

From: [Howard Fink](#)
To: [Matt Levandoski](#)
Cc: [Jerry Hunsburger](#)
Subject: Cooper Van Wieren
Date: Friday, April 10, 2020 10:22:00 AM

Hi Matt,

Just got off the phone with Jane Clark from the Chamber of Commerce. As you may know, they own (have a reverter clause) on the triangle piece of property to the north. For the meantime, we need to hold off on the construction of the bike path from 152nd to Perry. She is fine with the runway coming out on their section of property.

Please proceed with the runway and path along Ottawa beach but ask the contractor to hold off on the one from 152nd. Other than quantity amounts, please let me know if this changes the pricing model.

Howard

Howard Fink

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Denise Nestel](#)
To: [Jerry Hunsburger \(Archive\)](#); [Daniel Martin](#)
Cc: [Howard Fink](#); dnestel@outlook.com
Subject: Fw: Quick Update
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 8:42:02 AM

I just received and read Jerry Barman's email to the Board regarding the Notice of Eviction. Barman's email needs to be addressed immediately.

Manager's previous "quick update" states "Please see this as a mini – managers' report, particular on the Airport" and concludes with **his** decision that **he** will take, unless the Board promptly "objects"

On receiving the "quick update" I promptly asked for legal review before an action was taken by Manager. This email is more than a "request". It is an objection by a Trustee.

While Barman's email was received following the "quick update", it appears that Manager had already acted before "updating" the Board. The statement that Manager's actions were "consistent" the Board's "decision" is not true. It cannot be true because the Board was never apprised of these facts.

Manager makes several significant statements in the "quick update." The statements are highlighted in yellow (by me) below and include:

"We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). "

"Given the boards previous decisions",

"This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days. "

NOW, I ask the Supervisor and legal counsel to reread Jerry Barman's letter to the Board re EVICTION NOTICE. Barman's email to the Board makes several legitimate points.

Did Manager forget that the Governor continues to issue emergency restrictions on movement?
Wouldn't anybody with common sense see that Barman's comments are reasonable?

What if Park Township is sued for "wrongful eviction"?

What if Barman's letter finds it's way to the Holland Sentinel?

What if publishing Barman's letter causes all the other disgruntled and aggrieved residents to write letters complaining of Park Township's "unreasonable decisions" and its intractable Manager?

What if Barman's letter goes viral on the internet?

This issue needs immediate attention (and for that matter, so does the Reserve's breach of the PUD). Manager is wrong in taking these actions. This needs to be stopped and a suitable resolution negotiated. AND, it is the Board's right to be informed of the negotiations and to vote BEFORE action is taken. Not, as in this case, after the fact.

I expect to receive confirmation from Supervisor and legal counsel that this issue will be rectified and/or that the Board will be provided the opportunity to address and rectify the issue.

Denise Nestel

From: Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 6:54 AM

To: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Daniel Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Subject: Fw: Quick Update

This Township and particularly this Manager needs to slow down.

1) I read Jerry Barman's

From: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:34 PM

To: Board Archive <board.archive@parktownship.org>; Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>; George Jacob <gjacob@parktownship.org>; Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>; Jan Steggerda <jsteggerda@parktownship.org>; Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Jim Gerard <jgerard@parktownship.org>; Julie Northrup <jnorthrup@parktownship.org>; Skip Keeter <ekeeter@parktownship.org>; Steve Spoelhof <sspoelhof@parktownship.org>

Cc: Dan Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Subject: Quick Update

Hi Everyone,

Please see this as a mini – managers' report, particular on the Airport.

- 1) Regarding the vote at the last board meeting, there is one item which we all missed (thank you Jerry for calling it to my attention). The vote we took on the ~ 80,000 expenditure included a bike path on the property owned by the Chamber of Commerce. I have since spoken with Jane and the Chamber has not been able to meet on the issue and is unlikely to reach resolution on the 10 acres until after the COVID crisis. To rectify the situation, we will be moving the Bike Path south closer to the township offices and away from the northern property boundary from Perry to 152 ND ave. The Following graphic shows the deviation. There will be no change in cost, and actually a slight decrease as the distance of the bike path is less.



- 2) We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). Given the boards previous decisions, consistent with the closure of the airport, current property zoning, and the desire for the property to remain recreational / public use – we will not be allowing the hangers to turn into personal storage buildings from the tenants. This means, the tenants will have the option of abandoning the hanger and the Township eventually taking ownership via abandonment, the tenant demolishing the hanger, or the tenant removing and moving the hanger. All of the tenants presumably will be concerned on the cost of demolition and or removal. Given that we currently have no way of evaluating the condition of each hanger in the current COVID environment (meaning if there is value to the township to keep the hanger – if the tenant so chooses to abandon it), and for some semblance of good will to pilots that have been at the airport for a considerable period of time, I am suggesting the following. That we allow tenants to abandon their hanger, and as long as they leave it in substantial working condition (meaning no partial demolition – similar to what Brian did years ago) we will release them from any obligation of cost for removal of the structure. Such removal (based on previous demolition quotes) may be as much as approximately 8,000 – 10,000 per hanger. Also, we may decide to keep some of the hangers if the tenant does in fact abandon them and repurpose the buildings for recreational uses – similar to what happened with John Gronbergs hanger. This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days.

Thanks,

Be safe and be well. This is trying times, but the truth is we are all blessed. We have much to be thankful for.

Howard

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Howard Fink](#)
To: [Board Archive](#); [Denise Nestel](#); [George Jacob \(Archive\)](#); [Howard Fink](#); [Jan Steggerda](#); [Jerry Hunsburger \(Archive\)](#); [Jim Gerard](#); [Julie Northrup](#); [Skip Keeter](#); [Steve Spoelhof](#)
Cc: [Dan Martin](#)
Subject: Quick Update
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:34:14 PM

Hi Everyone,

Please see this as a mini – managers’ report, particular on the Airport.

- 1) Regarding the vote at the last board meeting, there is one item which we all missed (thank you Jerry for calling it to my attention). The vote we took on the ~ 80,000 expenditure included a bike path on the property owned by the Chamber of Commerce. I have since spoken with Jane and the Chamber has not been able to meet on the issue and is unlikely to reach resolution on the 10 acres until after the COVID crisis. To rectify the situation, we will be moving the Bike Path south closer to the township offices and away from the northern property boundary from Perry to 152 ND ave. The Following graphic shows the deviation. There will be no change in cost, and actually a slight decrease as the distance of the bike path is less.



- 2) We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). Given the boards previous decisions, consistent with the closure of the airport, current property zoning, and the desire for the property to remain recreational / public use – we will not be allowing the hangers to turn into personal storage buildings from the tenants. This means, the tenants will have the option of abandoning the hanger and the Township eventually taking ownership via abandonment, the tenant demolishing the hanger, or the tenant removing and moving the hanger. All of the tenants presumably will be concerned on the cost of demolition and or removal. Given that we currently have no way of evaluating the condition of each hanger in the current COVID environment (meaning if there is value to the township to keep the hanger – if the tenant so chooses to abandon it), and for some assemblance of good will to pilots that have been at the airport for a considerable period of time, I am suggesting the following. That we allow tenants to abandon their

hanger, and as long as they leave it in substantial working condition (meaning no partial demolition – similar to what Brian did years ago) we will release them from any obligation of cost for removal of the structure. Such removal (based on previous demolition quotes) may be as much as approximately 8,000 – 10,000 per hanger. Also, we may decided to keep some of the hangers if the tennant does in fact abandom them and repurpose the buildings for recreational uses – similar to what happened with John Gronbergs hanger. This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days.

Thanks,

Be safe and be well. This is trying times, but the truth is we are all blessed. We have much to be thankfull for.

Howard

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Howard Fink](#)
To: [Board Archive](#); [Denise Nestel](#); [George Jacob](#); [Howard Fink](#); [Jan Steggerda](#); [Jerry Hunsburger](#); [Jim Gerard](#); [Julie Northrup](#); [Skip Keeter](#); [Steve Spoelhof](#)
Cc: [Dan Martin](#)
Subject: Quick Update
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:34:00 PM

Hi Everyone,

Please see this as a mini – managers’ report, particular on the Airport.

- 1) Regarding the vote at the last board meeting, there is one item which we all missed (thank you Jerry for calling it to my attention). The vote we took on the ~ 80,000 expenditure included a bike path on the property owned by the Chamber of Commerce. I have since spoken with Jane and the Chamber has not been able to meet on the issue and is unlikely to reach resolution on the 10 acres until after the COVID crisis. To rectify the situation, we will be moving the Bike Path south closer to the township offices and away from the northern property boundary from Perry to 152 ND ave. The Following graphic shows the deviation. There will be no change in cost, and actually a slight decrease as the distance of the bike path is less.



- 2) We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). Given the boards previous decisions, consistent with the closure of the airport, current property zoning, and the desire for the property to remain recreational / public use – we will not be allowing the hangers to turn into personal storage buildings from the tenants. This means, the tenants will have the option of abandoning the hanger and the Township eventually taking ownership via abandonment, the tenant demolishing the hanger, or the tenant removing and moving the hanger. All of the tenants presumably will be concerned on the cost of demolition and or removal. Given that we currently have no way of evaluating the condition of each hanger in the current COVID environment (meaning if there is value to the township to keep the hanger – if the tenant so chooses to abandon it), and for some semblance of good will to pilots that have been at the airport for a considerable period of time, I am suggesting the following. That we allow tenants to abandon their

hanger, and as long as they leave it in substantial working condition (meaning no partial demolition – similar to what Brian did years ago) we will release them from any obligation of cost for removal of the structure. Such removal (based on previous demolition quotes) may be as much as approximately 8,000 – 10,000 per hanger. Also, we may decided to keep some of the hangers if the tennant does in fact abandom them and repurpose the buildings for recreational uses – similar to what happened with John Gronbergs hanger. This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days.

Thanks,

Be safe and be well. This is trying times, but the truth is we are all blessed. We have much to be thankfull for.

Howard

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Matt Levandoski](#)
To: [Howard Fink](#)
Subject: RE: Cooper Van Wieren
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:27:01 PM

Caution! This email is from an external address and contains a link. Use caution when following links as they could open malicious web sites.

Howard

Is the premise I show in the sketch below correct? Do you want me to get revised bulletin pricing for 400' less of path before issuing a change order for what the board approved? It may be better to get the full change order and then a credit once we know for sure the actual length.

Thanks,

Matthew G. Levandoski, PLA

Prein&Newhof

t. 616-364-8491 d. 616-588-9018

[Website](#) | [Blog](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Matt Levandoski

Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 10:39 AM

To: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>

Cc: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Jon Van Duinen <jvanduinen@preinnewhof.com>

Subject: RE: Cooper Van Wieren

Howard,

I was not aware of any reverter clauses on any of the airport property but it isn't an issue. Is the image below what you're referring to? See below. If so the path could run inside and would be about 400' shorter. Not a problem with the bulletin, we'll just have to coordinate with the contractor to update the pricing, it should lower the price below the \$80k approved last night. Both paths will be constructed in the fall. Thanks.



Matthew G. Levandoski, PLA

Prein&Newhof

t. 616-364-8491 d. 616-588-9018

[Website](#) | [Blog](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>

Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 10:23 AM

To: Matt Levandoski <mlevandoski@preinnewhof.com>

Cc: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>

Subject: Cooper Van Wieren

Hi Matt,

Just got off the phone with Jane Clark from the Chamber of Commerce. As you may know, they own (have a reverter clause) on the triangle piece of property to the north. For the meantime, we need to hold off on the construction of the bike path from 152nd to Perry. She is fine with the runway coming out on their section of property.

Please proceed with the runway and path along Ottawa beach but ask the contractor to hold off on the one from 152nd. Other than quantity amounts, please let me know if this changes the pricing model.

Howard

Howard Fink

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Howard Fink](#)
To: [Matt Levandoski](#)
Subject: Re: Cooper Van Wieren
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 10:24:15 PM

Yes and yes

From: Matt Levandoski <mlevandoski@preinnewhof.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:26 PM
To: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>
Subject: RE: Cooper Van Wieren

Caution! This email is from an external address and contains a link. Use caution when following links as they could open malicious web sites.

Howard

Is the premise I show in the sketch below correct? Do you want me to get revised bulletin pricing for 400' less of path before issuing a change order for what the board approved? It may be better to get the full change order and then a credit once we know for sure the actual length.

Thanks,

Matthew G. Levandoski, PLA

Prein&Newhof

t. 616-364-8491 d. 616-588-9018

[Website](#) | [Blog](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Matt Levandoski
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 10:39 AM
To: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>
Cc: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Jon Van Duinen <jvanduinen@preinnewhof.com>
Subject: RE: Cooper Van Wieren

Howard,

I was not aware of any reverter clauses on any of the airport property but it isn't an issue. Is the image below what you're referring to? See below. If so the path could run inside and would be about 400' shorter. Not a problem with the bulletin, we'll just have to coordinate with the contractor to update the pricing, it should lower the price below the \$80k approved last night. Both paths will be constructed in the fall. Thanks.



Matthew G. Levandoski, PLA

Prein&Newhof

t. 616-364-8491 d. 616-588-9018

[Website](#) | [Blog](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>

Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 10:23 AM

To: Matt Levandoski <mlevandoski@preinnewhof.com>

Cc: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>

Subject: Cooper Van Wieren

Hi Matt,

Just got off the phone with Jane Clark from the Chamber of Commerce. As you may know, they own (have a reverter clause) on the triangle piece of property to the north. For the meantime, we need to hold off on the construction of the bike path from 152nd to Perry. She is fine with the runway coming out on their section of property.

Please proceed with the runway and path along Ottawa beach but ask the contractor to hold off on the one from 152nd. Other than quantity amounts, please let me know if this changes the pricing model.

Howard

Howard Fink

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Skip Keeter](#)
To: [Howard Fink](#)
Subject: Re: Quick Update
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 12:53:12 PM

Howard, I don't see the mail from Denise you're referencing in this email.

Skip Keeter
Park Township Clerk
(616) 738-4240
ekeeter@parktownship.org

From: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 9:53:28 AM
To: Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>; Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Daniel Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>
Cc: dnestel@outlook.com <dnestel@outlook.com>; Board <board@parktownship.org>
Subject: RE: Quick Update

Denise,

I respect your opinion. I don't agree with it, but I respect it. I do aim to understand it and gain greater clarity on where you are coming from.

If there is a strong objection to a decision I have made (and you feel it is policy rather than administrative), you should send the correspondence to the entire board. You should also ask for a special meeting to be called (with consent of the other trustees and board members), so the issue can be debated in public and voted on by the board. In situations like what you have documented, the supervisors authority is limited – much like that of an individual board member.

I think your email is significant – and as such I am forwarding it to the entire board.

Hope this helps from a process standpoint.

Howard

Howard Fink
Park Township Manager
hfink@parktownship.org
616.738.4229 (office)
616.399.8540 (fax)

From: Denise Nestel
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 8:42 AM
To: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Daniel Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>
Cc: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>; dnestel@outlook.com
Subject: Fw: Quick Update

I just received and read Jerry Barman's email to the Board regarding the Notice of Eviction. Barman's email needs to be addressed immediately.

Manager's previous "quick update" states "Please see this as a mini – managers' report, particular on the Airport" and concludes with **his** decision that **he** will take, unless the Board promptly "objects"

On receiving the "quick update" I promptly asked for legal review before an action was taken by Manager. This email is more than a "request". It is an objection by a Trustee.

While Barman's email was received following the "quick update", it appears that Manager had already acted before "updating" the Board. The statement that Manager's actions were "consistent" the Board's "decision" is not true. It cannot be true because the Board was never apprised of these facts.

Manager makes several significant statements in the "quick update." The statements are highlighted in yellow (by me) below and include:

"We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). "

"Given the boards previous decisions",

"This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days. "

NOW, I ask the Supervisor and legal counsel to reread Jerry Barman's letter to the Board re EVICTION NOTICE. Barman's email to the Board makes several legitimate points.

Did Manager forget that the Governor continues to issue emergency restrictions on movement?

Wouldn't anybody with common sense see that Barman's comments are reasonable?

What if Park Township is sued for "wrongful eviction"?

What if Barman's letter finds it's way to the Holland Sentinel?

What if publishing Barman's letter causes all the other disgruntled and aggrieved residents to write letters complaining of Park Township's "unreasonable decisions" and its intractable Manager?

What if Barman's letter goes viral on the internet?

This issue needs immediate attention (and for that matter, so does the Reserve's breach of the PUD).

Manager is wrong in taking these actions. This needs to be stopped and a suitable resolution

negotiated. AND, it is the Board's right to be informed of the negotiations and to vote BEFORE action is taken. Not, as in this case, after the fact.

I expect to receive confirmation from Supervisor and legal counsel that this issue will be rectified and/or that the Board will be provided the opportunity to address and rectify the issue.

Denise Nestel

From: Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 6:54 AM

To: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Daniel Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Subject: Fw: Quick Update

This Township and particularly this Manager needs to slow down.

1) I read Jerry Barman's

From: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:34 PM

To: Board Archive <board.archive@parktownship.org>; Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>; George Jacob <gjacob@parktownship.org>; Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>; Jan Steggerda <jsteggerda@parktownship.org>; Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Jim Gerard <jgerard@parktownship.org>; Julie Northrup <jnorthrup@parktownship.org>; Skip Keeter <ekeeter@parktownship.org>; Steve Spoelhof <sspoelhof@parktownship.org>

Cc: Dan Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Subject: Quick Update

Hi Everyone,

Please see this as a mini – managers' report, particular on the Airport.

- 1) Regarding the vote at the last board meeting, there is one item which we all missed (thank you Jerry for calling it to my attention). The vote we took on the ~ 80,000 expenditure included a bike path on the property owned by the Chamber of Commerce. I have since spoken with Jane and the Chamber has not been able to meet on the issue and is unlikely to reach resolution on the 10 acres until after the COVID crisis. To rectify the situation, we will be moving the Bike Path south closer to the township offices and away from the northern property boundary from Perry to 152 ND ave. The Following graphic shows the deviation. There will be no change in cost, and actually a slight decrease as the

distance of the bike path is less.



- 2) We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). Given the boards previous decisions, consistent with the closure of the airport, current property zoning, and the desire for the property to remain recreational / public use – we will not be allowing the hangers to turn into personal storage buildings from the tenants. This means, the tenants will have the option of abandoning the hanger and the Township eventually taking ownership via abandonment, the tenant demolishing the hanger, or the tenant removing and moving the hanger. All of the tenants presumably will be concerned on the cost of demolition and or removal. Given that we currently have no way of evaluating the condition of each hanger in the current COVID environment (meaning if there is value to the township to keep the hanger – if the tenant so chooses to abandon it), and for some semblance of good will to pilots that have been at the airport for a considerable period of time, I am suggesting the following. That we allow tenants to abandon their hanger, and as long as they leave it in substantial working condition (meaning no partial demolition – similar to what Brian did years ago) we will release them from any obligation of cost for removal of the structure. Such removal (based on previous demolition quotes) may be as much as approximately 8,000 – 10,000 per hanger. Also, we may decide to keep some of the hangers if the tenant does in fact abandon them and repurpose the buildings for recreational uses – similar to what happened with John Gronbergs hanger. This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days.

Thanks,

Be safe and be well. This is trying times, but the truth is we are all blessed. We have much to be thankful for.

Howard

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Denise Nestel](#)
To: [Howard Fink](#); [Daniel R. Martin](#)
Cc: [Board](#)
Subject: Re: Quick Update. DO NOT REPLY
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 4:40:58 PM

Before moving forward, I request that township legal counsel confirms that the has reviewed the course of action recommended in this report, and, if there are potential negative legal consequences to the township, that Dan Martin will timely advise the Supervisor and Manager.

Denise

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 14, 2020, at 2:34 PM, Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org> wrote:

Hi Everyone,

Please see this as a mini – managers’ report, particular on the Airport.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1) <!--[endif]-->Regarding the vote at the last board meeting, there is one item which we all missed (thank you Jerry for calling it to my attention). The vote we took on the ~ 80,000 expenditure included a bike path on the property owned by the Chamber of Commerce. I have since spoken with Jane and the Chamber has not been able to meet on the issue and is unlikely to reach resolution on the 10 acres until after the COVID crisis. To rectify the situation, we will be moving the Bike Path south closer to the township offices and away from the northern property boundary from Perry to 152 ND ave. The Following graphic shows the deviation. There will be no change in cost, and actually a slight decrease as the distance of the bike path is less.

<image001.jpg>

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2) <!--[endif]-->We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). Given the boards previous decisions, consistent with the closure of the airport, current property zoning, and the desire for the property to remain recreational / public use – we will not be allowing the hangers to turn into personal storage buildings from the tenants. This means, the tenants will have the option of abandoning the hanger and the Township eventually taking ownership via abandonment, the tenant demolishing the hanger, or the tenant removing and moving the hanger. All of the tenants presumably will be concerned on the cost of demolition and or removal. Given that we currently have no way of evaluating the condition of each hanger in the current COVID environment (meaning if there is value to the township to keep the hanger – if the tenant so chooses to abandon it), and for some assemblance of good will to pilots that have been at

the airport for a considerable period of time, I am suggesting the following. That we allow tenants to abandon their hanger, and as long as they leave it in substantial working condition (meaning no partial demolition – similar to what Brian did years ago) we will release them from any obligation of cost for removal of the structure. Such removal (based on previous demolition quotes) may be as much as approximately 8,000 – 10,000 per hanger. Also, we may decide to keep some of the hangers if the tenant does in fact abandon them and repurpose the buildings for recreational uses – similar to what happened with John Gronberg's hanger. This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days.

Thanks,

Be safe and be well. This is trying times, but the truth is we are all blessed. We have much to be thankful for.

Howard

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Howard Fink](#)
To: [Denise Nestel](#); [Jerry Hunsburger](#); [Daniel Martin](#)
Cc: dnestel@outlook.com; [Board](#)
Subject: RE: Quick Update
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 9:53:00 AM

Denise,

I respect your opinion. I don't agree with it, but I respect it. I do aim to understand it and gain greater clarity on where you are coming from.

If there is a strong objection to a decision I have made (and you feel it is policy rather than administrative), you should send the correspondence to the entire board. You should also ask for a special meeting to be called (with consent of the other trustees and board members), so the issue can be debated in public and voted on by the board. In situations like what you have documented, the supervisors authority is limited – much like that of an individual board member.

I think your email is significant – and as such I am forwarding it to the entire board.

Hope this helps from a process standpoint.

Howard

Howard Fink

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: Denise Nestel

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 8:42 AM

To: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Daniel Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Cc: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>; dnestel@outlook.com

Subject: Fw: Quick Update

I just received and read Jerry Barman's email to the Board regarding the Notice of Eviction. Barman's email needs to be addressed immediately.

Manager's previous "quick update" states "Please see this as a mini – managers' report, particular on the Airport" and concludes with **his** decision that **he** will take, unless the Board promptly "objects"

On receiving the "quick update" I promptly asked for legal review before an action was taken by Manager. This email is more than a "request". It is an objection by a Trustee.

While Barman's email was received following the "quick update", it appears that Manager had already acted before "updating" the Board. The statement that Manager's actions were "consistent" the Board's "decision" is not true. It cannot be true because the Board was never apprised of these facts.

Manager makes several significant statements in the "quick update." The statements are highlighted in yellow (by me) below and include:

"We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger)."

"Given the boards previous decisions",

"This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days."

NOW, I ask the Supervisor and legal counsel to reread Jerry Barman's letter to the Board re EVICTION NOTICE. Barman's email to the Board makes several legitimate points.

Did Manager forget that the Governor continues to issue emergency restrictions on movement?

Wouldn't anybody with common sense see that Barman's comments are reasonable?

What if Park Township is sued for "wrongful eviction"?

What if Barman's letter finds it's way to the Holland Sentinel?

What if publishing Barman's letter causes all the other disgruntled and aggrieved residents to write letters complaining of Park Township's "unreasonable decisions" and its intractable Manager?

What if Barman's letter goes viral on the internet?

This issue needs immediate attention (and for that matter, so does the Reserve's breach of the PUD).

Manager is wrong in taking these actions. This needs to be stopped and a suitable resolution negotiated. AND, it is the Board's right to be informed of the negotiations and to vote BEFORE action is taken. Not, as in this case, after the fact.

I expect to receive confirmation from Supervisor and legal counsel that this issue will be rectified and/or that the Board will be provided the opportunity to address and rectify the issue.

Denise Nestel

From: Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 6:54 AM

To: Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Daniel Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Subject: Fw: Quick Update

This Township and particularly this Manager needs to slow down.

1) I read Jerry Barman's

From: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:34 PM

To: Board Archive <board.archive@parktownship.org>; Denise Nestel <dnestel@parktownship.org>; George Jacob <gjacob@parktownship.org>; Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>; Jan Steggerda <jsteggerda@parktownship.org>; Jerry Hunsburger <jhunsburger@parktownship.org>; Jim Gerard <jgerard@parktownship.org>; Julie Northrup <jnorthrup@parktownship.org>; Skip Keeter <ekeeter@parktownship.org>; Steve Spoelhof <sspoelhof@parktownship.org>

Cc: Dan Martin <dmartin@thrunlaw.com>

Subject: Quick Update

Hi Everyone,

Please see this as a mini – managers' report, particular on the Airport.

- 1) Regarding the vote at the last board meeting, there is one item which we all missed (thank you Jerry for calling it to my attention). The vote we took on the ~ 80,000 expenditure included a bike path on the property owned by the Chamber of Commerce. I have since spoken with Jane and the Chamber has not been able to meet on the issue and is unlikely to reach resolution on the 10 acres until after the COVID crisis. To rectify the situation, we will be moving the Bike Path south closer to the township offices and away from the northern property boundary from Perry to 152 ND ave. The Following graphic shows the deviation. There will be no change in cost, and actually a slight decrease as the distance of the bike path is less.



- 2) We will be sending out letters to the private hanger tenants shortly (those that own their hanger). Given the boards previous decisions, consistent with the closure of the airport, current property zoning, and the desire for the property to remain recreational / public use – we will not be allowing the hangers to turn into personal storage buildings from the tenants. This means, the tenants will have the option of abandoning the hanger and the Township eventually taking ownership via abandonment, the tenant demolishing the hanger, or the tenant removing and moving the hanger. All of the tenants presumably will be concerned on the cost of demolition and or removal. Given that we currently have no way of evaluating the condition of each hanger in the current COVID environment (meaning if there is value to the township to keep the hanger – if the tenant so chooses to abandon it), and for some assemblance of good will to pilots that have been at the airport for a considerable period of time, I am suggesting the following. That we allow tenants to abandon their hanger, and as long as they leave it in substantial working condition (meaning no partial demolition – similar to what Brian did years ago) we will release them from any obligation of cost for removal of the structure. Such removal (based on previous demolition quotes) may be as much as approximately 8,000 – 10,000 per hanger. Also, we may decided to keep some of the hangers if the tenant does in fact abandon them and repurpose the buildings for recreational uses – similar to what happened with John Gronbergs hanger. This is my advice and best choice on how to move forward. If there are no objections, I will move forward with this approach in the next few days.

Thanks,

Be safe and be well. This is trying times, but the truth is we are all blessed. We have much to be thankful for.

Howard

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: [Howard Fink](#)
To: [Jerry Hunsburger](#)
Subject: RE: The 10 acres at the airport
Date: Friday, April 10, 2020 9:40:00 AM

Thank you.

Yes. I will contact the chamber and work with the contractor / Matt.

Howard

Howard Fink

Park Township Manager

hfink@parktownship.org

616.738.4229 (office)

616.399.8540 (fax)

From: Jerry Hunsburger
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 6:19 AM
To: Board <board@parktownship.org>
Cc: Howard Fink <hfink@parktownship.org>
Subject: The 10 acres at the airport

Howard,

This morning it hit me that the Chamber has not determined what they will do regarding the 10 acre "reverter clause" issue.

Our decision last night on adding the bike path from 152nd street to Perry will be impacted by the Chamber Board's decision....correct?

Do we need to hold signing a contract until the Chamber Board clarifies their position?

Jerry Hunsburger

From: [Jerry Hunsburger](#)
To: [Board](#)
Cc: [Howard Fink](#)
Subject: The 10 acres at the airport
Date: Friday, April 10, 2020 6:19:20 AM

Howard,

This morning it hit me that the Chamber has not determined what they will do regarding the 10 acre "reverter clause" issue.

Our decision last night on adding the bike path from 152nd street to Perry will be impacted by the Chamber Board's decision....correct?

Do we need to hold signing a contract until the Chamber Board clarifies their position?

Jerry Hunsburger