



4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306
(248) 651-9260
Paintcreektrail.org

**REGULAR MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
Via Teleconferencing – GoToMeeting**

CALL TO ORDER: The Tuesday, June 16, 2020 Regular Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Blanchard at 7:00 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Rock Blanchard, Frank Ferriolo, Linda Gamage, Steve Sage, Dan Simon, Donni Steele, Jeff Stout, David Walker

Voting Alternates Present: None

Non-Voting Alternates Present: Robin Buxar, Theresa Mungoli, Clara Pinkham

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: None

Voting Members Absent: None

Alternates Absent: Chris Barnett, David Becker, Ann Petersen, Chris Hagen, Martha Olijnyk

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

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Absent: Vacant

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Chairperson Blanchard explained the purpose of the electronic meeting is to maintain social distancing and comply with the Michigan Governor's Executive Order 2020-21. The meeting will be held electronically by video conferencing through GoToMeeting.com. The video conference can be accessed by downloading the app GoToMeeting. The meeting number is 855450605. Public comment and questions will be accepted during the meeting at an appropriate time. Please silence your audio and wait for direction from the Chair of the meeting. Please be advised there will be a three (3) minute time limit for public comments. You may also send correspondence regarding this meeting to the Paint Creek Trailways Commission office, addressed to 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306. You may also email your comments or concerns to manager@paintcreektrail.org. A copy of the meeting materials may be found on the Commission's website or may be reviewed at the Commission's office by appointment. Please also use the aforementioned contact for any questions on this process.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Chairperson Blanchard announced he will do his best to hold the meeting to two hours or less.

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Stout, ***Moved***, to approve the June 16, 2020 agenda as presented.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Ferriolo, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. Minutes – May 19, 2020 Regular Meeting, approve and file
- b. Treasurers Report – May 2020, receive and file

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

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Ferriolo, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Ford presented the list of invoices totaling \$65,861.21. In addition to the recorder's fee, this amount includes credit card charges for GoToMeeting for the May and June meetings, hand sanitizer, face masks, postage, thermometer for bike patroller, the memorial stone for the Moutrie Garden and the benches for the garden, payment to Oakland Township for their share of the MNRTF reimbursement of the bridge renovation, and bike patroller supplies. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$96,000.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Gamage, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved in the amount of \$65,861.21 and orders be drawn for payment.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Ferriolo, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: Limited Access Permit Request, 5680 N. Livernois, Oakland Township:

Mr. Tom Steigerwald is calling in, introduced himself and explained his property backs up to the trail and he'd like to gain access to the trail as a single property use. As mentioned in the Subcommittee's report, he had proposed a design for the steps. His property is 2/3 on the east side of the creek, and another 1/3 on the west side where the trail access is. There is a grade to get up to the trail and he wants to add stairs there. He has taken walks on the trail recently and noticed there are ten different single property use access points from Kings Cove to Adams Road; various styles of access – some are piles of dirt and others are actual stairs or bridges for trail access. He feels precedence has been set to allow people to have single property use access to the trail. It is his intent to fund the project himself to gain access to the trail – he will maintain it while he's the property owner. In regards to other single use access points, there is one that is a very similar construction to what he would like to do just north of his property with cement which is not his choice because it violates what goes into the wetlands. He proposes to go with gravel. The pitch is a 25 degree angle; the typical stairway in homes is 32-1/2 degrees, so it's more forgiving as far as being up against the trail. It does come close, but if someone is going to fall down the steps, someone is going to fall down the hill. He's read the Subcommittee's report, but would like reconsideration. Chairperson Blanchard thanked the applicant for his presentation and the detailed drawings that were provided. Speaking for the Subcommittee, Mr. Walker commented all of the members have been to the parcel at least once. What we are trying to accommodate is within reason, public access to the trail, for the good of many versus the good of a few. What they are trying to do is provide not everybody access individually from their backyards onto the trail. The Committee has concerns that we're trying to limit the number the number of personal access points to the trail, that's not what the trail is about. When they see the applicant's opportunity presented as such, it's for the benefit of a few and not for many. It is a single access point for the applicant's family, and as the applicant stated, for as long as they live on the parcel. The proposed staircase is all on Trailway Commission property, so the future liability would lie with the Commission. If the applicant makes the commitment to take care of it while he lives there, the trailway will be here much longer than anyone serving in this capacity today. That is a concern, they don't want to see single points of access, and 100% of the staircase

is built on trail property. When we look at the pros and cons in constructing the stairs, there are a lot of cons. This is a steep slope with vegetation that will need to be removed, so there will be an erosion concern. The stairway will require ongoing maintenance, and after the applicant moves, this becomes the responsibility of the Commission, which is a concern. Signage on private property was another concern. Navigating down the stairs onto the applicant's property, there is a pretty good buffer before getting to the property, so the applicant is creating a situation where you see inviting stairs, but there's no private property signage. The applicant is going to be welcoming all the trail users into his backyard. This is a concern without signage on trail property. Signage on the applicant's property would be very difficult to see with all the existing foliage. The report goes on to say it's a very steep embankment, it's a narrow point of the trail, and the Committee has concerns with a biker, walker or a child falling down the stairs; it's a seven foot drop and would cause injury on Commission property – our liability. Mr. Walker hopes Mr. Steigerwald understands the Committee's rationale behind their recommendation to not allow this access point. Mr. Steigerwald asked if the other personal use access points were previously approved by the Commission. Mr. Blanchard indicated some may have been existing long before many of the members on this Commission were there. During the past few years, the Commission has been very selective on what they approve because we don't want a lot of these situations that cause liability, particularly tonight's request as it's all on trail property. If the Commission were to build this staircase, we would have to follow ADA guidelines; so can they allow the applicant to build something that doesn't meet the guidelines? The Commission tries to provide access, but tries to provide group access for more homeowners using the same access point, as we've had issues with this, and the erosion problems caused. Ms. Gamage indicated there is a similar access point just south of Dutton, and commented it appears as if it might be a single use access point. It was approved in the last few years, but it provides access to the trail for an entire street of residents and is safer than their other options. When considering requests, the Committee uses this as one of the criteria when reviewing access – if it benefits multiple property owners. So, some of the single access points the applicant referred to may benefit an entire street or subdivision. Ms. Steele made a motion and commented when she got on the Commission, we had just completed a survey of the entire trail and easements along the trail. A letter was sent to relevant property owners advising them to remove the access and easements to the trail. Starting with a clean slate is where we came from about seven years ago, and staying on this path is the thing to do. She mentioned access to the bridge to connect the Polly Ann Trail was approved, and the engineers did specifications that meet our standards. We need to follow this train of thought moving forward to preserve the trail. She apologized to the applicant. Mr. Steigerwald indicated he understands and respects the Commission's opinions– he was just hoping he could find a solution. Mr. Blanchard commented we work hard with our neighbors along the trail, but have to look out for all the users, not just adjacent property owners.

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Walker, *Moved*, to follow the Subcommittee's recommendation and not grant the limited use permit for single use access at 5680 N. Livernois.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Ferriolo, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

UPDATE Moutrie Pollinator Garden: Mr. Louis Carrio, President of the Friends Group, is present to provide an update. He asked Ms. Ford to display a rendering of the garden layout. The garden is scheduled to be planted starting tomorrow morning at 9:00. He would like to get consensus on the use of educational and informational material. He feels a key element would be a sign at the entrance to the garden from the trail, either in the location he's indicated on the diagram or on the opposite side of the entrance. The opposite side is where the memorial rock will be located within the vegetation. If the sign were placed here, it would potentially block the stone, which is undesirable. He feels where the sign is indicated on the diagram is a better

location. Ms. Ford displayed renderings of a few different signs. The objectives of the sign would be to explain pollinators, describe the plants and their purpose, encourage stewardship, acknowledge contributions and direct interested parties to informative resources, such as the website, etc. He's looked at some sign designs, and some are too busy and some don't have enough information. The one in the center of the rendering that is not straight up and down, but angled, lends itself to standing and reading it comfortably and does not interfere with viewing the garden. There is a similar sign in the City of Rochester that describes different trees that are planted, and people can go to the original tree and see the nomenclature on the tree. This is the approach he has in mind. Looking at the plantings in the garden, some may not always be there, so he suggests picking out a few of the most important ones and then use a QR code to link back to the website for more information, that way the sign is not cluttered. He's looking for Commission feedback as to how to proceed on the sign. Mr. Blanchard indicated that Messrs. Ferriolo, Walker and Becker had previously expressed interest in being on this Committee, and asked if anyone would volunteer to help Mr. Carrio with developing the signs. Mr. Walker said we've spent a lot of time and we do have a committee for our signage; wouldn't we tap into that resource pool and use their existing knowledge to help in this situation – he doesn't want to re-create something that already exists. Ms. Ford said the committee didn't do anything specific with pollinators, we are using Rochester Sign Shop for the production, and could see if they are able to do that and get a quote on what Mr. Carrio would like to do. The content on our signs is not specific to pollinators. Maybe we could reach out to Marilyn Trent with Rochester Pollinators to see if they might have some resources we could utilize for content. Mr. Carrio referred back to the sign diagram, and indicated the center sign comes from a company called Pulse Design, and they specialize in this type of nature oriented signs. He would consider them as a possible supplier as well, not to rule out Rochester Sign Shop. The nice thing about the Pulse Design is they have the high resolution graphics and the capability of doing a high quality sign and have a lot of experience with pollinators and nature. He could lay out a sign in rough draft and propose it to both companies and get their feedback as to their qualifications and cost. Mr. Blanchard likes the idea, and this type of sign and thinks it's important to use similar materials as our other signs if we can, so it doesn't look totally different from what's going on the trail. That's where the Sign Committee would come into play. He thinks it might be a good idea to get someone from the committee to work with Mr. Carrio. Ms. Gamage asked what type of assistance is being asked for. Mr. Carrio said he would draft the sign design and then distribute it to others for feedback. Ms. Gamage offered her assistance, as well as Ms. Buxar and Ms. Pinkham. The draft should be also reviewed by Ms. Trent for input on the content. Mr. Blanchard invited all who are interested in the garden planting to come out tomorrow. He commented additional boulders will be placed near the side path to deter people from riding/walking through the garden. Mr. Carrio indicated he talked to Mrs. Moutrie about the fact that there would be other people identified via benches or other signage as contributors to the garden, and she had no problem with that. Ms. Gray has ordered the two benches that were donated, delivery time is 4-6 weeks and the City of Rochester Hills will install them. Mr. Carrio asked if there is any chance the City has a couple of benches they could put there temporarily to discourage traffic. Ms. Gray will ask. Ms. Steele thanked Mr. Carrio for all his work in following through on this project – it's a big undertaking. Ms. Pinkham asked how access for the plants is being handled tomorrow. Mr. Carrio explained they are coming through the condominium complex to the side path, not through the trail itself.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Mannik & Smith Group Change Order for Parking Lot Resurfacing Field Inspection & Project Administration: Ms. Ford stated we will be using WCI for the resurfacing, but we need to get it inspected to ensure the work was done properly, etc. She has asked Mannik Smith to do that work for us; this is their change order for \$1,500 to do the inspection and the project administration for resurfacing of the Dutton and Gallagher

parking lots. Mr. Ferriolo asked if the estimates shown in the packets are still estimates and nothing is final in terms of costs, and we have \$25,000 left over for Oakland Township Parks & Rec. Ms. Ford said this is correct – the only thing that is an estimate at this point is the bridge stairs, because they haven't done the design work yet and hasn't gone out for bid. The parking lot resurfacing costs is \$20,000 – we have a quote for that, and \$1,500 is what the inspection and administration cost will be. The signage was quoted at \$34,450 and Rochester Sign Shop said they would honor this quote. It's just the stairs that are the variable.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to approve the Mannik & Smith change order for the resurfacing field inspection and project administration in the amount of \$1,500.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Ferriolo, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: 2021 Budget: Ms. Ford and Ms. Gray talked to the auditor and he asked what effects we thought that COVID-19 would potentially be having on this year's budget, since we receive our funding from the various municipalities. Staff has received all the payments in January, so for this fiscal year we are unaffected. She wants to start the discussion tonight about what next year could potentially look like, and asked if the elected commissioners have been having budget discussions about how the revenue is going to be affected in their communities next year and whether that will have any impact on the trail budget. She wants to get the ball rolling on this discussion as she starts to plan for next year's budget. Mr. Ferriolo asked for an explanation of the contributions from the municipalities, and how they are determined. This year's budget is in the packet, and Ms. Ford explained each of the communities pays equally for operations and staff, and the patrol program is prorated based on mileage. She displayed a chart of what the request history has been for these contributions over the last 14 years, showing where increases and decreases have occurred. Mr. Ferriolo said Oakland will be having a revenue budget discussion tomorrow; about possible impacts coming in next year's budget. He feels the way our system works here; the function would be more of whether or not the Commission is going to ask for any increase going into next year. It's more of an issue of what percentage we are going to request because the contributions are absolute. He can't imagine any municipality arbitrarily reducing the contributions in 2021, save for perhaps on a request for not increasing the percent. Ms. Ford explained she knows that with the mounted patrol, there will be a 2% increase in the rate we pay the officers, so that will be an increase for next year. Ms. Steele said Orion had to cut their budget close to \$800,000 this year, and would think they would be on track to do the same thing next year based on what she sees on the webinars and the State Treasury, etc. It was an overall cut – things like travel and conferences, and they furloughed people. She doesn't know where the cuts will come from next year, but they are starting their budget process now, so she will know more in the next couple of months. She indicated they never talked about cutting trail funds. Mr. Walker said Rochester Hills was de-briefed by Joe Snyder, their CFO the end of last month with the seven year forecast and what impact COVID-19 would have. Rochester Hills came into this situation financially strong, and there is a strong conservative approach to their finances that will weather the storm. The take away was taxable value of houses will stay the same, so these revenues will continue. What will obviously suffer is the state shared revenues, e.g., the Act 51, that's the unknown variable, and also some lost revenue departmentally and investment income. The COVID impact will be felt in certain aspects, but not in the greater budgetary aspect. Mr. Walker reached out to Mr. Snyder today and specifically asked about their commitment to the Commission, and he commented he did not see any inability for Rochester Hills to continue funding the trailways in their community, as the budget would support continuing this commitment. Mr. Sage concurred with Mr. Walker's position from the City of Rochester's standpoint, and their commitment is in place and will continue. He doesn't see any issues going forward. Mr. Ferriolo reiterated that it may be more of a function of how the

Commission has respect for the municipalities in terms of what the increase or no increase might be going into next year. It may be a statement from the Commission that under the circumstances we're not looking to ask for a significant increase for next year. Mr. Blanchard agrees it's a good plan to look at the budget early and review expenses to see if there are opportunities to cut back if we have to. It might be good to hold the line next year and not ask for increases. The Commission asked staff to look at the budget and come back early with the presentation of the 2021 budget. Ms. Gamage's only concern about a potential added expense would be if we wind up having another extended stay home situation in the future – and if staff would have additional needs at home to continue doing their job. If they need anything additional for a home setup, we should consider building that into next year's budget.

UPDATE/DISCUSSION: 2020 Trail Events: A memo was included in the packet detailing events as they now stand. Ms. Ford indicated she has confirmation from the Run Michigan Cheap July 12th event that it's still scheduled, but they will comply with the Governor's order to have an event with 100 people or less and maintain social distancing. As of right now, the Motor City Brew Tours is still planning to have the Cruisin' for the Trails event on August 30th, but also planning on limiting their group size and will make a final decision by July 24th whether to cancel the event, depending on the situation. The Commission needs to discuss the Labor Day Bridge Walk and where we are with that event - and also the bridge ribbon cutting. The Brooksie Way race will be done as a virtual event this year. Mr. Ferriolo said Oakland Township has cancelled all their Music in the Meadows concerts for the summer, and the Mackinac Bridge Walk has been cancelled. Many events are being cancelled in the best interest of staying on the safe side. That's where he is on this event. We could stop with 100 or more, but around 400 people attend this event. Then there's our responsibility, given that we are going to have X number of people – what are we taking on in terms of responsibility to make sure everyone is safe; testers, hand sanitizers, masks? These are things to consider. He thinks it's better to be safe than sorry and would rather see the event move into next year where hopefully everything will be open. As far as the ribbon cutting, this event can happen at any time, because the Commission says when it will be held. It might be better next spring because the anticipation is that deaths are going to continue to rise over the next several months – the concerns about COVID are not going away. About four years ago he was the one pushing to hold the event when there was talk about not having it; he loves this event. He feels there is a very good reason to say it's not a good idea this year. However, whatever the Commission decides, he's ready to carry the banner. Ms. Gamage agrees this is an important event for the trail, and was initially based on the former Governor's suggestion to do a virtual bridge walk encouraging people all over who couldn't make it to the Mackinac Bridge to do a virtual bridge walk in their local area. She suggested doing something fun on the trail virtually maybe featuring the new bridge – something fun for the week around Labor Day, e.g., a scavenger hunt for families, not one event for less than 100 people at the same time, but something that spans more time spotlighting the new bridge. It's a shame we haven't been able to celebrate our new bridge as it was a huge undertaking for a lot of people and a great amenity on the trail. This also depends on how much time staff has to administer the event, as she doesn't know how their time has been dealing with everything else that's going on. She asked staff to think about this idea as we haven't had an event for a while. Mr. Simon agreed with Mr. Ferriolo, and commented he had a discussion at the Parks & Rec meeting, and the Goodison Good Times has been cancelled because trying to contain little children, maintain social distancing, and sharing food and utensils is very dangerous because of the virus. They are not taking on the responsibility of exposing people because they can't control the crowd to maintain the right safety requirements. The bridge ribbon cutting can be scheduled for next year. There's no reason to put people in danger because we want to celebrate something that can be postponed. Ms. Steele asked staff how the virtual event mentioned in the Manager's Report was received. Ms. Ford indicated she did some sharing on social media and got feedback on that.

They had a scavenger hunt and she shared it with her daughter's elementary school. They enjoyed it and the teacher sent some pictures back of the students that participated. She received a notification from the American Hiking Society asking everyone to suspend promotion of the event due to the protests that were going on, they didn't want to detract from that focus and the media, so she stopped posting on social media, but kept the website content up. Ms. Mungioli agreed with Ms. Gamage and likes the idea about doing something creative on the trail. Even the Detroit Fireworks are being rescheduled to the end of August in a different kind of set-up to allow people to celebrate. RARA is opening up outdoor activities and will start indoor things as permitted in July. So there will be more activities happening in the community. If we can be innovative in approaching this activity it might be good, as this year is getting depressing with everything being cancelled. We have a few months to plan it. Mr. Blanchard agrees with Messrs. Ferriolo and Simon's comments, and also likes the idea of doing something virtual, but has concerns if staff has time to plan for it. He asked if anyone wants to be on a committee to work out a virtual event. He's not in favor of trying to scale back and putting all the precautions in this year. He's not sure if we should allow the July 12th event to happen on the trail as he doesn't know how they will handle social distancing. Every event he's seen so far has been virtual. He would be in favor of a virtual bridge walk or an event spanning a week or so, but would leave it up to staff's recommendation. Ms. Ford will discuss this with Ms. Gray, and feels a virtual event is more manageable than something in person, but they do have other construction projects in the works that they weren't anticipating this year. We may be building stairs at the bridge in September and won't want people to be in a construction zone. Mr. Blanchard asked if they need volunteers to help at this point. Ms. Gamage suggested letting staff discuss it and come back to the Commission with recommendations. Ms. Mungioli offered her assistance to staff if needed before the next meeting. Mr. Blanchard asked who sponsors the Run Michigan Cheap event. Ms. Gray indicated Frank Race Management is the sponsor, and a few years ago came before the Commission to ask permission for their first event. He runs a company that puts on races throughout the state and indicates on the application there will be 100 people, but most of his events don't come near that many participants. He usually requests two or three dates, the April date was cancelled. It is nothing on par with any of the larger events that we have. Mr. Blanchard asked if staff was OK with this event, and if they would have the proper precautions in place. Ms. Ford has not confirmed that they are going to have sanitizers or any of those types of things, but she can ask. Mr. Simon asked what areas of the trail will be used. Ms. Gray explained it's a combined half marathon, 10k and 5k, and the longest portion of the run will take place from Lake Orion to Dutton Road, which is Oakland Township. Ms. Gamage indicated he needs insurance and asked if he has already obtained it. Ms. Gray stated he provided insurance prior to the original April date. Ms. Gamage is concerned the insurance came about before the current situation, and asked if we should check with our insurance company to see if we have any liability for an event happening or if there is anything additional we need from the sponsor's insurance to cover any liability we might have. She has concerns because half marathon races pass out water, and doesn't know if they intend to do that, but those stations would seem to encourage more interaction. She's not sure if this is our jurisdiction to say they need sanitizer, etc., but suggested we check with our insurance. Mr. Blanchard said if the event is going to happen, they should have to follow the guidelines and we should state if the event is going to happen, that he should follow whatever the guidelines are – social distancing and sanitizers. Otherwise, he doesn't think we should allow the event on the trail, and thinks we may have some liability. Mr. Ferriolo agrees with this point, and thinks these are appropriate questions to ask. Mr. Simon commented that stores requiring masks to enter can't enforce this rule when people enter without masks, there will not be any police enforcement and no way to enforce this. If you give out hand sanitizer or masks, people can just throw them away. He's with Messrs. Ferriolo and Blanchard – why put anyone in danger. Ms. Steele feels the opposite – if they want to have an event, that's what the trail is for, to have events and serve the community and residents. If

they follow the guidelines, and they check with their insurance and we check with our insurance, administratively we should allow them to have them to have their event. She doesn't have a problem with the event on the trail. Mr. Stout said he was on the trail and 90% of the people he passed don't have masks or sanitizer, it was just people enjoying the trail. He's not caught up with comments about endangering people, we're outside and using the best practices that fit the individual. Mr. Ferriolo doesn't disagree, but thinks it wouldn't hurt to contact our attorney and ask the question. As long as we ask them to do whatever, maybe that's all we need to do. If they don't do it, maybe that's all the responsibility we have. Is there a difference between asking them or having them sign off on something, and not doing anything. That's where the attorney comes in. Mr. Carrio asked if the restrooms will be open for the events. Ms. Ford indicated all the restrooms on the trail are open, but drinking fountains are not. The Commission directed Ms. Ford to contact our attorney and the insurance company.

INFORMATIONAL: Paint Creek Cider Mill COVID-19 Screening Procedures: Mr. Blanchard said this is good information about what they are setting up about going in and out of the building. Ms. Buxar said she doesn't know if this outline has been fully reviewed by Oakland Township, who owns the facility in which the Commission is in. This is a checklist, not that she disagrees with what's listed, but this is the Oakland Township Parks & Rec's list, who is also a tenant in the building. She believes if anyone enters the building, their contact should not be Oakland Township Parks & Rec, it should be Oakland Township Hall. If someone comes into the building that is ill, they need to contact the Township to let them know. She is sure this will be worked out, but just wanted to comment on it. Ms. Pinkham said these guidelines are for going into the building. She's been into the restaurant, and they are not doing anything there. She asked if the door is closed and locked between the Cider Mill and the back hallway where the bathroom is, and if the restaurant is exempt. Ms. Buxar said there is a gate there, and the restrooms are open. The gates are open when the building is open to access the restrooms, however that gate can't be locked as it's a fire hazard. The concessionaire has been notified by the Township Manager with some issues about what his practices are, and she will have the Manager check on this again. She doesn't believe the procedures put in place to enter the building were reviewed the Township. Right now, there are two different plans for COVID in the Township, the Parks & Rec plan and the Township plan, and she's not sure if this information was interchanged into one plan. This is being worked out now. Ms. Ford will forward any updated guidelines to the Commission. The City of Rochester has similar procedures, so if we do have our July meeting there, she will forward them to everyone. Mr. Blanchard asked if anyone is working in the Cider Mill building. Ms. Ford responded yes, but it's only open to the public from 10-2. Mr. Blanchard asked if staff was still working at home. Ms. Ford indicated for the most part, both staff members will go into the office when needed, but are still working from home. Ms. Steele asked how long staff intended to work from home. Ms. Ford doesn't have a date when they are planning to go back, but doesn't see it going on much further. She has to make arrangements to get child care secured. Mr. Ferriolo commented that according to the State, if you can go back to work in some fashion, then our staff needs to go back to work in the office if that's part of the requirement of the State. It's not a matter of saying you will take another month and work from home. Working from home is fine, but as soon as we can get off teleconferencing, then we get off it. The State has already said people can go back to work, so he suggests the Commission request that staff go back to the office on regular scheduled hours and be done with it. I would have to be told or explained to why, if the building is open and people are working in it, why our staff can't go in and work. Mr. Sage commented that if people don't feel safe going, he's not going to force them to do it. Mr. Blanchard feels the same way, and he has discussed this with Ms. Ford. There are other issues, e.g., childcare. He feels when staff is comfortable to come back, then they'll discuss it. If the Commission as a whole wants to discuss it, it should be on the July agenda. Mr. Ferriolo hopes we don't have to do that, but if we do, he'd

like it on the next agenda. Ms. Ford added the building was just opened this week to the public. Mr. Blanchard said Rochester Hills just opened this week, so we're not that far behind at this point. If you can work at home, he feels you should work at home and feels staff can do the majority of their work at home and go in when they have to. Ms. Gamage said a lot of places are reopening slowly now, but many people are being advised if they're able to do their job from home, they remain at home unless needed at the office. If this will be on a future agenda, we need to explore what we need them to do at the office versus what they do at home. Ms. Mungioli agreed with Ms. Gamage as the Executive Order as well as the phase the State is in, specifically states that if you can work from home do so, it's not a requirement to go into the office. She works at GM and will not be going back in the office until July. If you can work at home with no loss of productivity, stay at home. They will return employees slowly, but they also recognize parents who have extenuating childcare circumstances. She wants to work for the best effort of staff, their families and their safety. If there's no loss of productivity, then they should be able to stay at home until the work environment is suitable for their whole family.

MANAGER'S REPORT: In addition to the written report, Ms. Ford provided an update on the Boy Scout's project. He has gotten a lot of cans, thanks to Mr. Simon who posted about the project. He hasn't reached his goal, but is on his way, and plans to start building the kiosk the week of June 28th. Thanks to Orion Township for removing the old kiosk. She also thanked Oakland Township Parks & Rec for removing numerous trees on the trail after last week's storm. Mr. Blanchard appreciated the Parks Department from each community for the meeting held about trail maintenance, and hopes some partnerships will be formed in doing the maintenance. Ms. Ford agreed it was good to talk to the communities about what they're doing, and has been getting positive comments now about how the trail is in great shape. Ms. Gamage asked if there was any discussion about re-crowning the trail or will it just be graded in a flat fashion. Mr. Blanchard said some communities are using a box grader which gathers loose stone and drops it in the low areas, it's not going to crown it, but will fill the low areas. Mr. Sage asked about the educational campaign for cyclists regarding the maintenance issue as he got a correspondence from a resident regarding biker etiquette. We are undergoing a signage project – will it include proper etiquette? Ms. Ford indicated the rules of the trail talk about who yields to who, but can do more postings on social media and put something in the kiosks about this.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Mr. Sage reported the restrooms in Rochester Park will be open this Friday and on a scheduled sanitization maintenance routine. There is no intent to sanitize the bike station, and asked if the City should put up signage that it's open for use, but being sanitized. Ms. Ford indicated there are signs out that indicate the Commission is not sanitizing the trail. Mr. Blanchard said it might be a good idea, and if the City wants to do it, go ahead. Ms. Pinkham said the condition of the trail surface is great and thanked the municipalities. She also thanked the Friends Group and the Committee for the work on the garden. Ms. Buxar also thanked everyone for their work on the garden. Ms. Gamage thanked Mr. Simon for reaching out to Trout Unlimited for removing the log jam at the Dinosaur Hill bridge – she went by there today, and it's 10 times worse than it was a month ago. The water level is low and she will be joining crews on Saturday morning to take care of this situation and invited anyone who can to attend. Mr. Simon added everyone is meeting in Dinosaur Hill's parking lot at 9:00 a.m. and invited people to come out to work or just observe. Everyone is looking forward to meeting in person. Mr. Ferriolo said we can't meet in person because of the limitation in the meeting placed on how much of the public can attend. Until they lift that limitation, we have to continue to meet virtually. Right now, via video-conferencing, the public is unlimited. Happy July 4th!!

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Stout, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Ferriolo, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: July 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. – Rochester Municipal Offices

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

DAVID BECKER, Secretary