

**Bear Creek Township Special Meeting  
October 18, 2021- Zoom/In-Person Hybrid Mtg**

- I. Time: 3:30p.m.
- II. Roll Call: Hoffman, Keiser, Radatovich (participating remotely from Bear Creek Township, MI), Urman (participating remotely from Bear Creek Township, MI), Golding (participating remotely from Bear Creek Township, MI)
  - a. Others Present: Robert Bendzinski, Stephen Hayduk, Al Welsheimer
- III. Funding Options for Click Rd Fire Station
  - a. Keiser shared that the purpose of the meeting is to hear from potential bond counsel. The project on the table is the potential new fire hall and voting location. At this point, we are not sure what the cost will be. The township has hired an architect to design the building and give a cost estimate.
  - b. Bobby Bendzinski shared that there are two types of bonds the township can use to pay for the new fire hall. The first is an issuance of general obligation bonds that would require a vote. There are also limited tax bonds, which would not require a vote. Voted bonds create the lowest interest and allows the township to levy the money needed. In this situation, the township board would approve a resolution and ballot language, which would need to be delivered to the county clerk by August 16, 2022. This ballot language would include a brief description of what the bond would be spent on, as well as the first year's levy and the average levy over the time span. If the ballot proposal passed in the election, we would then get construction bids. However, you can only spend the bond proceeds on the project, and you cannot get more money than was in the ballot language. If the township were to choose the non-voted bond option, we would have to go through a 45-day referendum period. The resolution would be posted in the paper and there would be a 45-day period in which 10% of voters could sign a petition to abandon the project.
  - c. Keiser stated that he would like the township to use the voted bond if possible. Bendzinski clarified that this would allow the township to levy the tax to meet the payment. If the taxable value decreases, you would increase the levy, and vice versa. Urman agrees that the voted bond seems to be the better option.
  - d. Keiser asked if you can include the equipment cost if needed. He also asked if the upfront costs would be reimbursable. Bendzinski shared that there is a reimbursement resolution that the township will need to pass. Hard costs are reimbursable in this agreement. He shared information about his firm.
  - e. Welsheimer noted that we should have our cost estimate back from the architect by February at the latest. Bendzinski noted that we will have to ensure that the cost estimate is sufficient, because if that is the number that is voted on in November, we will not get construction bids until February 2023 at the earliest. Bendzinski noted that Miller Canfield can help the township draft the proper resolution and ballot language.
  - f. Hoffman noted that we have some money saved in the fire fund. If the estimate came back and the cost ended up being a bit higher, this earmarked money could help cushion that.
  - g. Bendzinski clarified that this is not a millage, this is a bond issue. He shared draft language similar to what the ballot could read. This proposal would be to levy tax to meet the debt service obligations on bonds. Hayduk noted that the township would have to calculate each year what we would need to levy. The ballot language is just an estimate. The amount will vary every year, but Hayduk can help us with an estimate of what the amounts would be.
  - h. Keiser clarified that this will not change the taxable value of someone's property.
  - i. Bendzinski noted that the firm will not be compensated until the bonds are sold and delivered. He will be sending more information to Urman about this project.
- IV. Adjournment: 4:04pm

Respectfully Submitted,

*Emma Radatovich*

Emma Radatovich, BCT Clerk