



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

SPECIAL MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
Via Teleconferencing – GoToMeeting
Access code: 834455485, or by phone 1-571-317-3122

CALL TO ORDER: The Tuesday, November 24, 2020 Special Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Blanchard at 7:00 p.m.

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

Voting Alternates Present: Robin Buxar

Non-Voting Alternates Present: David Becker, Theresa Mungioli, Martha Olijnyk, Clara Pinkham

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: None

Voting Members Absent: Frank Ferriolo

Alternates Absent: Chris Barnett, Chris Hagen, Ann Peterson

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.

VIRTUAL MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT: Chairperson Blanchard stated the purpose of the electronic meeting is to maintain social distancing and comply with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Order. 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 834455485. Public comment and questions will be accepted during the meeting at an appropriate time. Please silence your audio and wait for direction from the Chairperson. Please be advised there will be a three minute limit for public comments. You may also send correspondence regarding this meeting to the Paint Creek Trailways 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 office by appointment. Please use the aforementioned contact for any questions on this process.

Per the new virtual meeting requirement, all members stated their name, that they are all attending virtually, and where they are calling in from – Clara Pinkham, Rochester Hills; Robin Buxar, Oakland Township; Martha Olijnyk, Oakland Township; Rock Blanchard, Rochester Hills; Donni Steele, Orion Township; Dan Simon, Oakland Township; David Becker, Rochester; David Walker, Rochester Hills; Linda Gamage, Rochester; Jeff Stout, Orion Township; Steve Sage, Rochester and Theresa Mungioli, Rochester Hills.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: A discussion about citizens being members of the Commission was added before Commissioner's reports.

MOTION by Simon, seconded by Gamage, *Moved*, to approve the November 24, 2020 agenda as amended.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Mannik Smith Group Field Survey, Inspection and Project Management for Bridge 33.7 Stairway: Ms. Ford indicated we will begin construction next week on the new stairs at Bridge 33.7. Included in the packet was the fee for Mannik Smith to do the field survey, inspection and project management for this project. The document in the packet lists the cost as \$8,400. When she originally spoke to MSG about this earlier in the year, they had quoted \$6,500, so Ms. Ford went back to them and mentioned this. MSG will try to get as close as they can to the \$6,500 number. They won't know for sure until we have the pre-construction meeting next Tuesday, but there is another option on the table. Mr. Stout has some heartburn over MSG, and said for a company to say \$6,500 one day and \$8,400 the next – let's look at what we're getting. It's a simple stairway project proposed to go off of the trail. It's a \$28,000 and change project. MSG designed that project for nearly \$5,000. Typically, and he's confirmed this with Orion's engineering firm and has talked to Ms. Buxar regarding Oakland's engineering firm, design costs run about 10% of the project. We're over on that. For the \$8,400 that MSG wants, it will include a pre-construction meeting, four days of having one of their inspectors out there looking to make sure the company we hired builds a simple set of stairs down off our trail, a billing and a close out document. He feels we can easily utilize Oakland Township's building official, Mr. Berger, and have him inspect the construction and give it a green sticker for no cost. Mr. Stout said many times in Orion where we have repair and maintenance – projects totaling up to \$60,000-\$80,000, they don't go through engineering firms because it's not necessary. You have a contractor that provides a quote, they put in the project, and we go on to another day with more money in our pocket. He will not vote yes for another MSG project, especially this one totaling \$8,400. He recommends we use what we have in place, a building official that has agreed to come to a pre-construction meeting, do his proper inspections and give us the satisfaction that we're getting what we paid for and it's safe for the public. Ms. Buxar backed up Mr. Stout's comments, and said she's also confirmed with Oakland's engineering firm who has reviewed the scope of work. PEA felt the quote was high and would have put in a much lower cost of \$2,700, if we wanted to work within Oakland Township's structure. That's when we discussed this further. Mr. Berger has already reviewed the plans, no permits are required, has agreed to attend the meeting with Ms. Ford and the construction firm, and it's what he does every day. Ms. Buxar agrees with Mr. Stout, MSG's quote is extremely high. If we do need any civil engineering, PEA is in the township every day and is available. She does not support this as it's extremely above cost. Mr. Simon said if the Oakland Township inspector couldn't do it during normal work hours, we could offer a little bit overtime to him to come in after work and take a quick look at it. He agrees with Mr. Stout and Ms. Buxar, this is outrageous. Mr. Blanchard feels it's high also and feels it's great we can utilize our community's inspector and they are willing to do that. It's great they stepped up and offered that to us. This may be a lesson for the future that when we need engineering firms, maybe there is a way of working out any contracts with engineering firms working with our communities, to get a decent price. Mr. Stout offered to attend the pre-con meeting with Ms. Ford, and indicated Mr. Berger reviewed the plans and has no problem with it. Mr. Sage asked if we need a motion to not approve the MSG proposal, and

then a second motion to approve Oakland Township to perform field survey, inspection and project management. Chairperson said he's not sure we need a motion to not approve MSG.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to approve Oakland Township to provide services of field survey, inspection and project management during the construction and to inform Mannik Smith Group that we have rejected their offer.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Chairperson Blanchard thanked Mr. Stout, Ms. Buxar and Mr. Simon for getting together and coming up with this solution. Mr. Simon thanked Mr. Stout and Ms. Buxar for coming up with this idea and saving the Commission \$8,400.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Rochester Sign Shop Gateway and Kiosk Sign Installation:

Ms. Ford indicated the signs will be completed sometime this week for the nine kiosks and two gateway signs that we will be putting in. She sent out emails to the communities once we were notified they will be ready. The plan had been for the communities to install them. We contacted them back in January to ask them to install them anticipating this project would be done in the spring or early summer at the latest. Obviously, COVID happened and the State spending freeze, so everything got stopped and the project did not resume until early October. That is not what the communities were anticipating. When she spoke to the Sign Shop, instead of just having the communities needing to install them, they were also going to have to be assemble them on site because the sign shop can't do that in their shop. That was more than we were anticipating. An email is included in the packet, the Sign Shop is really pushing that we have them do the work for a variety of reasons; the assembly issue and if anything gets damaged when that was happening or during transport, the Commission would have to pay to get the sign replaced, whereas if anything got damaged when they were putting it in, then they give us a new sign at no cost. To encourage us to use them, they have dropped the install price by \$2,200, which is very generous of them. We have also been getting pushback from the communities about their ability to install the signs at this time of the year, because of staffing levels and timing, etc. Ms. Ford is requesting we approve the request to have the Rochester Sign Shop install the 11 signs for us. Mr. Sage said we've had this discussion previously and have decided in the interest to save some money, to have the local municipalities handle installation. He thought it would include both assembly and installation. He asked if the signs are that fragile that the Sign Shop is saying they have to control the entire process, and if they are fragile, why are we putting them up? Ms. Ford doesn't think they are that fragile as they are aluminum or steel, but maybe it's the scratching that is more of their concern. The Sign Shop also said the holes require special equipment that our communities may not have. Mr. Simon asked if we've hired the Sign Shop to install any other signs for the Commission. Ms. Ford indicated in her two years, we have not used them. Mr. Becker commented he doesn't recall ever hiring them to put in any signs, but said the Sign Shop is an excellent vendor and has dealt with them municipally and otherwise. If someone specializes in doing something, it's better to have them do it and pay a little extra money than have us do it and maybe do something incorrectly. If he could vote on this issue, he would support getting it done correctly now. He added we just saved \$8,000 on the MSG project, even though it's not the same funds. Ms. Ford added that we also have just secured \$30,000 from the County from our COVID relief grant that can't be used directly for this project, but the savings we're going to be making on salaries and rent could be applied to the \$4,400. Mr. Sage asked about the grant we received from the Community Foundation – can we apply any of those funds to this cost. Ms. Ford explained the grant is coming through the Community Foundation, but it's actually a Country grant, which can only be used for COVID related expenses including salaries and rent. What we will be saving on this can be applied towards this project. Mr. Simon asked if we can have

someone inspect the work before we pay the final bill to make sure everything is correct. Mr. Blanchard thought maybe the individual communities can send out their building inspectors or engineers to volunteer. He offered to go out with Ms. Ford. He'd like to know exactly what they're doing, cementing them in or putting gravel in the posts, etc. He commented about the funds and the fact that this is a tough time of year as a lot of the Parks Departments are cut back on staff and trying to get things in order before the winter. When the project was originally approved, installation was scheduled earlier in the year. He feels using COVID funds to offset some of it, even if it's not for this project, is legitimate as we're in this predicament because of COVID – everything got put on hold. It justifies using those funds to offset some of our costs so we can pay the Sign Shop to do the installation. Another issue is taking down some of the existing signs – possibly the Sign Shop could remove them, and when this project is voted on, we could include a not-to-exceed cost in case we have to pay them, and move forward. Ms. Gamage said the only reason she would support spending \$4,400 to install the signs is because of timing, but we had the cost covered with in-kind services by the communities. It's important to use those just as we're using them for the MSG project. She said we also talked about using the removed signs to auction, sell them or doing something with them. She suggested talking to the communities to see if they can remove existing signs and store them for the Commission until we decide what to do, or maybe store them in the Commission office. Ms. Ford knows Oakland Township is fine with removing the signs, storing would be at the Commission office. After speaking with Rochester today, she did not get a response yet if they could remove them. She still has to talk to Rochester Hills and Orion on this issue. There are some cases where the signs are being placed in a different location where there's not currently a sign, so the existing sign could stay up until someone could remove it. But there are some cases where the existing signs have to come down in order for the new sign to be installed, unless the sign could be placed in front of what exists, and is not sure if this could be done. She will be making calls tomorrow once the outcome is known. Ms. Gamage asked if the only reason we're concerned about timing, is that we don't want to store the signs, or have the Sign Shop store them because they'd be in danger of becoming damaged before they are installed. Ms. Ford indicated she doesn't have room to store the signs, and doesn't know if the Sign Shop has room to store them until spring as they are doing other production. Rochester indicated they did not have room to store their signs. Ms. Olinjyk asked if assembly was included in the original request to the communities. Ms. Ford thinks we specifically said just installation when we spoke with them. Ms. Olinjyk asked if we're hearing that someone will not do it this year, or is just that we're getting pushback – or are you saying that staffing levels are such that they can't do it before the end of the year. If they can't install, how do we expect them to take the existing signs down. Ms. Ford stated Rochester has said because of timing, equipment and personnel, that they can't do it at this time. Mr. Blanchard said it's tough for communities to do it at this time of the year, as some communities don't have the extra staff. He commented we saved \$8,000 tonight because a couple communities got together and came up with a proposal and is willing to offset that cost. In this case, not that we want to make a practice of it, because of the timing and COVID, he feels we should go ahead and approve it, maybe for a little extra just in case we have to have them remove the existing signs, because we have funds we can use. Taking the signs down could be as simple as taking a chainsaw and cutting the posts down flush with the ground and taking the sign away. Mr. Sage commented if we give clearance to the Sign Shop to do both tear down and install, he would not support anything higher than the install bid which was originally \$6,600.

MOTION by Sage, *Moved*, to approve to have the Rochester Sign Shop both remove and install the new signage at a cost not to exceed \$6,600. (there was no second to the motion)

Discussion: Mr. Sage then asked what we are going to do about storing the signs. Ms. Ford said if they can get them up to her office they could be stored there during the winter as long as the posts are removed. Ms. Buxar said she has some closet areas on the first level of the Cider that

are hers, and will discuss this with Ms. Ford later. Mr. Stout said before we vote on the motion, he wants to know what the biggest problem is. If we can find a way to store the new signs until the spring, will the communities have their staffs available then to remove the old and install the new signs? This might be an easy bit of storage – do the signs need to be installed by the end of the year, or can they wait until spring when community staffs are back. Ms. Ford said this could wait, it's just a matter of will they get damaged while waiting to get this sorted out for each community. It's not imperative they get installed right now, the grant goes for a while. Mr. Blanchard asked if the Sign Shop doesn't want to store them. Ms. Ford said yes. Mr. Blanchard said moving the signs a couple of times will enhance chances of getting damaged – and if they are damaged, we would have to pay to replace them. Mr. Becker doesn't want to dismiss the importance of having someone who knows how to handle the signs properly and install them. He's sure the communities' sign shops know how to do it, but he suspects the Rochester Sign Shop know how to do it better than anyone. Even if we have to wait until spring, Mr. Becker encourages us to use the Sign Shop because that gives us assurance of a job properly done. Mr. Simon asked if they indicated when they would start and finish the job. Ms. Ford confirmed they would start right away. Mr. Sage repeated his motion, and Ms. Ford indicated she would still like to see if she can get the communities to remove the existing signs if possible to save some costs. Mr. Sage said that might interfere with the timing if they can do it right now. Mr. Blanchard commented what if they say they don't want to take the signs down, just install. We're paying \$4,400 for installation only, and \$6,600 if they do both – do we want to do that? The signs can be cut down to the ground and removed after the ground is frozen. Ms. Steele asked if what's proposed is \$2,200 just to take the signs down – that seems high to her. She's happy that we've allowed each community not to have to install the new signs, so having them take them down and save \$2,200 would be a kind of a middle type solution. **Mr. Sage amended his motion.**

Amended Motion:

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Steele, *Moved*, to approve the Rochester Sign Shop to install the signs based on what was presented at \$4,400. We will determine how to remove the old signs.

Discussion: Mr. Becker has a problem with the motion as stated because we won't have the next meeting until late December and if there's a problem with taking the signs down to get them out of the way for new signs, work can't get done. He wonders if the motion can include some flexibility for Ms. Ford to administratively determine the balance between the \$4,400 and the \$6,600 to make sure the project gets done as soon as possible and as inexpensively as possible. She might negotiate with two municipalities to take signs down, and two who can't to save some money. Mr. Simon said we're paying this company \$32,950 – why don't we say we're going to give them a check for that amount, but they have to take the signs down too? Mr. Sage is willing to amend his motion with one clarification from Ms. Ford – can the Sign Shop cut down the signs and we will handle getting them transported to wherever before the installation. Ms. Ford had a conversation about this with Mr. Blanchard after the Sign Shop had closed today, so she does not know if they can take them down at all as she hasn't spoken to them. Mr. Sage commented that we may approve installation where there is not the possibility for installation if it's going in the same place as the existing sign. **Mr. Sage removed his motion.** Mr. Walker deferred to Mr. Becker's comments, and asked what about if we approve the \$4,400 to install the signs, and an additional of up to \$2,200 to remove the signs with the discretion of the Trail Manager able to negotiate that difference, whether it be a sign by sign variance or a community by community – but allow the extra \$2,200 to be at the discretion of what Ms. Ford can negotiate.

MOTION by Walker, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to approve \$4,400 for installation of the new signs, and up to \$2,200 for the removal of existing signs, negotiable by the Trail Manager based on which communities can remove the existing signs.

Discussion: Ms. Gamage asked if Ms. Ford can check with the communities first before negotiating the cost for removal. Mr. Walker said that is the intent of his motion. Ms. Ford will confirm with the Sign Shop if they can or can't take the signs out, and then reach out to the communities to see if they have the capability to remove the signs now. Mr. Walker doesn't want to go back through this exercise next month, we want to do it tonight and give Ms. Ford the latitude to get it done. This motion gives the framework to get it done. Ms. Buxar said Oakland Township will remove their signs, and asked how signs there are. Ms. Ford said there are three signs in Oakland Township. Ms. Olijnyk asked how many signs are in the same place the new signs will be installed in that have to be removed before install. Ms. Ford summarized signs to be removed – at mile marker 31.2, at Ludlow, at Tienken, at Dutton, at Silverbell, and the one at Atwater.

Chairperson Blanchard called the question.

Vote on the Motion:

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Blanchard, Buxar, Gamage, Sage, Simon, Stout, Walker

Nays: Steele

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: Citizen Representation on the Commission: Ms. Gamage asked that this be put on the agenda because it came to her attention during one of the Branding subcommittee meetings that the Rochester Hills citizen members' last meeting will be in December. Rochester Hills made that decision because they are going to put Parks and DPW people in place on the Commission rather than citizens. She thanked the Rochester Hills citizen representatives. She looked at the intergovernmental agreement because she had been under the impression that our agreement was that we would have two elected members and two citizen members, because in all the years she has been on the Commission, this is the way it's been. She feels that the citizen members provide a lot of time on the subcommittee support. They also provide a balanced perspective and a different perspective than the elected or hired people provide to the Commission. She was surprised in the intergovernmental agreement that it doesn't stipulate that. It actually says something like at least one of the members must be from the elected member unit. She is not proposing to change that at all, she's just saying that the precedent we've had all these years makes a lot of sense and appreciates having citizen representation on the Commission. She thanked Mr. Blanchard and Ms. Pinkham for all of their years of service. It makes sense that Parks and DPW people have a lot of knowledge and experience with issues we discuss and it makes sense to have them present, but also believes they can be present based on the intergovernmental agreement without getting rid of citizen representation. It says we have to have one elected member, they could be the alternate member, and there is no limit on the number of alternate members. And, our meetings are public, so they could still attend and provide input. She was just surprised to hear that that is happening and wanted bring it up during one of our meetings. (Mr. Blanchard is having technical issues at 7:49 p.m., so Vice-Chair Steele took over the meeting.) Mr. Becker said for many years, we've had a staff member of a community on the Commission, whose name is Mr. Blanchard. When he was on the Commission he was the Parks Director for Orion Township, but lived elsewhere. It didn't hamper the Commission in any way, it didn't narrow arguments – in fact with his being a staff member with the experience and knowledge he had, added much to the Commission. We have a second member on the Commission that has the same situation and he likes that diversity. He likes the diversity of having some citizen members, some elected members and some staff members who also serve very well in representing their City. He doesn't see a problem with what Rochester Hills is doing as they have the right under the interlocal agreement to choose their alternate members in any way they choose. He's glad to have this discussion to hear other people's views, but doesn't see anything to be worried about. Ms. Buxar said she heard about this earlier today

and understands Rochester Hills has the full right to represent their community how they wish. However, Mr. Blanchard has numerous years of experience – she doesn't know if the citizen reps wanted to step off or anything, but is there anything this Commission can perhaps do if they are still willing to serve, to suggest to Rochester Hills to put a grandfather on the Commission. She doesn't know if Rochester Hills has voted on this yet, but maybe a note from this Commission to the Council. This is dependent on whether the citizen reps want to serve; they are both valued members of this Commission and we appreciate their work. (Mr. Blanchard returned to the meeting at 7:52 and resumed as Chairperson.) Mr. Simon agrees with Mr. Becker and wonders how would we vote these residents out that want to attend and have voting rights. We always offer public comment; if we see a person rise to the top – a resident who is very interested – that could be a vetting process. We hardly see anyone that comes in unless they have a complaint, no one really shows a lot of interest to be a member. Is there a formula for picking out representatives? Ms. Buxar commented to Mr. Simon – the Parks and Rec citizen rep, Ms. Olijnyk, she would fight to keep her on this Commission as long as she wants. She's not sure what Mr. Simon is asking, but that is one of our citizen reps. Mr. Simon agreed. Ms. Gamage clarified she's not asking to change anything – Rochester Hills has the right to put whoever they want on the Commission. She's just saying she values staff input and diversity, but also thinks citizen representation is very important as well. She's not sure where the vetting process came in, she's not suggesting this or any changes – she just wanted to discuss the fact that our citizen representation has been important. As Mr. Blanchard has been both staff and citizen representatives, he commented it worked well in both cases and brought value to the Commission. He feels if it got to a situation that the communities all had staff members and elected officials, it's his opinion that this would not be a good situation. He feels that citizens and users of the trail certainly bring value to the Commission, and it would be a shame if we went to all elected officials and staff representatives. We may have a situation in Rochester Hills that they appoint a staff person who does not live in any of our communities. To him, that would not be a good thing, as it's important we be familiar with and users of the trail. We sometimes have to ask staff people to do something – maybe they won't want to do it, so they would get to vote against it. When he worked at Orion Township and sat on the Commission, there were times where he felt conflicted in his position because he worked for the Township and they didn't always agree with everything the Commission did. Mr. Becker seconded what Mr. Blanchard stated – it would not be good if we had a Commission only of elected officials and staff, as a mix of all three is important. He hopes if Rochester Hills moves forward, they will grandfather in the two current citizen members. Perhaps they would consider having one staff person and one citizen person recognizing the diversity of experience and thought on the Commission is important to the proper functioning of the Commission. Mr. Sage agreed with all the comments and went back to the intergovernmental agreement where it says the Commission shall be composed of two commissioners from each member unit, the governing board of each unit shall appoint its two commissioners, one of which shall be a member of the appointing governing board. So, one has to be an elected official, and then the municipality has the opportunity to provide the second member at their discretion. He doesn't support reopening the agreement. With all the feedback tonight, he feels it provides guidance for each municipality on who should be that second commissioner on this Board to best serve the interest of all communities. Chairperson Blanchard said Rochester Hills has to make a decision how they will do this, but has feedback from the Commission to go forward. Ms. Buxar asked the Rochester Hills rep where this decision came from, and asked if the Commission wants Ms. Ford forward a memo to the Council to suggest a grandfather clause for the current members. Mr. Becker feels we need to be cautious about not trying to make Rochester Hills think we are dictating what they should do with their decisions. Mr. Blanchard suggested sending Mr. Walker and Ms. Mungioli a synopsis of tonight's comments. He said both he and Ms. Pinkham received the application for next year,

filled them out and sent them in. They never heard anything until this week about the consideration not to have citizen representation. He would like to stay on the Commission.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Mr. Sage stated he got commitment from the City of Rochester to remove the kiosk once the Eagle Scout is prepared to install the new one at Ludlow. Mr. Walker said he heard and respects all the comments heard tonight, and will take the message forward to the rest of the Council. Mr. Simon recently drove by the Dillman & Upton lumber yard and didn't see any improvement to the fence and asked if the work has started. Ms. Ford said they have done the fence and it's much straighter than it was; all the I-beams are on their side of the property so you can't see them from the trail. We gave them permission not to stain the fence until the spring. Mr. Simon will take another look at it. Ms. Steele indicated Orion Township will remove the necessary signs. She congratulated Ms. Ford on the grant the Commission received. The Commission thanked Ms. Steele for alerting us about that grant. Ms. Olijnyk thanked everyone for their work over the past year and feels the discussion tonight was very respectful of everyone's opinions. Letting the communities know how the Commission feels without telling them what to do is very appropriate. This is a great way to deal with the general concerns we have. Ms. Buxar thanked everyone for their work on this Commission. Ms. Pinkham commented the D&U fence is leaning in one spot on the south side, she enjoyed being part of the Commission and would like the opportunity to do so in the future. Mr. Blanchard indicated the Personnel Committee needs to meet before the end of the year, and will send the evaluation form out to each member. Happy Thanksgiving to all!

ADJOURNMENT OF SPECIAL MEETING:

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to adjourn the Special Meeting at 8:13 p.m.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: December 15, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

DAVID BECKER, Secretary