

**VILLAGE OF FRANKLIN**  
**VILLAGE COUNCIL**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**August 6, 2013**  
**6:30 PM**  
AT THE VILLAGE HALL  
32325 Franklin Road, Franklin, Michigan

**WORKSHOP**

Pam Hanson, President Pro-Tem called the meeting to order at 6:30PM.

Present: Brian Gordon, Pam Hansen, Judy Moenck, Ed Saenz, Mike Seltzer  
Absent: Jim Kochensparger, Tom Morrow  
Also Present: Eileen Pulker, Clerk; Amy Sullivan, Administrator; Lance Vainik,  
Treasurer; John D. Staran, Attorney

**Motion by Seltzer, supported by Moenck, to excuse Jim Kochensparger and Tom Morrow from the meeting.**

**Motion was approved unanimously.**

**Pathways Discussion**

Amy Sullivan summarized the financial materials she had sent the Council Members, explaining specific figures. An historical background of the future financial environment was highlighted. Timing and strategies for a Village-wide vote were discussed.

Reference was made to the Franklin Community Association letter sent to the Council concerning Villagers' desire to have pathways within the Village.

There was a discussion as to the circumstances which might have contributed to the prior millage being so soundly defeated.

Pam Hansen and Mary Hepler, Rosemond Dr., both Planning Commission members at the time of the previous vote on pathways, shared their involvement and experiences leading up to the millage increase vote. Hepler gave her opinion as to why the issue was defeated and shared some of her insights going forward.

Mira Stakhiv, Crestwood Dr., expressed her belief that the high cost contributed to the defeat, as did the fear of change. She pointed out that the demographics of the Village have changed to younger families which might be more receptive to pathways and supported Mary's idea of providing the villagers with advance notices of the subject, thus ferreting out the negative opinions which could be resolved before the actual vote.

Suzanne McClow, Franklin Rd., opined that the scope of the project in the last proposal had been large, the entire Village at once and the material chosen, colored concrete, was the most expensive option.

Seltzer remarked that perception is very important.

Staran suggested that the Council refer this to the Planning Commission as part of the Master Plan discussions.

Saenz stated that he is not in favor of such a proposal. He believes that the subject of “pathways” stands alone and should not be connected with the Master Plan which could take up to a year for Council approval. Saenz noted that he thinks it should be done sooner than later adding that there is no need to give it to the PC. The VC can do it alone because it knows “... what the right thing to do is.”

Discussion ensued about setting priorities within the project and breaking down the Project into phases.

Hansen opined that she would like to give the PC the issue of “Pathways”. The PC has the process in place and the process shouldn’t be as drawn out as the first time because there is already good data and analysis. PC can do the work and give it back to the VC in advance of the Master Plan.

Hansen stated that there isn’t enough information adding that she would want to know more about the costs, timelines, options for financing, and Villagers’ opinions. She suggested putting a survey on FocusFranklin.com.

Suzanne McCloy stated that she is concerned about the path material and also feels it should be part of the Master Plan.

Mike Seltzer left at 7:30 PM.

Staran suggested that if the VC assigns this issue to the PC, it can identify the nature and strength of any objections or concerns; make recommendations as to the routing, the phasing, and the characteristics of the path itself, such as, color, material, width. Then come back to the VC separately or in conjunction with the Master Plan process. The timeline would be part of this.

Mira Stakhiv suggested that since the VC meetings are televised, the subject of “pathways” and the request for resident input should be brought up during the next meeting.

Gordon suggested that the subject be put on the agenda of next week’s Council Meeting and have a conversation about it with the goal of moving it on to PC with certain directives or taking some action at the Council level separate from moving it on to the PC.

Utilizing the Focus Franklin website, Sullivan composed 4 questions: 1. Prioritize the routes the residents would want; 2. Prioritize what materials residents would want; 3. Ask residents for any objections; 4. Does the resident’s opinion change when told that there would be a deficit in 2 years and a road rehab project probably needed in 5-10 years?

**Motion by Gordon, supported by Moenck to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 PM**  
**Motion passed unanimously.**

Submitted,

---

Gail Beke, Recording Secretary

---

Eileen H. Pulker, Clerk

---

Pamela Hansen, President Pro Tem