  
listed at the top,  
please state here  
the requirement  
to be met and  
explain how you  
will be qualified  
or eligible before  
you would be  
sworn in to an  
appointed office::**

**Please type your  
name in this box  
to signify that you  
can serve on a  
board or  
commission and  
the information  
in this application  
is accurate to the  
best of your  
knowledge. \*:**

Cynthia A. Paul

**Date Time :** 05/05/2016

**Consent and  
Certification:**

I agree

BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE  
RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANSING

WHEREAS, the Mayor made the appointment of Cynthia Paul of 915 Durant Street in Lansing, MI, 48915, as a City of Lansing Representative to the Potter Park Zoo Board for a term to expire December 31, 2017.

WHEREAS, The nominee has been vetted and meets the qualifications as required by the City Charter;

WHEREAS, the Public Service Committee met on Monday, October 24, 2016 and took affirmative action;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Lansing City Council, hereby, confirms the appointment of Cynthia Paul of 915 Durant Street in Lansing, MI, 48915, as a City of Lansing Representative to the Potter Park Zoo Board for a term to expire December 31, 2017.



**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

9th Floor, City Hall  
124 W. Michigan Avenue  
Lansing, Michigan 48933-1694  
(517) 483-4141 (voice)  
(517) 483-4479 (TDD)  
(517) 483-6066 (Fax)

Virg Bernero, Mayor

TO: City Council President Judi Brown Clarke and Councilmembers

FROM: Mayor Virg Bernero

DATE: 9-21-16

RE: Resolution— Acceptance of Public Streets in College Fields Development—  
Jones Property Development, LLC

---

The attached correspondence is forwarded for your review and appropriate action.

VB/rh  
Attachment



Virg Bernero, Mayor

**City of Lansing**  
**Inter-Departmental**  
**Memorandum**



To: Virg Bernero, Mayor

From: Chad A. Gamble, P.E., Director of Public Service

Subject: CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM – Acceptance of Public Streets in College Fields Development

Date: September 21, 2016

---

Please forward this resolution to City Council for placement on the Agenda.

If you have any questions, or need additional information, please give me a call.

**Attachments**

BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE  
RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANSING

WHEREAS, Jones Property Development, LLC, owner and developer of the College Fields Project in the City of Lansing, Meridian Township PA 425 area, has constructed and completed the roadways and public improvements for this phase of the overall development, the Vista at College Fields Phase VI, in accordance with, and as provided for, in the City approved site plan for this condominium project; and

WHEREAS, the developer has provided the City, through KEBS, Inc.'s licensed surveyors, with legal descriptions and depiction drawings for the roadways and public improvements "as built"; and

WHEREAS, the City's Public Service Department has overseen construction of the roadways and public improvements therein and has reviewed the legal descriptions in the warranty deeds that transfer to the City the roads and public improvements for ownership, operation and maintenance; and

WHEREAS, the warranty deeds for the roadways in the condominium project named Carnoustie Drive (i.e., the new west section of this roadway) and Ballybunion Way have been placed on file with the City Clerk on October 20, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan Department of Transportation requires that the City accept public streets by their centerline descriptions in order that the streets may be added to the Public Act 51 Street System for state revenue to local units of government purposes; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council approves City acceptance of the warranty deeds for the roads named Carnoustie Drive and Ballybunion Way located in the College Fields Condominium and Condominium Subdivision Plan project, with the legal descriptions annexed thereto as contained in Attachment A, and as filed, October 20, 2016, in the office of the City Clerk and granted by Jones Property Development, LLC, subject to the City Attorney's approval of evidence of clear marketable title.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the streets within the College Fields Development, with centerlines described herein are public streets for public street purposes located within the City of Lansing's right-of-way, under the control of the City of Lansing, open to the public before December 31, 2016, and are to be added to the Act 51 street system to accurately reflect their use as public streets.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the information above be submitted to the Michigan Department of Transportation for updates to the City's Act 51 street system.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the City Clerk is requested to record the unrecorded warranty deeds for the roads with the Ingham County Register of Deeds.

## ATTACHMENT A

### Carnoustie Drive – centerline description:

Commencing at the North 1/4 corner of said Section 32; thence S89°52'06"W along the North line of said Section 32 a distance of 720.80 feet; thence S00°07'54"E perpendicular to said North line 335.43 feet; thence S14°10'28"W 191.14 feet; thence S75°49'32"E 20.00 feet; thence S04°38'33"W 30.42 feet to the point of beginning of this centerline description; thence along said centerline the following six courses: N75°49'34"W 175.83 feet to Point "A", N75°49'34"W 102.09 feet, Southwesterly 272.94 feet along a curve to the left, said curve having a radius of 294.28 feet, a delta angle of 53°08'30", and a chord length of 263.26 feet bearing S78°14'55"W, Southwesterly 30.50 feet along a curve to the left, said curve having a radius of 213.50 feet, a delta angle of 8°11'06", and a chord length of 30.47 feet bearing S47°35'07"W, Southwesterly 299.91 feet along a curve to the left, said curve having a radius of 319.50 feet, a delta angle of 53°46'56", and a chord length of 289.02 feet bearing S16°36'06"W and S10°17'22"E 112.67 feet to the point of ending.

Total length of centerline - 993.94 feet

### Ballybunion Way – centerline description:

Commencing at the aforementioned Point "A"; thence along said centerline the following five courses: S14°10'28"W 101.67 feet, Southwesterly 158.35 feet along a curve to the right, said curve having a radius of 175.00 feet, a delta angle of 51°50'39", and a chord length of 153.00 feet bearing S40°05'47"W, S66°01'07"W 220.51 feet, Southwesterly 72.85 feet along a curve to the right, said curve having a radius of 175.00 feet, a delta angle of 23°50'59", and a chord length of 72.32 feet bearing S77°56'36"W and S89°52'06"W 67.13 feet to the point of ending.

Total length of centerline - 620.51 feet