



4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306
(248) 651-9260
(248) 601-0106 (FAX)
www.paintcreektrail.org

Paint Creek Trailways Commission Meeting

Tuesday, October 16, 2018 at 7:00 PM
Paint Creek Cider Mill, 4480 Orion Road, Rochester, MI 48306

MEETING AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Approval of Agenda**
4. **Public Comment**
5. **Consent Agenda:**
 - a. Minutes: Regular Meeting, September 18, 2018
 - b. Minutes: Special Joint Meeting – September 18, 2018
 - c. Minutes: Special Meeting – October 4, 2018
 - d. Treasurers Report – September 2018
6. **Approval of Invoices**
7. **Introduction:** Melissa Ford, Paint Creek Trail Manager
8. **Discussion:** 2019 Draft Budget
9. **Update:** Resurfacing
10. **Manager's Report**
11. **Commissioner Reports**
12. **Adjournment of Meeting**

Next Regular Meeting:

November 20, 2018 – Paint Creek Cider Mill, 4480 Orion Road, Rochester, MI 48306

Enclosures: Agenda Summary
 September 18, 2018 Draft Meeting Minutes
 September 18, 2018 Draft Special Joint Meeting Minutes
 October 4, 2018 Draft Special Meeting Minutes
 September 2018 Treasurer's Report
 Memo & Draft 2019 Paint Creek Trailways Commission Budget (will post an email Oct 11)
 October Manager's Report

**Agenda Summary
October 16, 2018**

1. Call To Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Public Comment
5. **Consent Agenda:**
 - a. **Minutes: Regular Meeting – September 18, 2018**
 - b. **Minutes: Special Joint Meeting – September 18, 2018**
 - c. **Minutes: Special Meeting – October 4, 2018**
 - d. **Treasurer’s Report – September 2018**
6. **Approval of Invoices**
7. **Introduction:** Melissa Ford, Paint Creek Trail Manager
Summary: New trail manager Melissa Ford will be present to introduce herself to the Commission. She will be a great asset to the Commission!
Desired Action: Receipt of Report
Budget Impact: None
8. **Discussion:** 2019 Draft Budget
Summary: I’ve developed a draft budget for your review and discussion, based on current Commission projects and future plans. I was waiting for salary information before completing; the budget is not in your packet, but will be emailed and posted on Thursday, October 11.
Desired Action: Discussion/Direction
Budget Impact: Unknown
9. **Update:** Resurfacing
Summary: This item is tentative, as we are waiting for information from Mannik Smith Group regarding construction engineering costs.
Desired Action: Update/Discussion/Direction
Budget Impact: Unknown.
10. **Manager's Report** - included in your packet.
11. **Commissioner Reports**
12. **Adjournment of Meeting**

Next Regular Meeting:

November 20, 2018 –Paint Creek Cider Mill, 4480 Orion Road, Rochester, MI 48306



4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306
(248) 651-9260
(248) 601-0106 (FAX)
www.paintcreektrail.org

REGULAR MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
City of Rochester Municipal Offices
400 Sixth Street, Rochester, Michigan 48307

CALL TO ORDER: The Tuesday, September 18, 2018 meeting was called to order by Chairperson Becker at 7:00 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Rock Blanchard, Susan Bowyer (*enter 7:25 p.m.*), Frank Ferriolo, Linda Gamage, Kim Russell (*enter 7:10 p.m.*), Donni Steele, Jeff Stout

Voting Alternates Present: Robin Buxar

Non-Voting Alternates Present: David Becker

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: None

Voting Members Absent: Van Agen

Alternates Absent: Chris Barnett, Ben Giovanelli, Chris Hagen, Lynn Loeb, Jenny McCardell, Martha Olijnyk

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Absent: Brad Mathisen

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Absent: Vacant

Others Present: Chris Gray, Assistant Trail Manager, Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Blanchard, seconded by Stout, ***Moved***, to approve the September 18, 2018 agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. Minutes – August 21, 2018 Regular Meeting, approve and file

b. Treasurers Report – August 2018, receive and file

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Buxar, ***Moved***, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Gray presented the invoices in the amount of \$18,673.56. In addition to the recorder's monthly fee, this amount includes 3rd Quarter wages for the Manager, Assistant Manager and Bike Patroller positions, Oakland County Mounted Patrol services for September, MML costs for the Trail Manager classified ad, Sir Speedy for the reprint of trail brochures, stamps and the gift card for the LDBW raffle. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is approximately \$100,000.

MOTION by Blanchard, supported by Buxar, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved in the amount of \$18,673.56 and orders be drawn for payment.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

UPDATE & DISCUSSION: Paint Creek Trail Resurfacing – Mannik Smith Group: Mr. Matt Mikolajczyk introduced himself and Mr. Cody Jones who are both with Mannik Smith Group. He will be only talking about the resurfacing project and not the bridge project at this point. This update covers the resurfacing of the trail outside the limits of the bridge, as well as the observation side paths and the deck. They conducted a site visit with Ms. Myers, and plans are being prepared. They have been holding off on the plans for the trail resurfacing because they knew that was going to go out to bid after the bridge is put out to bid. Now that they know the plans for the bridge will be ready after tonight, they will finalize the plans for the resurfacing. The design and layout of the deck is ready to be finalized and put out to bid shortly after the bridge goes out to bid. He is not sure at this time where the costs will come in at, but should have a report by the next meeting. They might bid this project with the resurfacing of Bear Creek Park to keep quantities higher to bring the aggregate unit prices down. The Commission thanked Mr. Mikolajczyk for the update.

UPDATE: Personnel Ad Hoc Committee: Trail Manager position: Mr. Becker said he has been keeping the Commission informed, and commented the Committee consists of himself, Ms. Steele, and Messrs. Blanchard and Van Agen. They received about 80 applications; Ms. Myers and Ms. Gray went through them and eliminated all but 10 people. The Personnel Committee did a ranking system of the 10, and narrowed it down to the top five. They interviewed all five, and four emerged very high. The top four were very close in ranking for different reasons, and it was clear the Committee couldn't come up with one to recommend to the Commission. The Committee members came up with one follow-up question each and they were forwarded to the four candidates Monday with a deadline to answer Thursday at 12 p.m. The Committee is hoping to reconvene and decide on a person to recommend to the Commission. Mr. Becker would like to call a special meeting within 10-14 days from now to bring forward the Committee's one recommendation for consideration. This is only a recommendation and there will be no hire until the Commission approves. Hopefully, a new Trail Manager will be approved in a week or two, assuming the candidate accepts. It was suggested that a few dates be offered for the special meeting, so as many Commissioners as possible can attend. Ms. Russell asked if it is possible if it's so close, to have maybe the top two come and be interviewed at the special meeting. Mr. Becker said the Committee will talk about this, but if there is a clear winner, he will suggest the Committee let the Commission work it out. Ms. Russell added that every Board she's been on, there's a subcommittee to narrow it down to two or three, then the whole Commission asks one question each, and they go from there. This way, there's buy-in from each community. Mr. Becker said if the Committee sees a clear top candidate, they will introduce that one – and if the Commission doesn't approve, then they'll go to the next one down. Ms. Russell said it's hard if you don't have a comparison. Mr. Becker indicated everyone is welcome to review the resumes. The Committee would like to send out the 70 rejection letters if the Commission approves that. Mr. Ferriolo agrees with Ms. Russell and goes a step further. He respects the job the Committee has done thus far, but would like to bring the four candidates together for a general review. There's something about the personal view – when we've interviewed people in the past, we've had them in front of us. He feels that makes a difference for his vote on the issue. Although he respects the Committee, if there was a significant difference between the top person and the other three, he might have a different perspective. But it seems the Committee is not so sure themselves, and are throwing up a coin. The whole Commission should jump in. This should be done rapidly. He realizes this might add another step in between where the Committee wants to go with this, but he feels this is where Ms. Russell is coming from, and where he'd like to be. He'd like to see people and hopefully everyone agrees. Mr. Becker would like to get the answers

to the follow-up questions back; and the Committee has heard what the Commission is saying. They will do what the Commission wants. In the past, he believes they have brought one candidate forward. Ms. Gamage also agrees with maybe seeing the top four or the top couple candidates. She's not interested in the 70 resumes that were put on the side, she's interested in the four that are remaining, so she would like to see those candidates. Ms. Gray was asked to provide the resumes of the four candidates to the Commission, as well as their answers to the questions, and the Commission was asked to keep this information confidential. Ms. Steele added that the Ad Hoc Committee is made up of each municipality, so all the communities have an input by having a representative from their community on the Committee. This has been considered and covered. The amount of time and effort and hours spent with the last five candidates has been a lot, and the discussion has been a lot, and there might be a lot that's missed by having them come in and interview, by only seeing that small portion of it at the very end and trying to make a decision on that much information. That's her trepidation with having the interviews being done, because the Commission is only seeing a small picture, where the Committee has seen the whole process. Mr. Blanchard agrees with that, as the Committee has worked really hard and it's been difficult for them to agree, and now we're bringing more people into the mix. He feels this will make it more difficult instead of a better decision. The Committee knows, based on the interviews they've done and meeting those people – the Commission will only be able to see them the one time. Ms. Steele said the questions were based on the interviews themselves, so they answer more than the specific questions themselves, because the Committee based the questions on the candidates and every question that was asked prior to that. For the Commission just to see the five questions, they won't realize that the Committee started with 80 questions to get down to the five questions. She feels it would be very nerve-wracking on the interviewee's part to come before the Board – we might lose some of their enthusiasm to want to be the Trail Manager. This concerns her. Mr. Ferriolo said we're dealing with a job application, and people that are going for jobs today know they are in competition with other people. The person the Commission does choose, when they know they're up against four or five other people, savor the win even more so than someone being picked out and not knowing they were in a great competition. The whole idea of the candidates coming in and making a presentation of themselves is part of what is required of the Trail Manager's position – they need to get up in front of people and make a presentation. The Committee did an excellent job of getting to a point, but if there is no real leader of the pack, that's where the Commission needs to weight in and make a judgment call to support the Committee, but to give a little more flavor in terms of their impression of what the candidates give off. He would feel better having witnessed this and then making a decision. Mr. Blanchard said if this is what the Commission is going to do and bring the candidates in, we need to design a list of questions. Mr. Becker said again, let the Committee get the answers to the questions and see if that does any more segregating the pack. It's a Commission decision on how they want to handle the hiring, the Committee can't hire the person. After we go through the next step, let's decide where to go from there. We have to find out according to the Open Meetings Act, whether this decision can be made through email or a special meeting to decide what to do, and then another special meeting. Ms. Russell feels the Commission is being steered in a direction that is not typical of how you hire any Board. She's been on several Commissions and it's always been very helpful and appreciative to any Board that has a subcommittee, to narrow it down, and then you review the resumes. According to MML and HR, you must have every question exactly the same for every candidate. She doesn't want anyone to feel unappreciative of the subcommittee, because each representative from the community is here, but there are several Commissioners that have a different point of view. She doesn't want the Committee to feel insulted, but she just to give it the best process that it can be. She feels the last four resumes should be given to the Commission. She has a feeling that this is trying to be one way instead of listening to what the Commission is saying. Mr. Becker doesn't think he said it was one way, he said let's see what happens and he will keep the Commission

informed. The Commission will decide the process. If the Commission wants to interview, then the Commission has to make up the questions and make sure everyone is treated fairly. Ms. Gray was also asked to send out the answers to the original questions to the Commission. Ms. Steele doesn't want to drag this out because Ms. Myers will be gone, and we'll lose the overlap. Any four of the top candidates would be fantastic. To take it through a long process would be to the Commission's disadvantage. It's not trying to hold back information, it's trying to move things along faster. Mr. Blanchard is also concerned that Ms. Myers is going to run out of time to assist the new person – if we're going to do this, we're going to have to have two very quick meetings scheduled in time so that Ms. Myers is able to have some overlap. Ms. Buxar suggested bringing in the top two contenders that the Ad Hoc Committee chooses to bring forward, but if we get the resumes, once everyone reviews them, you'd have an idea of who the four are, and narrow it down. She does think they have to be able to talk to and in front of the Commission, that ability is a foregone conclusion. If it could be narrowed down to two, we set a meeting and have five questions that are quite simple and ask the two candidates and make a decision of the two. This needs to be done quickly. Mr. Ferriolo still thinks bringing in the four candidates is still on the table as a possibility; that's his sense. Unless there is something startling that comes out of the questions, he's assuming we're talking about four and not two candidates. Asking the same questions of the candidates is not so bad. What he's looking for is the presentation of the individual; how that person is going to handle questions coming from a Committee or anyone else. It's not necessary to come up with new questions – it's how will they handle the same questions in front of the whole Commission. Mr. Becker asked that we wait until the end of the week to get the answers, send everyone the information, and if we are committed to make a decision about the hiring process through email to decide to do that, and if not, we'll have a special meeting to decide on how to handle it. Instead of arguing about the hypothetical, why don't we wait to see what shakes out after we get the responses to the questions. Ms. Gamage indicated there are four people who have expressed the opinion that they would like the candidates brought to them. She expressed her appreciation for all the hard work the Committee has done; it's difficult to eliminate people down to a certain number. The Commission does the hiring, but if the Committee only brings one person to the Commission, that's a predetermined result. She feels the Commission has spoken and unless any of the members have changed their opinions, this is important to the Commission. Mr. Blanchard asked if there is agreement that they want to see four candidates, or two. He personally doesn't feel we should bring four candidates to a meeting. The Commission needs to decide on what they want and vote on it. Dr. Bowyer said we need to expedite this, and she'd rather see four people and meet them herself. Ms. Gray pointed that not only would an additional meeting require availability of the Commission, but also of the candidates. Mr. Blanchard feels that the Commission has written answers coming back from four people, so if the subcommittee even meets to go over those, it's a waste of time. He'd rather say OK – get the answers, give them to the Commission and have the four people come together for a meeting, otherwise he's going to meet on two or three nights to go over the answers – why?

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to allow the Ad Hoc Committee to review the answers to the questions delivered to the remaining candidates, and report via email to the Commission their recommendation based on their top two candidates.

Ms. Russell asked if we can legally do that by email. It's not sure this can be done.

Ms. Steele changed her motion to three candidates. Ms. Gamage asked if the Committee would report back to the Commission and recommend two candidates? Ms. Steele said if we get the answers back and it's obvious that two of them are off the table, why go through the process? Let the Committee see how the answers come back, you might have a candidate that chooses not to

answer any more. If you just allow the Ad Hoc Committee to go through the process – the next step that is lined up, and then report back to the Commission – that’s what she is motioning to do. Mr. Blanchard is not sure, as he thought Ms. Steele indicated so many were coming to the Commission – two or three. Ms. Steele indicated she said two, and then changed her mind to three, and then back to two. Mr. Blanchard agrees to bring two candidates, not four, back to the Commission, based on the next step.

Mr. Ferriolo is against two candidates, however if the motion was compromised to three, he would accept. He wanted four, but if there is resistance on the part of the Committee, and this gets them into gear to go with three rather than two, he would accept this. Dr. Bowyer asked if there is a time limit on the motion – Ms. Steele said Thursday at 5:00 p.m. we’ll have the answers to the questions. Dr. Bowyer said if two filter to the top and two go down, or if the Committee finds all four are the same, would they bring the four or would the Committee make an arbitrary decision to narrow it down further themselves. Dr. Bowyer asked if all four were really exceptional, could they be brought forward? Mr. Blanchard agreed to that – if the Committee can’t make a decision based on those answers, they will bring all four forward. Ms. Russell suggested the motion be changed to bring two to four candidates to the Commission so there is that option. Ms. Gray will forward the resumes, the original questions and answers, and the answers to the final questions to the Commission, the Committee will meet soon, and make a recommendation to the Commission based on the results. The Commission will make the decision. Ms. Steele agreed to amend her motion to recommend two to four finalists. Mr. Blanchard agreed. If the Commissioners have a question they want to see that has not been asked, it should be forwarded to Mr. Becker and Ms. Gray.

Amended Motion as voted on:

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to allow the Ad Hoc Committee to review the answers to questions delivered to the remaining candidates, and report via email to the Commission recommending their top two to four finalists to appear before the Commission.

Mr. Blanchard called the question. There was no objection.

Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

UPDATE: Village of Lake Orion discussions: Ms. Gray reported the attorneys, Ms. Hamameh and Ms. Kucharek, are still working on the language of the agreement. Ms. Steele asked if Mr. Dan Kelly has been involved. Ms. Gray reported not to her knowledge – the particular language they were working on was just between the two.

REPORT: Labor Day Bridge Walk: Ms. Gray reported it was a great event. Approximately 400 attendees participated, 157 pre-registered. We raised \$1,500 towards the bridge replacement project expenses. She thanked Mr. Ferriolo, Ms. Gamage, Dr. Bowyer and Mr. Van Agen for all the work they did on the event – it was very helpful. Photos have been posted on the website and Facebook. Dr. Bowyer told people that the pictures would be on Facebook, so maybe something could be put out there that if someone doesn’t see their picture, email the trail office. The Commission thanked Ms. Myers and Ms. Gray and everyone that volunteered – it was a great event with a wonderful turnout. Nice work on the event!!!

MANAGER’S REPORT: Ms. Gray had nothing to add to the written report.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Ms. Russell reminded everyone that the Brooksie Way event is this weekend. The Commissioners all thanked staff for their work on the LDBW event.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Gamage, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 7:55 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT MEETING: October 16, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill

Respectfully submitted,

CHRIS GRAY, Assistant Trail Manager

HANK VAN AGEN, Secretary

DRAFT



4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306
(248) 651-9260
(248) 601-0106 (FAX)
www.paintcreektrail.org

**JOINT MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
and the OAKLAND TOWNSHIP PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION**

City of Rochester Municipal Offices
400 Sixth Street, Rochester, Michigan 48307

CALL TO ORDER: The Tuesday, September 18, 2018 Joint Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Becker at 8:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL FOR EACH GOVERNMENTAL BODY:

Paint Creek Trailways Commission:

Voting Members Present: Rock Blanchard, Susan Bowyer, Frank Ferriolo, Linda Gamage, Kim Russell, Donni Steele (*exit 9:00 p.m.*), Jeff Stout, Van Agen

Voting Alternates Present: None

Non-Voting Alternates Present: David Becker

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: None

Voting Members Absent: None

Alternates Absent: Chris Barnett, Robin Buxar, Ben Giovanelli, Chris Hagen, Lynn Loeb, Jenny McCardell, Martha Olijnyk

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Absent: Brad Mathisen

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Absent: Vacant

Others Present: Chris Gray, Assistant Trail Manager, Mindy-Milos Dale, Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Director, Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

Quorum present

Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission:

Present: Emily Barkham, Colin Choi, Dan Simon, Hank Van Agen

Absent: Craig Blust, Daniel Bukowski, Cathy Rooney

Quorum present

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the pledge.

PAINT CREEK TRAIL BRIDGE 33.7 RENOVATION PROJECT STATUS REPORT –

Mannik Smith Group: Mr. Matt Mikolajczyk, the Project Manager, came forward with his slide presentation. Also present is his co-worker, Mr. Cody Jones, who helped a lot with the design portion. They have been hired to help evaluate the existing bridge for replacement. They have looked at some rehab options and different types of structures and ultimately decided to go with a prefabricated truss system. The original design was a 75 foot long bridge with concrete abutments, which was put out to bid. The bids came back higher than anticipated. Due to that, they rejected the bids and looked at some cost savings measures. This also allowed time for research of additional funding sources. They looked at narrowing the 75 foot long bridge down to 60 feet. They also looked at abutment options. He explained how a Geosynthetically-Reinforced Soil (“GRS”) abutment is constructed, which is what they are proposing to use as a

cost saving measure. They worked with their geotechnical group to look at the soil borings and see where the water table elevations were to make sure this was an option that they could pursue. He explained why two different abutment options were dismissed. The GRS abutment is like stacking up self-contained beanbags. They are the whole width of the bridge, and about 16 feet at the bottom getting wider at the top. Each layer is stacked about a foot high and rock is placed in each layer. You are stacking layers of geogrid and geofabric with rock in between, so you're relying on the soil below. There is a sill that the truss would sit on, which distributes the load to the soil below. This is all protected by rip-rap in front. They are also recommending some sheet piling that would stay in place in front of the tow for protection during construction. He showed renderings of what it would look like – there's a non-structural casing on the front using modular blocks filled with gravel tying back to the system. This is material that can't break down, so it won't go anywhere. The fabric is made of plastic that doesn't break down. He showed a photo of the block with the fabric in between each level of block, so it's connected at each height change. This is actually a really quick system to install. MDOT has been using the system since the 70's, not so much for abutments, but for walls. They have been using the system for abutments more recently. MDOT is pushing to go with this system as they see it as a cost effective way to construct an abutment, especially for small bridges. In this case, you would have the sheeting that would extend above the bottom of the footing, which is all reinforced soil, and then it's backfilled with large stone rip-rap to prevent washouts. The rip-rap would prevent scouring. The materials used for the geofabric and the stone are designed for a 75-year life, but it may be more like 100 year life or more. You may have to go in and touch up some concrete block facing, but he doesn't see it being an ongoing maintenance issue every year – maybe after 20 years. You could actually take everything down and replace it new without affecting the structure, it's all façade. He showed a picture of what our bridge would look like. He knows one local contractor that completed a similar project, so he knows the system. He referred to a handout in the packet that shows where these types of abutments have been built around the nation as of 2014.

Mr. Ferriolo asked what the difference is in the abutment construction and its proximity to water for the 60 foot versus the 75 foot version – is there an impact on design that would make the 75 foot span with this abutment better in terms of longevity or repair? Mr. Mikolajczyk said yes there is – the thing with this wall system; the structure doesn't sit right on the face of the wall. The actual structure is back so it might be 3 or 4 feet to the bearing as opposed to right at the middle of the block. So it will push the walls in and narrow the waterway. Right now they have the permit to set the two walls 51 feet apart from each other – that narrows the waterway and speeds up the water that goes through. The water was going through at 5 feet per second, now we're up to 7 feet per second, so the requirement for rip-rap is a little bit larger. If it were to go out, it would slow the water down and the rip-rap might get a bit smaller. This velocity is an average velocity during a 100 year storm event. Everyday velocity won't see any change. Mr. Ferriolo said there's a \$50,000-60,000 difference in price between the 60 foot and 75 foot span. Is there a significant advantage to that investment for the long-term value of the bridge or not? Is there an advantage to re-look at the 75 foot span with the GRS abutment? Mr. Mikolajczyk said they can make either design work – the only advantage to taking it out is it slows down the water, and the rip-rap might have less of an ability to wash away. But they have designed for that, they've increased the diameter of the rip-rap to account for that case. This is in the estimate spec they have written. Mr. Simon asked why they went to the 75 foot length in the first place. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the reason was to reduce the exposed face of the abutment because they were worried about people getting under and marking the face. That way, they were allowed to bring the rip-rap up higher so that it wasn't somewhere where people would go and paint the face of the abutment. Also, it did reduce the size of the rip-rap by going with a wider span.

Mr. Blanchard asked by going with the GRS system compared to the one that was originally bid out – what is the difference in what they estimate in cost. Mr. Jones responded it is about \$45,000. Mr. Blanchard then asked if this includes reducing the span of the bridge or is the bridge the same as originally bid. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the bridge is either 60 foot or 75 foot long – they had to adjust the location of the abutment, so the concrete abutment would be in line with the end of the truss, where it would be slightly in front of it. So, they held the length of the bridge and moved the things underneath. Mr. Jones said the big cost savings comes from material pricing – concrete is expensive and steel pricing is going up. This system is all aggregate, geosynthetic fabric which is cheaper, and masonry facing – these prices don't fluctuate very much. There is also cost savings on construction time and the specialization that is not needed to deal with this type of construction. Mr. Becker asked if the 75 year estimated time span is for the structural or is the façade included in that 75 years. Mr. Mikolajczyk said they are basically landscape wall blocks and held in place – usually he sees issues if they are not held in place correctly or leaching of the concrete coming through the block. It won't necessarily fail – during 75 years you might have to do some replacing of block, but not a full replacement during that time span. Mr. Simon asked if the cloth on the bags will be woven or non-woven – woven is extremely strong versus non-woven. Mr. Mikolajczyk said this will be put together in their spec; he's sure it's a woven fabric, but not sure what it is specifically. Mr. Simon asked if it is stitched. Mr. Mikolajczyk said he will put a performance spec together – how high they will be and what materials will be required, and also what loads are on top of it. They will actually put the design together and specify materials they have in their system. There might be 3 or 4 different design systems that they use specifically for this type of abutment that they've done and have history with. Everything will be taken into consideration when putting the spec together so it's tight. He relies on his team to put everything together.

Mr. Mikolajczyk said they provided the costs for open sections, galvanized and weathering steel, 75 foot long and 60 foot long. Mr. Ferriolo asked if the weathering steel includes the corrosion allowance built in. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the weathering steel option has the corrosion allowance, the galvanized does not. Mr. Stout asked for clarification of the cost option sheet – is the left column where we were, and the right hand column is where are going? Ms. Milos-Dale explained the left column is where we originally started, the next column was the low bid, the remainder of the columns are all the combinations of the different options – galvanized versus the weathering, the 60 foot versus the 75 foot span, and GRS abutments versus the concrete footing. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the estimates stated are based on the unit price average bids, so they are trying to get in the middle. The number in the red parentheses is what we are short in dollars as of today. Mr. Ferriolo asked about the \$148,157 deficit from the old date – if we were to compare that with the same structure going out for bid this year – the expectation would be the column to the extreme right; where we were originally at \$802, now comes back at \$912. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the \$802 was the low bid, so the expectation is that it would be higher than that for the same thing we went out to bid for last year – this also has the 10% contingency built in. Ms. Milos-Dale commented that because of the time span now, and that they have been working on the other options, we also have the potential for getting additional grant assistance. Mr. Mikolajczyk said at the time, the Boards did not know how they could cover the overage, this really bought time moving to figure out a plan if it's higher than what the grant currently covers.

Bridge Design (open vs tubular), span length and type of steel

Mr. Mikolajczyk said the four options presented are the open section trusses – they did not present anything with a closed section.

REVIEW ENGINEER'S COST ESTIMATES FOR BRIDGE 33.7 REVISIONS: Mannik Smith Group: Mr. Mikolajczyk thanked Ms. Milos-Dale for her summarization. They got the

four prices for weathering steel, galvanized steel, the 75 foot and 60 foot span. They are looking at two different abutment styles – the spread footing and the GRS abutments, with those prices being \$532,000 and change, and \$486,000 and change. With either one of these abutment options, if you pick whatever bridge you go with, and add the bridge and installation prices is basically what the estimate will be for that bridge with everything included. The spread sheet adds in the construction administration which is 10% of the lowest estimate – right around \$70,000, and then 10% contingency over the estimate that would have to be accepted through MDOT. Basically, he wanted to show the potential cost savings in the two abutment styles, and then any savings realized from changing the type of steel and the length of the bridge in the four options. The spread sheet also includes the design engineering fees. The construction admin fees are not covered with the grant so they need to be recovered in house. The only thing the grant would cover would be the construction costs. Ms. Milos-Dale corrected him as the MNRTF grant does cover 15% of engineering costs.

Mr. Ferriolo commented the difference between the two constructions is \$73,000, which is a clean look at where we can go – we can go the cheapest way out, which is the GRS at 60 foot with galvanized steel versus where we were last year, which is \$215,000 over budgeted funds – so we have \$73,000 under the budget that the Parks Commission put together two years ago, so they are \$73,000 over their budget or \$215,000 over their budget from the lowest possible option versus the concrete, 75 foot option with weathering steel with corrosion allowance. The difference is about \$125,000-\$135,000 in additional expense to go the option we had last year. Ms. Milos-Dale stated the very bottom line is based on potential savings for changing the bid timing. Mr. Mikolajczyk said this is based on information they got from other contractors – the timing of the bid is still important as long as he can get it out in October. Mr. Stout asked if the current operating engineer's situation comes into play with this as far as bidding, scheduling, backlog and potential savings. Mr. Stout then explained the shut-down that is currently occurring – all current projects that have any federal dollars have stopped. Does this have any effect on the construction? Mr. Mikolajczyk said depending on how long this lasts, none of this was brought into consideration into this estimate. Obviously, the longer that goes, the more work they have on the books that is not going anywhere. Until this is resolved, it's hard to tell if it will bump into next season or the following season, depending on how long it goes and how long the seasons are. Mr. Stout believes this situation will enter into our project at some point because it is construction.

Mr. Becker is looking at the 60 foot bridge length, the GRS abutments and weathering steel – if our efforts at getting grants are successful, going with the weathering steel would be a deficit of \$122,057 and within our reach. It looks like it's about \$50,000 more than the cheapest minimum. Are the aesthetics or the \$50,000 more important if we don't get the grant– and if we do get the grant, we would have the money to do that. Mr. Ferriolo said he not sure we are going to know before we go out to bid which way it's going to go. We have to assume we're not going to get the grant. That may put pressure on our rationalizing. He wants to go back to where we were last year, but we're not going to do that. Practicality comes down to a discussion on the GRS versus concrete. The GRS is impressive, but in terms of fail-safe for the Township, is it better for us to amortize the expense of concrete, which is a \$50,000 differential, over 75 years, versus saving the \$50,000 now.

Mr. Stout said there is very no maintenance for the concrete aside from graffiti or cracking. Ms. Milos-Dale added spalling is also a concern. Spalling is where the concrete will pop off the front. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the reinforcement inside the concrete will corrode and expand. Because of that there is a massive amount of pressure that builds up and pops the concrete off, and that's where spall is developed. It creates a gap and allows water in and eventually pop off and spall.

There is no reinforcing steel in the GRS abutments, so the potential for spalling goes away. Mr. Choi asked if the concrete is more structural and load bearing with the concrete footing option versus the GRS option - the concrete is more facing and non load-bearing. Mr. Mikolajczyk said this is correct.

Mr. Blanchard asked if on the block itself, if you were trying to get graffiti off, do they have a different outside texture; more smooth rather than textured. Mr. Mikolajczyk said there are some options, they usually go with the split block facing which is textured and more difficult to clean, but there may be other smooth block type texture. You would have to paint over it to fix it. Mr. Mikolajczyk said all the steel they specify in the abutments are epoxy coated, so they have a coating over the bars to prevent water from getting to them, so there should be less of a potential for corrosion, but there is still potential because it's steel. There are other options to get away from steel but are more expensive.

Ms. Russell commented on the block, with graffiti, and the power-washing, she feels it's actually more aesthetically pleasing with a little bit of texture because once you start painting, the paint starts to peel, so after time it looks terrible. So she thinks with the texture with the spray wash versus the split block with the painting is a better solution from her experience. Mr. Mikolajczyk said these are details they can put together in the specifications and share with the Boards before they put it out to bid.

Ms. Steele wonders if we should revisit repairing of the old bridge. We're up to a million dollars for a bridge from where we started.

Mr. Ferriolo asked relative to the 60 foot effect on the flow of water, if MDEQ is OK with that? Mr. Mikolajczyk said yes, and they have a permit for both the 60 foot and 75 foot. Mr. Ferriolo said with that understanding, and the only other issue – the bridge type, the Keystone, is the one we originally were looking at, expect that it's possibly galvanized instead of weathering steel. All things considered into this, the \$50,000 credit issue may go away too – so he suggests consideration on the first step up of galvanized, 60 foot with the GRS as the proposed motion for agreement considering Parks budget, and whether or not any more money is realized to help out. Failsafe to get this job done next year, this would be the least costly opportunity that we have if it's approved.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded Stout, *Moved*, to approve revision option and design engineering cost estimate to prepare plans for bidding on Bridge 33.7 renovations to include the 60 foot length, galvanized steel with the GRS abutments.

Discussion on the Motion:

Mr. Choi goes back to the 60 foot versus the 75 foot – he gets that it's 40% faster and we have a permit for that, what is the impact of that speed to surrounding areas. There was a neighbor that was very concerned about the impact to his property and the surrounding properties. What's the impact of that, if at all? Mr. Mikolajczyk said the speed of the water flowing underneath the structure is really under the structure between the abutments. As it goes past the abutments, it opens up, and the speed will slow down, especially if we go with a shorter span. It will be fast underneath and will slow down as it goes out. Either span is not going to affect any of the land up or downstream, or negatively from what's there now.

Mr. Becker said the first suggestion was the 75 foot span – now a 60 foot span is acceptable – what makes the 60 foot acceptable, where earlier the 75 foot was first suggested. What are we losing by going to the 60 foot span and is it worth the \$50,000. Mr. Mikolajczyk said it's

mostly the shorter abutments, the face is not exposed as much. The water would slow going through the bridge, so the rip-rap is smaller. It's a little larger bridge, but it's not that much of a cost difference. He feels the 75 foot span suits the site, not so much the aesthetics, but also for the efficiency of the hydraulics going through the bridge – they are better with the longer span. Mr. Jones indicated that the MDEQ said the 75 foot span is what they'd like to see, but that does not mean we have to agree.

Mr. Choi asked if by going from a 75 foot to a 60 foot span, that we're just taking on more scouring risk. Mr. Mikolajczyk said that would be the risk – if we didn't haven't have the rip-rap properly designed, it does have more potential for scouring. Ms. Milos-Dale added she's had situations along the creek with their maintenance that the rip-rap was not big enough and everything got washed away. She feels the right design of the rip-rap is really important, especially if we go with the GRS system. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the rip-rap is pretty deep in the ground and there's a large tow in front. It is pretty substantial.

Mr. Choi feels the cost difference is \$30,000 and with the risk of scouring impacting the bridge over that period time, if we're not repairing more over that time. In this case, he'd rather minimize that risk, and go to a 75 foot bridge. He likes the GRS over concrete because part of the issue is variability in cost. Concrete has a higher variability of costs because of prices going up. GRS sounds like the materials that are inherent to produce abutments that are pretty stable, so he's more comfortable with that. He gets the 60 foot length and appreciates the idea of cutting costs down and protecting the budget, but is trying to understand the risk in the long-term.

Mr. Becker agrees with that. If we don't get a grant, the Parks and Recreation Commission will have to come up with the extra money.

Mr. Blanchard asked if there is an option to go with the 75 foot span, or the weathering steel, if the idea is that we get the grant. The motion could be to go with the 60 foot, but if we get the grant, we can change it to the 75 foot and concrete.

Mr. Mikolajczyk said he can put everything together for the 60 foot or 75 foot galvanized. The spec would be very little change – he would hope to do that before they give it to MDOT. There is some wiggle room to do it before they go out to bid through MDOT. There's always a chance if there's money there before the contractor orders the bridge, to make changes to the steel type. There are a couple different options depending on the outcome of the grant. A steel change is a bit more doable than the length. Some of these changes can happen even while it's out to bid. When we do get the bid prices back, if we happen to be low and there's some money on the table, there is some potential to negotiate with the contractor to make some changes. The changes should be minor – but if it's a span length that would affect multiple items, it could really make a difference. The Board would not have to accept the negotiated amount at that point. They could negotiate after the fact.

Mr. Simon asked what the span of the old railroad was. It was 61 foot. He indicated we weren't changing a lot on the width if we stick with the 60 foot bridge. He said what we don't know is the GRS abutment history. Concrete has been around for hundreds of years - concrete footings are going to last. He doesn't trust putting cloth around rocks. Mr. Jones said the Federal Highway has a website containing FAQ's about construction, design and durability and why it would last 100 years, even though they know nothing has been in place for 100 years. The website will direct you to this research.

Mr. Blanchard is in favor of doing exactly how we bid it before with the exception of the GRS system. It looks like a good system and they've used it in other places and it has lasted in those situations. He likes the weathering steel and we bid it out as a 75 foot bridge and weathering steel for a reason – this is the option to go to.

Ms. Russell is in favor of the GRS system – we have to trust in new things. She feels the 75 foot length is important over the 60 foot.

Mr. Ferriolo agreed to amend his motion to go to a 75 foot span after hearing the discussion, and given the option that we may have an opportunity to switch from galvanized to weathering steel. Mr. Stout agreed to the amendment.

VOTE BY PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION

Amended Motion:

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Stout, *Moved*, to approve the revision option and design engineering cost to prepare plans for bidding on Bridge 33.7 renovations to include the 75 foot foot length, galvanized steel with the GRS base with an anticipated deficit of \$102,257.

Ms. Bowyer asked that when the bids come back in, can we change from galvanized to weathering and from the GRS system? Mr. Mikolajczyk said no, the GRS change would be a design change. The only change that could be made after the bid would be the steel. Mr. Blanchard asked if the estimated cost should be included in the motion. Mr. Mikolajczyk said an estimated cost of \$928,457 was provided, but there's some viabilities and no guarantee. It was agreed not to put this figure in the motion.

Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

VOTE BY OAKLAND TOWNSHIP PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION:

MOTION by Choi, seconded by Barkham, *Moved*, to approve the revision option and design engineering cost to prepare plans for bidding on Bridge 33.7 renovations to include the 75 foot length, galvanized steel with the GRS base.

Ayes: All Nays: None

OVERVIEW OF NEXT STAGE OF THE PROCESS Mannik Smith Group: Mr.

Mikolajczyk said the next stage is to finalize the specification for the GRS abutment and get the plans ready for bid and get it to MDOT no later than October 28th. They will try to do it sooner than that, with the latest bid letting of January 4th. Once, that is done, it's a month long process, and then within three days we'll know what the prices are.

AJDOURNMENT BY THE PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION:

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT BY THE OAKLAND TOWNSHIP PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION:

MOTION by Choi, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Respectfully submitted,

EMILY BARKHAM, Secretary
Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission

HANK VAN AGEN, Secretary
Paint Creek Trailways Commission

DRAFT



4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306
(248) 651-9260
(248) 601-0106 (FAX)
www.paintcreektrail.org

SPECIAL MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
Paint Creek Cider Mill
4480 Orion Road, Oakland Township, MI 48306

CALL TO ORDER: The Thursday, October 4, 2018 special meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairperson Blanchard at 6:10 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Rock Blanchard, Frank Ferriolo, Donni Steele, Hank Van Agen

Voting Alternates Present: Jenny McCardell

Non-Voting Alternates Present: Martha Olijnyk

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: None

Voting Members Absent: Susan Bowyer, Linda Gamage (*participated via phone*), Kim Russell, Jeff Stout

Alternates Absent: Chris Barnett, David Becker, Robin Buxar, Ben Giovanelli, Chris Hagen, Lynn Loeb

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Absent: Brad Mathisen

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Absent: Vacant

Others Present: Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Van Agen, *Moved*, to approve the October 4, 2018 agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

DISCUSSION: Candidate Interview Format and Questions: The first interview is at 7:00, the second at 7:40. The Commissioners discussed and coordinated the format and questions that will be asked of each candidate. Each Commissioner will ask one or two identical questions of the candidates. Commissioners who were not part of the subcommittee will ask their questions first. Questions were then formalized.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by McCardell, *Moved*, to recess the special meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting was called back to order at 6:55 p.m.

CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS:

Melissa Ford

Mr. Blanchard explained that one of the Commissioners is participating via phone. The Commission welcomed Ms. Ford and explained some different members are present tonight. Ms. Ford introduced herself and summarized her background. She is presently the archivist at the Marshall Brothers Sculpture Museum at Saginaw Valley State University. She has been there 11 years, and has a Master's Degree in Public History and a Bachelor's Degree in History and Anthropology. She is responsible for managing the museum's archival collections working on exhibitions. She does grant writing, administering grants that pertain to her department. She also conducts tours. She is an adjunct professor at the University as well. She is looking for a part time position and indicated she would leave her position at Saginaw Valley if offered the Manager position.

The Commission then asked their questions and received answers. She has project management skills, experience working with grant projects and budgets and working with public. She's willing to take any training necessary to get up to speed and adequately perform the job. She is familiar with working with and presenting reports to Boards. She has prepared budgets in Excel for grant proposals. She participated in a 5-year Strategic Plan. She had ideas on how to recruit volunteers for the Friends Group and updating the website. She is familiar with social media and writes press releases. She lives near the trail and could bike to work. She is flexible with the indoor versus outdoor responsibilities. She would like to give two weeks notice to her employer if offered the position. Mr. Blanchard indicated there is one more candidate to interview, and a decision should be made tonight or very soon. The Commission thanked Ms. Ford for her time.

The interview concluded at 7:30 p.m.

Janet Hofman (via Skype and FaceTime)

The Commission welcomed Ms. Hofman. Ms. Hofman introduced herself and summarized her background. She is originally from the Detroit area and has a Bachelor's Degree in Geography and Tourism from Eastern Michigan. When she graduated, she left Michigan to explore as many places as possible and has been doing this for the past ten years. She worked for the National Parks Service for a long time; six seasons with them at five or six different national parks. Then she worked for a couple of non-profits, one in Washington DC and one in Denver focusing on sustainable agriculture and low income neighborhoods. She ended going back to school obtaining a Master's Degree in Parks and Resource Management. Her passion is with parks and public lands and getting people to connect with those areas. Since that time, she's been working with Arizona State Parks, which is where she is for the next two weeks. She's the Assistant Manager of Slide Rocks Parks in Sedona, which is a water recreation park. She is coming back to Michigan October 21st due to family issues. She is familiar with the trail as her dad lived in Lake Orion.

The Commission asked their questions and received answers. She is interested in this job because she wants to get back into the non-profit world in a position that is community based and conservation minded. She likes that the Trail is rooted in the communities that it runs through. Her current position is a full-time position and is now in a position where she doesn't need to work full-time. This is not a concern to her as she is currently paid less than what was listed in the posting. Once she moves back, she has an open schedule, and would have the time to dedicate herself to the position as much as needed. Her position doesn't lend to coordinating with a Board, however there were Boards for the non-profits. Her experience with interacting with Board members was a lot of fund-raisers, but is something she's comfortable with. She is comfortable with communication skills and looks forward to working with the Board. Her boss is more involved in the budget and how to allot funds to various areas of the park. She's has experience in the entry level of the budget. She has experience with different software, not

QuickBooks specifically. She has assisted with a Master Plan for the non-profits as well as the Parks, mostly by editing, developing and writing, not creating a new plan. She is familiar with and has experience with Friends Groups, and the volunteering effort, especially through social media. She had grant writing courses in her education, and assisted her boss in these efforts. She has never written a full grant, believes she's a good writer and looks forward to writing one. She is a self-disciplined and balanced person, and what has to be done, will get done effectively. She will be relocating to Madison Heights when she returns. She would be available to start on October 25th. The Commission thanked Ms. Hofman for her time and indicated she will be hearing a decision within a week.

The interview concluded at 8:15 p.m.

The Commission debated pros and cons of each candidate. Mr. Blanchard shared emails from Mr. Stout and Mr. Becker relative to their preference. Both candidates are excellent.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Offering Trail Manager Position:

MOTION by Van Agen, seconded by Ferriolo, *Moved*, to forward the Commission's results to the Chairman and offer the position of the Trail Manager to Ms. Ford.

Ayes: All None: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Steele, *Moved*, to direct the Chairman to follow through with the offer to Ms. Ford including negotiations and the contract for salary range.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION by Steele, seconded by McCardell, *Moved*, to direct the Chairman to contact Ms. Hofman after negotiations are completed with Ms. Ford. Rejection letters should be sent to others that were interviewed.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

The Personnel Committee, Ms. Myers and Ms. Gray were thanked for all their hard work in prelude to tonight's meeting.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: No reports were given.

ADJOURNMENT OF SPECIAL MEETING:

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Steele, *Moved*, to adjourn the Special Meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT MEETING: October 16, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill

Respectfully submitted,

HANK VAN AGEN, Secretary

Paint Creek Trailways Commission

Treasurer's Report - Flagstar Bank

September 2018

Balance:	1-Sep-18			
	Checking Balance		\$	139,601.88
	Outstanding Checks (3264,3268,3276,3277)		\$	890.00
				<u>\$ 138,711.88</u>
Revenues:				
	Interest Income		\$	27.33
	Total Revenues		\$	27.33
				<u>\$ 138,739.21</u>
Expenditures:				
	3282 - Chase card services:		\$	515.00
	USPS - Stamps	\$		15.00
	Rochester Bike Shop - LDBW	\$		500.00
				<u>\$ 515.00</u>
	3283 - Michigan Municipal League - Trail Manager job listing		\$	106.32
	3284 - Oakland County Mounted Patrol - September 2018		\$	1,004.76
	3285 - Oakland Twp Parks & Recreation - 3rd Qtr Wages/FICA		\$	15,317.48
	3286 - Sandi DiSipio - August 21, 2018 Recorders Fee		\$	230.00
	3287 - Sir Speedy Printing - Trail map/brochure reprint		\$	1,500.00
	Total Expenditures		\$	18,673.56
				<u>\$ 120,065.65</u>
Balance:	30-Sep-18			
	Checking Balance		\$	120,955.65
	Outstanding Checks (3268,3276,3277,3286)		\$	890.00
				<u>\$ 120,065.65</u>
	TRAILWAYS COMMISSION BALANCE			\$ 120,065.65

Signed By: _____
 Trailways Commission Treasurer Trail Manager

Date: _____



MEMO

To: Commissioners, Alternates and Staff

From: Kristen Myers, Trail Manager

Subject: October Manager's Report

Date: October 10, 2018

Advisory Committee Reports

There are no advisory committee reports. The branding committee is still waiting on me for direction,

Complaints/Vandalism

Spray paint graffiti on mile marker 35.

Medical Emergencies/Police/Fire Calls on the Trail

I am unaware of any Medical Emergencies/Police/ or Fire calls on the Trail.

Finances

We are still waiting for a few July License fee invoices to be paid.

Promotion of the Trail

- Our Facebook page has 5,703 followers, an increase of 18 since last month
- Our Twitter account has 637 followers, an increase of 4 since last month.
- Our Instagram Account has 343 followers, an increase of 2 since last month.
- Our E-Newsletter has 94 subscribers so far. I had to delete over 60 fake accounts, mostly with Russian (.ru) email addresses. I have updated and increased our security protocols for signups.
- I've posted information and photos on social media.
- I've spent 3 hours on the trail this past month.

Future Agenda Items

- ◆ Vandalism Ordinance in Orion Township
- ◆ Cider Mill Gateway/Moutrie Memorial Project Updates
- ◆ Bridge 33.7 Renovation Updates – Joint Meeting with OTPRC
- ◆ 2018 Resurfacing Engineering – Update
- ◆ Iron Belle Trail Grant RFP for Signage Design Services
- ◆ Village of Lake Orion Membership & Participation on PCTC

Paint Creek Trail Website Analytics

In the last 30 days, we had 16,260 visitors, with 136,852 visits. The top 10 visited pages:

Top Pages	Last 30 Days
Home Page	8,328
Trail Maps	1,632
Maps	1,425
Parking	976
E-Newsletter	870
Maps	635
Mileage	600
History	338
FAQ	335
2018 Cruisin' For the Trails	332

In August, we had 15,984 visitors, with 147,689 visits. The top 10 visited pages:

Top Pages	August
Home Page	9,402
Trail Maps	1,727
Labor Day Bridge Walk	1,580
Maps	1,571
Parking	1,046
Jobs	911
E-Newsletter	830
Maps	637
Labor Day Bridge Walk Registration	603
Mileage	504

2018 Temporary Permit Approvals

- Frank Race Mgmt, Run Michigan Cheap: 3/25, 4/29, 5/19
- Cruisin' for the Trails – 5/5
- RCS Foundation Hometown Hustle: 5/12
- MI Nature Association Rattlesnake Run/Walk 5k: 6/30
- Orion Arts Center – Dragon on the Lake 5K – 8/25
- Gears & Beers Benefit for Jenna Kast Foundation 9/8
- CCC – Mother's Wish 5K – 9/15
- Crossroads Walkathon: 9/22
- Brooksie Way Half Marathon: 9/24
- Orion Firefighters Association 5K: 9/29

Commission Ad-Hoc Committee Assignments

Recognition Ad Hoc committee (as part of National Trails Day – June 2)	Gamage, Olijnyk, Russell
Personnel Ad Hoc committee	Becker, Blanchard, Steele, Van Agen
SE Rochester Property Ad Hoc committee	Becker, Blanchard, Gamage, Russell
Labor Day Bridge Walk (Sept 3) Ad Hoc committee	Blanchard, Bowyer, Ferriolo, Olijnyk
Lake Orion Membership Ad Hoc committee	Becker, Blanchard, Steele, Van Agen
Trail Branding Ad Hoc committee	Gamage, Loeb, Myers, Olijnyk
Rochester Hills Art/Pathway & Trail Improvements Ad Hoc committee	Becker, Blanchard, Bowyer, Russell

Limited Use Permit Policy Ad Hoc committee	Bowyer, Stout, Van Agen
--	-------------------------

2018 Goals

Administrative

Progress

Continue coordinating assistance with Friends of the Paint Creek Trail (ongoing)	<p>Feb: Kristen and Chris working on one day liquor license for Friends. Motor City Brew Tour's Cruisin' for the Trails fundraising cycling event scheduled for May 5, 2018. Next Friends meeting scheduled for April 5, 2018.</p> <p>March: Liquor permit application is complete and has received Township and Sheriff Office approval. It is being mailed today. I've also been working with the new President on administrative tasks and budget planning.</p> <p>April: Liquor permit approved; Chris and I attended the Friends meeting and provided updates on Trail issues and projects.</p> <p>May: Successful Brew Tour event held on May 5. \$6,200 was raised for trail improvements.</p>
Continue Trail etiquette education (ongoing)	<p>Ongoing – will take opportunities to continue education.</p> <p>Feb: Created “horses” page on website, added courtesy information.</p> <p>April: Included Trail Courtesy information in the draft 2018 Trail Newsletter</p> <p>May: Included large section about Trail Courtesy in the newsletter</p>
New Brochure/Map Update	<p>Feb: Waiting DNR decision on Iron Belle Trail Grant. Announcements in March.</p> <p>March: We got the grant! Waiting for paperwork from the DNR. The Branding committee is trying to find time to meet and get started.</p> <p>April: The Branding Committee has met and begin discussions regarding the IBT Grant and sign/map updates.</p> <p>October: 7500 updated brochures were received.</p>
New Bike Patroller (fill vacancy)	<p>Feb: Kristen will contact personnel committee over next few weeks to review job description, determine timeline for posting</p> <p>March: I updated the job description and sent it to the personnel committee. My goal is to get their approval and post the position in the beginning of April.</p> <p>April: The Bike Patroller Job Posting was published on April 10. Applications are due by 3:00pm on April 26.</p> <p>May: 10 resumes received; interviews will be over the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>June: Interviews were held, a candidate is being recommended at the meeting.</p> <p>July: Dan Butterworth has started patrolling and is doing a great job.</p>
Continue coordination and participation with Oakland County Trail, Water, & Land Alliance (TWLA)	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Feb: TWLA Report in packet from January meeting.</p> <p>April: I will be attending the April 19 meeting, and will be giving a presentation on the Paint Creek Trail.</p> <p>June: I've been assisting the MTGA with their Great Lake to Lake Trail Route 1 plans.</p>

	<p>July: I've still been assisting the MTGA with their Great Lake to Lake Trail Route 1 plans, and it continues to progress.</p> <p>October: I attended/chaired the TWLA Fall Celebration held in Independence Twp on October 4.</p> <p>August: I am scheduled to present at the next Great Lake to Lake Trail Route 1 summit in early October.</p>
Trail Closure education/public relations/Communications Plan campaign in 2018	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Feb: Kristen presenting communications plan on agenda</p> <p>March: MailChimp account established. Working on draft newsletter, will be presented in April.</p> <p>April: Draft newsletter is on the agenda.</p> <p>May: Newsletter completed, uploaded to website, sent to printer.</p> <p>June: Several postings on social media and website announcing project postponement. Chris and I placed posters in kiosks also. Revised newsletter should be sent to print next week.</p> <p>August: Newsletter updated, sent to print, and mailed to almost 900 property owners.</p>

Master Plan

Progress

Southeast Rochester Property Development	<p>Feb: Kristen coordinating with Mannik Smith. Field survey with engineers scheduled for March, weather permitting.</p> <p>April: I will be on the trail with Mannik Smith engineers this week and/or next to work on the surfacing designs for the pathway and observation deck.</p> <p>May: Conducted site visit with Mannik Smith on April 30.</p> <p>July: I met with representatives from the City of Rochester, the County, and FCRT regarding coordinating improvements in the area.</p>
Wayfinding signage in Rochester and Lake Orion	<p>Feb: Waiting DNR decision on Iron Belle Trail Grant. Announcements in March.</p> <p>March: We got the grant! Waiting for paperwork from the DNR.</p> <p>April: The Branding Committee has met and begin discussions regarding the IBT Grant and sign/map updates.</p> <p>May: The Branding Committee is waiting on some answer from me regarding the signage project. Will resume work with them this month.</p>
Bridge 33.7 Renovation Project – work with OTPRC, MDOT, and DNR to replace bridge	<p>Feb: Kristen coordinating with Mannik Smith and OTPRC regarding tree removals. Waiting for DNR approval of renovation plans. Tentatively week of February 19</p> <p>March: Received approval from DNR and MDOT today for the engineering plans. Will be put out to bid ASAP. Will keep you posted.</p> <p>April: An update is on this month's agenda.</p> <p>June: A joint meeting was held on May 30 with OTPRC. Both groups requested that the engineer investigate cost savings by changing some scope items. Another meeting will be scheduled when the information is ready for discussion.</p> <p>August: Contacted MSG regarding sinkhole; had engineers conduct testing to ensure bridge and trail integrity. Waiting for MDEQ response to plan next joint meeting.</p> <p>October: Project should go out to bid at the end of this month. Chris has submitted a LOI to a local foundation</p>

	for funding; if approved, I will help write the proposal and submit it on behalf of the Commission.
City of Rochester – Bridge Replacement	Feb: Kristen will contact Rochester DPW director over the next month to start discussions and offer assistance.

Planning & Development Goals

Progress

National Trails Day –June 2, 2018	Feb: Kristen coordinating with Lake Orion DDA; Chris working on promotional item options. March: Plans have been fine-tuned with the DDA April: This item is on the agenda. May: Plans finalized, promotion started. Invites are in your meeting packet. June: Event was held, report given at the June 19 meeting.
Labor Day Bridge Walk – September 3, 2018	Sponsorship volunteers should start soliciting sponsors in March May: This item is on the agenda. July: Commissioner Ferriolo has been busy securing sponsors for our LDBW. Thank you, Frank! August: Press release written and distributed; online registration updated and open; posters made and are in trail kiosks; neoprene key chain holders ordered and expected to arrive next week. Dr. Bowyer working on securing volunteers; Commissioner Ferriolo secured sponsors. Insurance sent to Rochester; event and use of Kiwanis pavilion approved. September: Successful event held with 400 participants!
Paint Creek Trail Resurfacing	Feb: Kristen coordinating with Mannik Smith. Field survey with engineers scheduled for March, weather permitting. March: Engineers have begun preliminary design; once the weather permits, I will inspect the trail with the engineers. April: I will be on the trail with Mannik Smith engineers this week and/or next to work on the surfacing designs for the trail. May: Resurfacing engineers and I rode the entire trail, noting areas in need of repair or improvement. August: Engineers are putting final touches on design engineering. Will be presenting to Commission in September (hopefully – depending on bridge approval process with MDEQ) October: Waiting on Mannik Smith to provide cost estimate for Construction Engineering. Is tentatively on the agenda. Chris and I have been working on a grant application that may assist with partial funding of this project.
Trail identification and road crossing signage (Branding)	Feb: Waiting DNR decision on Iron Belle Trail Grant. Announcements in March. March: We got the grant! Waiting for paperwork from the DNR April: The Branding Committee has met and begin discussions regarding the IBT Grant and sign/map updates. May: The Branding Committee is waiting on some answer from me regarding the signage project. Will resume work with them this month. October: Will work with new trail manager to resume this project.
David Moutrie Memorial Project – near Flagstar	Feb: Presentation on Feb 20 Agenda

	<p>March: Have not had time to contact designer to update changes. Aiming for April agenda.</p> <p>April: Still haven't contacted designer to make changes. We will try again for May!</p> <p>May: Have contacted designer, waiting on updated design and cost estimates.</p> <p>July: We had a great site visit after our June 19 meeting. Thank you to everyone who attended!</p> <p>October: I am turning this project over to the Friends group and the new trail manager.</p>
Gateway Signage – Each community	<p>Feb: Waiting DNR decision on Iron Belle Trail Grant. Announcements in March.</p> <p>March: We got the grant! Waiting for paperwork from the DNR</p> <p>April: The Branding Committee has met and begin discussions regarding the IBT Grant and sign/map updates.</p> <p>October: Will work with new trail manager to resume this project.</p>
Tienken Educational Pathway Project	<p>Feb: Kristen Coordinating with Mannik Smith on design. Will contact Kings Cove when more information available.</p> <p>April: I will be on the trail with Mannik Smith engineers this week and/or next to work on the surfacing designs for the pathway.</p> <p>May: Resurfacing engineers and I rode the entire trail, and went through the pathway site preparing for development.</p> <p>June: The surfacing has been postponed until 2019, after the bridge project.</p> <p>October: Waiting for more information from Mannik Smith.</p>
Oakland Township Parking Lot Development	<p>Feb: Kristen contacted by OTPRC; provided input on new lot. Chris attended OTPRC Capital Improvements Comm meeting. OTPRC will be applying for MNRTF grant to develop new parking lot in Adams/Orion corridor. See memo in your packet.</p> <p>March: This item is on the agenda for approval.</p> <p>April: OTPRC has submitted their application to the MNRTF. They will find out if it gets funded in December 2018.</p> <p>June: I attended a site visit with OTPRC and the DNR Grant Coordinator to walk the site and show where development and connections will be.</p>

Policies

Progress

Native Plant Approval Policy	No progress yet. Need expert assistance
Conservation Stewardship Policy	No progress yet. Need expert assistance
Limited Use Permit Policy	<p>Feb: Ad-Hoc Committee will have update at Feb 20 meeting</p> <p>April: Ad-Hoc Committee will have a recommendation at the meeting.</p> <p>May: This item is on the agenda</p>
Fund Balance Policy	<p>No progress yet; Auditor making recommendation</p> <p>Feb: Auditor made recommendation to keep \$25,000 (3 months) worth of expenses in fund balance.</p>

Maintenance**Progress**

Assure Restrooms are maintained (ongoing)	Ongoing. C/K restroom closed until April 1, 2018 April: Restroom is back open and will be cleaned by Turner Sanitation twice a week, per Orion Township.
Continue vandalism prevention education (ongoing)	Ongoing.
Continue surface maintenance inspections and coordination of repairs (ongoing)	Feb: Community Service volunteer conducted limited trail inspection this month. No issues. May: I conducted an inspection while out with the resurfacing engineer. I will type it up and email it as soon as I can.
Road Crossing improvements – work with RCOC	Ongoing. Continue working with RCOC for improvements at our crossings.

Long Term Goals**Progress**

Polly Ann Connection	Ongoing. Orion Township working on Clarkston Road connector; Village of Lake Orion trail extension completed. March: Wrote letters of support for Orion Township's MNRTF and TAP grant applications for the Clarkston Road Phase 3A and 3B pathway connectors, east of M-24. See you packet for more information.
Side parcel acquisition for parking and trail access	Will continue looking for opportunities
Acquisition of historic resources	Will continue looking for opportunities March: Have been working with the bridge engineer for a plan to salvage parts of bridge 33.7
Installation of drinking fountain, where appropriate, in each community	Will continue looking for opportunities March: Oakland Twp.'s Paint Creek Junction trailhead project has included the installation of a hand pump well for potable water.
Village of Lake Orion Membership on PCTC	Ad-Hoc Committee Recommendation scheduled for March 20, 2018 with a vote on April 16, 2018 March: This item is on the agenda. April: This item is on the agenda. May: This item is on the agenda. June: A special meeting was held for the PCTC to discuss this. July: The three attorneys have met and are in discussions. August: Attorney Hamameh has been working with the Village of LO attorney. October: Attorney Hamameh is waiting for a response from the Village of Lake Orion's attorney.