



Putnam Township
3280 West M-36
Pinckney, MI 48169

Dennis M. Brennan
Supervisor

(734) 878-3131
Supervisor@putnamtwp.us

September 18, 2019

For Immediate Release

On September 16, 2019, Patrick Glance, a resident of Nita Drive in Putnam Township, filed recall language with the Livingston County Clerk in an effort to remove Putnam Township Supervisor, Dennis Brennan, from office.

The reasons given for the recall are as follows:

“The Township Supervisor committed malfeasance in the creation of a Special Assessment group (sic) that was not assessed proportionate to the benefit of the property owners, contrary to state law!”

“His miss management (sic) of public funds and his lack of transparency requires his removal from office.”

Patrick Glance is angry that his road was not paved as part of the project funded by the Sarah Drive Road Improvement Special Assessment District (SAD) in 2017. He told me in a meeting on Monday the 16th that he would withdraw the recall if the board would agree to pave his road. Otherwise, he would have me removed from office and replace me with someone who would. He also told a neighbor that he was using the recall as “blackmail” to force us to pave the road using money from the Sarah Drive SAD.

Sarah Drive is the only ingress and egress for the 207 residential properties that make up the SAD. From Sarah Drive, there are several roads that branch off to the north, south and east of Sarah Drive. The residents of all those branch roads have to use Sarah Drive to get to their homes. So, paving Sarah Drive equally benefitted all the residents who use that road to get to their road. Paving any one of the branch roads would create an unequal benefit to the residents of that road at the expense of residents on other roads.

The Sarah Drive Road Improvement Project was completed in 2017 at a tremendous savings, compared to estimates provided to us by the Livingston County Road Commission. As a result of the County Road Commission estimate, the Assessment amount was set at \$1,753.59 per residential parcel. The actual cost of the project, including all associated costs was \$877.28 per parcel assessed, less than half the original assessment.

We have tried to explain to him, on many occasions that we cannot use funds from one project to complete another project. That would be illegal. What he wants is this: rather than refund or credit the amount of the over-assessment to each taxpayer, use those funds to pave Nita Drive. Essentially, that means that every other taxpayer in the SAD would be contributing their \$926.31 to pay for paving Nita.

In regard to Mr. Glance's first allegation, malfeasance, I would point out that the Township Supervisor did not create the Sarah Drive Special Assessment District unilaterally. The establishment of the district was a collaborative effort involving the residents, the elected officials, the Trustees and our Township Attorney all working within the parameters set forth in Public Act 188. (PA 188). All resolutions were passed, and public hearings held, in accordance with PA 188, with proper notice to residents in every case. To accuse one person with malfeasance, you must accuse all involved.

PA 188 provides residents with specific means to protest their inclusion in a SAD as well as their assessment amounts, if they feel they are not receiving a benefit proportional to their assessment. At no time did Mr. Glance exercise his right to protest his assessment beyond speaking at the call to public. He had a small window of opportunity to bring his case to the State's Tax Tribunal and he did not. Now, two and a half years after the assessment roll was confirmed, he is accusing me of malfeasance because I will not bend to his demands.

Regarding his second allegation, mismanagement of funds and lack of transparency. The Township Supervisor does not manage funds. The Treasurer manages funds at the direction of the Township Board. But I don't think Mr. Glance is using the correct terminology for what he is accusing. He is upset that we did not tell him that the project came in under budget. And he's upset that we did not use the remaining assessment funds to pave his road. He is also under the mistaken impression that the Township was not going to adjust the assessment amounts to reflect the cost savings for the Sarah Drive project. The Township Board has been working with our attorneys and our auditor to work out the details of providing for the amended assessment and we will pass a resolution, at our regular meeting tonight, that will accomplish that. As far as transparency is concerned, all discussion of the Sarah Drive assessment and cost savings have been done in open meetings and the Sarah Drive SAD Budget is part of the public budget package.

Mr. Glance will tell you that he presented the Township with a petition signed by 150 residents who favor using the Sarah Drive funds to pave Nita Drive as well as other roads not specified in his petition. The 150 signatures potentially represent as much as one third of the properties in the SAD. Two thirds of the residents did NOT sign his petition. We have dealt with many inquiries from residents who told us they signed that petition under duress or false pretenses.

The scope of the Sarah Drive project, as laid out in the resolutions that created the SAD and the Assessment Roll, is quite specific. Any change to the scope would still have to comply with PA 188, including petitions, resolutions, public notices and public hearings. Most importantly, a modified project, using the same SAD funds, cannot provide a benefit to one group of residents that would be disproportionate to the others in the SAD. To pave one branch road, like Nita Drive, you would have to provide an equal benefit to each of the residents in the SAD. In order for the Township to pave Nita Drive using Sarah Drive funds, we would have to take the approximately \$926 per residence refund for everyone in the SAD and divert those funds to Nita Drive. I don't even want to speculate what might happen if we were to attempt such a maneuver.

Finally, we have explained to Mr. Glance that, if he wants Nita Drive paved, he could attempt to petition the Township for a SAD specifically for Nita Drive. However, the Township is not required to take on a Special Assessment District and, after dealing with Mr. Glance, I am personally soured on the idea of ever doing it again.

This vain attempt to recall a public official, for his own personal gain, is a horrendous abuse of the election laws and a waste of taxpayer funds. In addition to the time I have to spend defending myself from false accusations, there are many others who are now involved in the process including the County Clerk and Deputy Clerk, The Township Clerk and Deputy Clerk as well as members of the County Election Commission, Judge Miriam Cavanaugh and County Treasurer Jennifer Nash who will have to meet to deal with Mr. Glances allegations.

I would like to invite members of the media to attend tonight's meeting at Putnam Township Hall at 7:00 PM. There, you will have an opportunity to hear from our Township Attorney regarding Mr. Glance's petition and the Township's resolution to refund the over-assessment to the members of the SAD. Mr. Glance has promised to disrupt our meeting by bringing a crowd of supporters to demand that his road be paved. It could be interesting. I'm only interested in the truth being reported and defending my good name from the false accusations contained in Mr. Glance's recall language.

Thank you!

Dennis M. Brennan
Putnam Township Supervisor

UPDATE: I just received a written memo from Patrick Glance stating that, if the Township Board delays refunding the assessment to the members of the assessment district, he will withdraw the request for recall on Thursday morning. The Putnam Township Board will not be bullied by anyone, especially in a way that would be detrimental to so many taxpayers (206 residences, if you don't count Mr. Glance).

Contact information: Patrick Glance, 1338 Nita Drive, Pinckney MI 48169. Telephone (734) 765-2575