



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

REGULAR MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
Paint Creek Cider Mill
4480 Orion Road, Rochester, MI 48306

CALL TO ORDER: The Tuesday, March 19, 2019 meeting was called to order by Chairperson Becker at 7:00 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Rock Blanchard, Susan Bowyer, Frank Ferriolo, Kim Russell (*enter 8:20 p.m.*), Donni Steele

Voting Alternates Present: David Becker, Martha Olijnyk

Non-Voting Alternates Present: None

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

Voting Members Absent: Linda Gamage, Jeff Stout, Hank Van Agen

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

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Absent: None

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Absent: Vacant

Others Present: Melissa Ford, Trail Manager, Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Blanchard, seconded by Olijnyk, ***Moved***, to approve the March 19, 2019 agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. Minutes – February 13, 2019, Joint Meeting with OTPRC, approve and file
- b. Minutes – February 19, 2019 Regular Meeting, approve and file
- c. Treasurers Report – February 2019, receive and file

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Blanchard, ***Moved***, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Ford presented the list of invoices totaling \$15,639.78. In addition to the recorder's fee, this amount includes payment to Foster, Swift, Collins & Smith PC for legal services for the Lake Orion license agreement, bridge change order and resurfacing bid docs, payment to Ramie Phillips PC for the 2018 financial audit, cost for the annual website database storage and 1st Qtr wages and FICA for the Manager and Assistant Manager's wages. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$71,215.

MOTION by Blanchard, seconded by Bowyer, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved in the amount of \$15,639.78 and orders be drawn for payment.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL: 2019 Budget Amendment: Chairman Becker explained the request is to move \$2,000 from the unrestricted fund balance into the legal budget. The reason is the legal budget is under \$100 and more legal requirements are expected with the bridge and resurfacing projects. Rather than ask the Commission for permission to pay legal services for each invoice, we would like to move this amount into the legal budget. Staff is allowed to spend up to \$1,000 without permission of the Commission. Major expenses would still come before the Commission.

MOTION by Olijnyk, seconded by Bowyer, *Moved*, to move \$2,000 from the unrestricted fund balance into the legal budget.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL: Community Foundation of Greater Rochester, Inc. Advisory Committee:

Chairman Becker explained the Community Foundation requires an Advisory Committee for handling funds in the Foundation. There is concern that this be done quickly. He asked that the four officers of the Commission serve as the Advisory Committee – Ms. Steele, Messrs. Becker, Blanchard and Van Agen, when it comes to disbursing funds. Ms. Ford stated the Commission can't publicly announce this until this agreement is place.

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Ferriolo, *Moved*, to form the Advisory Committee for the Community Foundation that includes Mr. Becker, Mr. Blanchard, Ms. Steele and Mr. Van Agen.

Mr. Blanchard wonders if there would be some value to have a Friends Group member on the Committee. Mr. Ferriolo thinks the Committee should be limited to one member from each Commission member community. In regard to the actual contract, Ms. Olijnyk pointed out that in the description of the organization, Orion Township is not listed. She then asked what the funds could be used for. Ms. Ford clarified if the grant is received, those funds would be restricted to the resurfacing and bridge projects; if other individuals want to donate, those funds could be used towards other projects. It is the consensus of the Commission that it's great we will be part of the Foundation as it may open other doors for funding. Staff was thanked for all their work.

Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL: Adopt-A-Trail Signage Fee: Ms. Ford is proposing to institute a \$50 signage fee for Adopt-A-Trail groups to help defray the costs for the two signs that each group has on their section of the trail. Two years ago when the last group signed up the cost was about \$40 plus shipping for the signs, and there has been some turnover. So the new groups will have that same cost. There are seven different sections of the trail, so that's a \$350 expense every time there is turnover for all of the different segments. She has approached some of the groups to see if they would be open the idea of paying for the signs, and there was no push-back. The groups get to keep the signs they paid for if they choose not to be part of the Adopt-A-Trail program in the future.

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to institute a \$50 signage fee for Adopt-A-Trail groups to help defray the signage costs.

Mr. Ferriolo suggested clarification the cost is for two signs. Ms. Bowyer asked if the cost was for the signs in the future. Ms. Ford explained the cost for the signs is in perpetuity. Mr. Blanchard asked what happens if the price of the signs increase. He suggested the motion read to defray the cost of the signs, regardless of what it is. Upon a question if Rochester Hills sign shop

provides the signs, Ms. Ford indicated the signs are ordered on line, but will check with the Rochester Hills to see if we can get a better deal. Ms. Steele agreed to amend her motion; Mr. Blanchard agreed.

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to institute a signage fee to defray the expense of two signs in perpetuity for Adopt-A-Trail groups.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL: Master Plan Update

Request for Proposals – Planning Services: Mr. Becker indicated proposals were received from McKenna and Giffels Webster; their estimates were much over the Commission’s budget. The committee thought the proposals were bloated with items we didn’t really need. Ms. Ford made a call and asked if they could bring their proposals down to the \$7,000 that is budgeted. She passed out their responses to the members, explained she asked them to submit a synopsis, and that’s why one response is shorter than the other. The committee and Ms. Ford have read the synopsis. Mr. Becker said we can give the responses back to the committee if the Commission wants to give them the right to make the decision. Ms. Bowyer said both bidders are great, Giffels Webster completed the Rochester Hills Master Plan recently, did a great job and received awards for it. McKenna did the Oakland Township, so they are both working in communities that are on the trail; either one will be good. McKenna first came in at \$25,000 and Giffels Webster was at \$15,000, but were both responsive to bringing their estimate down to \$7,000. Ms. Bowyer pointed out what McKenna eliminated from their bid, and commented what Giffels Webster eliminated were items that the committee felt weren’t relevant to what they wanted. She tends more toward Giffels Webster because she knows what Rochester Hills’ final product was. Ms. Steele added that Giffels Webster answered the proposals more accurately to the RFP than McKenna, who did not gear their proposal towards the Commission specifically, but more generic. She leans towards Giffels Webster as well. Mr. Ferriolo’s first impression is to lean towards Giffels Webster, but holds that back as the committee may have had more intense discussion on this. Mr. Blanchard agrees based on what was in the packet, as McKenna was looking at more of a whole recreational plan versus just the trailway. He’s fine with Giffels Webster, as their price was closer to what was budgeted in the beginning. He feels we will get more from them. Chairman Becker disagrees and feels McKenna more to offer. He feels McKenna has a better proposal, a lot more effort in the deliverables for the amount of money, and will hold more public meetings. The Commission then discussed the differences in the scope of the work and deliverables. After reading the proposals and updated synopsis, Ms. Ford concurs with Giffels Webster.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Olijnyk, *Moved*, that the Commission award Giffels Webster the project in the amount of \$7,000 as proposed in their latest proposal.

Ayes: Blanchard, Bowyer, Ferriolo, Olijnyk, Steele

Nays: Becker

MOTION CARRIED.

Community Description: Chairman Becker indicated this chapter was written by Ms. Ford and reviewed by the committee, Ms. Gamage, Messrs. Blanchard and Van Agen. Small changes were suggested and incorporated. Due to how the guidelines have changed, the demographic information has been omitted from this section and will now be included in the goals and action plan. Ms. Ford was thanked for her work. For the next chapter, Mr. Becker said the procedure is that Ms. Ford will draft the chapter and forward to the committee for review; they would meet prior to the next Commission meeting, and bring the updated chapter to the next meeting. Mr. Blanchard is concerned that we keep on schedule with the Master Plan, so the committee could review the updated chapter and provide comments without a meeting – this could then be brought back to the Commission for approval. It was suggested the next chapter be updated and sent to

the committee as soon as it's completed. A motion is not necessary to approve this chapter as the entire plan will be reviewed and approved at a later date. It is the consensus of the Commission to approve the updated chapter.

Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee to Review Administrative Structure Section: Ms. Olijnyk, Ms. Bowyer and Mr. Blanchard agreed to review the next section. Chairman Becker asked that the next section be forwarded to him for review also.

DISCUSSION: Cider Mill Gateway Project: At the last meeting it was requested that the Commission review both the Cider Mill Gateway and the Tienken Educational Side Path projects. Information on proposals for both projects was included in the packet, and the members watched the video presentation regarding the Cider Mill project. The packet information was provided to the members as a reminder of the previous bid proposals on both projects. Mr. Becker commented after the original presentation, he remembers the Commission wanted to scale back a lot of the project suggestions because of the costs and the effect it would have on the natural beauty of the trail. The Commission had not accepted this plan as aesthetically appropriate for the trail. Mr. Ferriolo remembers that the project would have been done in phases, and some things were too much. Generally he remembers the overall plan in three phases was quite good, and doesn't remember cutting back. The idea was if there was support for this, people might donate money to support the idea. Mr. Blanchard remembers when getting bids for resurfacing, the Friends Group was looking at doing something on a smaller scale with the money that they had for the Moutrie project. There are some great things with this project, and if done on a phased-in schedule, parts of it the Friends Group could buy in to. He feels we need to meet with them about what they want to do with the Moutrie memorial. There are other projects that have been designed and bid out, e.g. the observation deck, which he would like to see done before this project. Ms. Ford said she spoke to the President of the Friends Group about both the projects, and he's asking for clarification from the Commission about what they think is an appropriate memorial. He's read the minutes and feels some Commission members don't feel a large scale project is appropriate for a memorial to one person, and that there are concerns about setting a precedent about large scale memorials for one person and what would happen in the future if another memorial was proposed. The Friends Group is thinking more along the lines of doing some kind of center green area with a sculpture in an educational component. He reminded Ms. Ford that the family has input on how the money will be used for the Moutrie project. He is looking for clarification on how the Commission wants to proceed with the memorial. Mr. Becker remembers that he and Ms. Myers thought Mr. Moutrie would not like a big bicycle on a granite stone. Mr. Ferriolo would like to see what the Moutrie family has to say about the memorial. Mr. Blanchard feels there should be a committee that works with the Friends Group and the family to come up with a proposal on a project that works for everyone. He doesn't want anyone to get discouraged as the money has been there for a while and nothing has been done. He would like to sit down and meet with these people about ideas. Ms. Olijnyk feels a committee is a good idea to move this forward. Ms. Bowyer agrees. Ms. Steele agrees with taking a project, finishing it, and then moving on to the next project. There are many projects in the works, and likes the idea of planting flowers with a bench in a smaller setting. She feels the Cider Mill Gateway project is very large, and will be a maintenance nightmare, and thinks the overlook project will get much more use with canoes and a picnic area. Mr. Becker likes the idea of forming a committee to meet with the family and the Friends Group, although he thinks the beauty of the trail is more important than the family's wishes in case their aesthetics don't match what this Commission wants. Ms. Ford indicated there is \$8,000 for the Moutrie memorial, which includes \$5,000 from the Rochester Junior Women's Club for an educational component at the Tienken site. Mr. Ferriolo said his sense of what we're dealing with here is to make sure the Commission is directing what is to be done, and then, get support to do whatever else to we

eventually want to do, so we won't be ripping something up five years from now if the project is phased in over a few years dependent on donations. The committee should develop the concept based on what the Commission would like to see. Ms. Bowyer said the Tienken Path project had a bench and an educational path, and the thought was to spend the \$8,000 here to do the memorial project. There is a lot of work with the Cider Mill site, where at the Tienken site, the trail is already there. This is a much smaller scope for the money. Mr. Blanchard said the original plan for the memorial was at the Tienken site, and agrees the \$5,000 educational fund could be used there. A Memorial Committee including Mr. Blanchard and Mr. Ferriolo, was formed to discuss this project with the family and Friends Group to come up with concept ideas. Ms. Ford has asked the Friends Group President to attend Commission meetings following their meeting to report on what they discussed at their meeting.

DISCUSSION: Tienken Educational Side Path Project: This issue was discussed with the Cider Mill Gateway project. Mr. Blanchard commented a project needs to be completed in Rochester Hills as this has been in the Master Plan for quite some time.

DISCUSSION: 2019 Goals: Ms. Ford indicated the 2018 goals as well as the 2019 goals were included in the packet. She had asked the members if there were additional goals or goals that needed to be eliminated to submit this information to her, and to prioritize the goals submitting the rankings to her for discussion for the next meeting. Mr. Becker suggested two additional goals – to maintain focus on keeping the trail a natural beauty trail and to ensure a smooth transition when Ms. Ford goes on maternity leave. Chairman Becker asked each member to provide the goal prioritization ratings to Ms. Ford as soon as possible.

MANAGER'S REPORT: In addition to her written report, Ms. Ford reported there has been maintenance on the trail this week – overhead tree trimming has occurred in Orion and Oakland sections of the trail. There was also a company doing woody vegetation management between Dutton and Gallagher Roads, clearing both sides of the trail, which should be completed tomorrow. Oakland Township will come in and remove any remaining debris. She heard back from Mannik Smith Group on the resurfacing project – she received the revised cost estimate today and the specs will be ready on Friday. Hopefully everything will be ready to go out to bid. She is working on a press release in regards to the grant, but this can't be publicized until the agreement is in place. Mr. Ferriolo said the Trailways Commission meeting is on Oakland Township's calendar and asked that other municipalities make sure this meeting is listed on their respective calendars.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Ms. Bowyer will look into getting the Trailways meetings listed on Rochester Hills' calendar. Ms. Russell apologized for being late and will make sure the Commission meetings are listed on the calendar. She also asked that the resurfacing start in Rochester because it needs to be put into this year's budget, otherwise it goes back to the general fund and it's earmarked for this year. In regard to the Solaronics license, it is Rochester's attorney's opinion that if it stays the status of manufacturing (whatever it's zoned), then the new owner would have the same right as Solaronics has now and would pay to use that easement. If the property is rezoned, the license would be null and void. Ms. Ford added that the Rochester Planning Commission is meeting on April 18th to talk about the proposed rezoning changes. Ms. Russell then spoke of a presentation at City Beautiful about saving the monarchs and bees, and asked the Commission to work together with this effort. Mr. Blanchard feels this fits in with the Moutrie memorial project with the garden and education. Ms. Russell will forward the presentation to Ms. Ford and asked that it be sent to the Commissioners to see how we can all help with this effort.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Olijnyk, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 8:30 p.m.
Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT MEETING: April 16, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. – Rochester Municipal Offices

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

HANK VAN AGEN, Secretary