



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

REGULAR MEETING of the PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
Via Teleconferencing – GoToMeeting
Access code: 653646309, or by phone 1-571-317-3122

CALL TO ORDER: The Tuesday, January 19, 2021 Regular Meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairperson Olijnyk at 7:02 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Robin Buxar, Ken Elwert, Linda Gamage, Steve Sage, Dan Simon, Jeff Stout, David Walker

Voting Alternates Present: None

Non-Voting Alternates Present: David Becker, Dave Mabry, Theresa Mungoli, Martha Olijnyk, Chris Shepard

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Present: Jerry Narsh

Voting Members Absent: Donni Steele

Alternates Absent: Julia Dalrymple, Ann Peterson

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Absent: Doug Hobbs

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

COMMISSIONER INTRODUCTIONS: For the benefit of new Commissioners, Vice-Chair Olijnyk asked each member to introduce themselves, indicate which municipality they represent, and where they are attending tonight's virtual meeting. Current Commissioners – Robin Buxar, voting member representing Oakland Township, attending from Oakland Township; Linda Gamage, voting member representing Rochester, attending from Rochester; Martha Olijnyk, alternate member representing Oakland Township and Vice-Chairperson, attending from Oakland Township; Steve Sage, voting member representing Rochester, attending from Rochester; Theresa Mungoli, alternate member representing Rochester Hills, attending from Rochester Hills; Dan Simon, voting member representing Oakland Township (explained this is his last meeting and will be replaced by Brian Blust), attending from Oakland Township; Jeff Stout, voting member representing Orion Township, attending from Orion Township; David Walker, voting member representing Rochester Hills and Treasurer, attending from Rochester Hills, David Becker, alternate member representing Rochester and Secretary, attending from Rochester. Newer Commissioners – Ken Elwert, voting member representing Rochester Hills, attending from Orion Township; Dave Mabry, alternate member representing Oakland Township, attending from Oakland Township; Jerry Narsh, alternate member representing the Village of Lake Orion, attending from the Village; Chris Shepard, alternate member representing Rochester Hills, attending from Rochester Hills. Also attending the meeting and introducing themselves are Louis Carrio, President of the Friends Group, attending from Rochester Hills, and Brian Blust, who will be the voting member representing Oakland Township starting next meeting, attending from Oakland Township, Melissa Ford, Manager of the Paint Creek Trail, attending from the Village

of Lake Orion; Chris Gray, Assistant Manager of the Paint Creek Trail, attending from Rochester Hills.

VIRTUAL MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT: Vice-Chairperson Olijnyk 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 Commission will provide reasonable and necessary auxiliary services with individuals with disabilities with advance notice. The video conference can be accessed by downloading the app GoToMeeting, the meeting number is 653646309. 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-minute limit for public comment. You may also send correspondence regarding this meeting to the Paint Creek Trailways office addressed to 4393 Collins Rd., 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.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Buxar, seconded by Stout, *Moved*, to approve the January 19, 2021 agenda as presented.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA: Ms. Ford noted there is a typo in the minutes relative to the date of the next regular meeting which she will correct.

- a. Minutes – December 15, 2020 Regular Meeting, approve and file
- b. Treasurers Report – December 2020

MOTION by Simon, seconded by Sage, *Moved*, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Ford presented the list of invoices totaling \$30,030.83. In addition to the recorder's fee, this amount includes credit card charges for postage and stickers for the new Map Kiosks; MSG invoice for the Bridge 33.7 stair design (revised invoice), and L.J. Construction invoice for the Bridge 33.7 Stairway Construction. Ms. Ford explained for the MSG revised invoice, we approved an invoice for them in December, but the mileage was incorrect on that invoice – that check was voided and replaced with the correct amount (which was less than the original amount). Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$83,000.

MOTION by Buxar, seconded by Gamage, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved in the amount of \$30,030.83 and orders be drawn for payment.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL: Budget Amendment: Ms. Ford is requesting an amendment to this year's budget – to amend the amount for rent this year from the Township. When the 2021 budget was approved, she was unaware that the rent had been raised for the year. She requests that we move \$1,250 from the unrestricted fund balance to the operations budget to cover this difference. The

budget included in the packet does not include this change. Ms. Olijnyk asked what the unrestricted fund balance will be reduced to. Ms. Ford explained it would go down \$1,250, leaving the balance at \$59,795. Ms. Gamage noted the increase is 25% over the current rent of \$5,000, which seems substantial and asked if a reason was given for the increase. Ms. Ford said no reason was given to her, but everyone in the building saw an increase – we haven't had an increase in ten years. The previous rent had been \$2,500 and when it was raised last time it went to \$5,000 or a 50% increase. Ms. Buxar indicated that the Board of Trustees did not have a meeting on March 26th, so that's incorrect. The increase actually took place across the board for all tenants at the Cider Mill at the budget workshop. Oakland Township's Assistant Manager did notify everyone verbally; there is no formal lease between everybody. It's an informal lease that the Township is not confined to an increase every year, and no rents have been increased for over ten years, so a per space increase was done that affected everyone in the building. The concessionaire is the only one with a formal lease. She explained the \$520 per month lease includes network services, township emails, services with IT Right assistance, heat, water, space itself, internet, payroll services, W2 filing, taxes, the building maintenance, cleaning, restroom supplies, lawn cutting, snow removal – all is included in the rent. The Township decided after ten years to increase the rent based on the space for each individual tenant, so others realized a larger increase than the Commission did. Ms. Buxar commented all of the Township's costs have gone up quite a bit. Ms. Gamage agreed this is a bargain, and explained that each member community provides an in-kind service to the Commission. Oakland Township provides office space with a small charge for rent, and meeting accommodations for six months of the year in the building. She explained the other in-kind services provided by the other communities. She did not realize there has not been an increase in ten years and what this covers, and is inclined to make a motion. Vice-Chair Olijnyk suggested we ask the Township Manager to send an email to help remember these things so this won't happen again. Ms. Ford thinks what happened is that this happened at the start of the COVID shutdown and everyone had gone into working remotely.

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Elwert, *Moved*, to support the increase, and amend the current budget.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Review of License Agreements by Trailways Attorney: Ms. Ford stated the Licensing Committee has been discussing and reviewing our license agreements and put forth recommendations on how these should be handled. Many of these fees have not been increased in several years and the Committee feels they need to be updated and, in some cases, renegotiated by our Trailways attorney, Ms. Hamameh. She has spoken with her and she believes it will take her one hour to review and revise the standard license agreement. She also plans to check the most recent deed on file with the Register of Deeds to ensure that is signed by the current owner of the property. Once that first agreement is reviewed, she will use that language to revise the remaining agreements, which will be a nominal amount of time – approximately two hours. The remaining time will depend on how much negotiation is required with the property owners. Ms. Hamameh charges \$125/hr for her services. Ms. Ford and the Committee are recommending the Commission approve having Ms. Hamameh review, update and negotiate the current license agreements. Mr. Simon asked if we can put a not to exceed limit on the negotiations in case it goes four or six hours. Ms. Ford said we could, as she budgeted an extra \$1,500 funding in the legal line item this year specifically for this, so there is a total of \$3,500 budgeted. Mr. Simon feels we should still have a not to exceed limit just in case. Ms. Olijnyk asked how many different entities she will be negotiating with. Ms. Ford believes it is eight. Ms. Olijnyk said we could direct the attorney to tell the Commission when she has reached an hour or two, and then seek permission to go more. Ms. Buxar asked how the motion should be

framed. She doesn't have a problem with going this route, but it's hard to put limitations on an attorney's time, because we don't know. Ms. Olijnyk said we could say that after one hour of negotiation time with each person or after so many hours, she has to check in with the Commission on the status and provide an estimate of time she thinks it will be to finish. Mr. Sage said if we have \$3,500 budgeted to the line item, we could stop at some threshold and request an update from the attorney. So, we're not into the hours, it's simply the financial threshold we are willing to endure. Ms. Buxar agreed this is reasonable.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Stout, **Moved**, to approve that once the budgeted line item reaches \$2,500, an update from the attorney to the Commission is required to move forward.

Discussion: Ms. Buxar asked if we need to add review and update the current licensing agreements in order to authorize the attorney to review, update and negotiate the agreements and come back to the Commission as stated. Mr. Sage and Mr. Stout agreed with this amendment.

Amended Motion:

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Stout, **Moved**, to approve that the attorney be authorized to review, update and negotiate the license agreements, and once the budgeted line item reaches \$2,500, an update from the attorney is required to move forward.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Policy on Electric Personal Mobility Devices: Vice-Chair Olijnyk indicated this issue was discussed last month but more information was needed. Ms. Ford said specifically the one-wheel devices seen on the trail was discussed last month, and a photo was included in the packet. She was asked to look at our policies pertaining to e-bikes and other power-driven mobility devices. Neither had language that would be applicable to this situation; both policies were included in the packet. She was asked to see if there was any kind of classification system for these devices. There isn't one like there is for the electric bikes. There is a wide range of speeds for these devices – from 7 mph up to 30 mph. There is no way by looking at them to know what kind of speed they can go up to; there is no tag like the e-bikes have. Ms. Ford is suggesting we adopt a policy that prohibits these devices as well as other similar devices. The language provided is similar to what the Huron-Clinton Metroparks use. Like our speed limit, Ms. Ford doesn't know how enforceable it is as the bike patroller does not have the ability to ticket people. But this would be a policy we have that states we don't want these devices on our trail. Mr. Simon read the policy carefully, feels it is very well written and would vote to accept this policy. He commented that some of these vehicles are quite heavy with the rider on it, so if there is a collision with someone or into a tree, people are going to be hurt. As a policy, it's well written and we can't control the top speed if they run into something – there will be damages. Ms. Olijnyk noted the website just says we are a non-motorized trail, not specific as to what this means. Ms. Ford said this will be updated on the website, and put out on social media as a reminder to people. Ms. Gamage wonders if it's necessary this be added, if we say the trail is non-motorized, is that sufficient? She is not sure if another policy is necessary, but agrees it is well written and covers the situation. If there is already something in place, do we need another policy? Mr. Carrio asked about the Class 2 e-bikes – they are considered much like a motor bike in that you don't have to pedal, is that intended? Ms. Ford is unsure of the question. Mr. Carrio explained the Class 1 bikes have to be pedaled, and you don't have to pedal the Class 2's. Is it intended to have that in effect as a motorized vehicle because you don't pedal? Ms. Ford explained that legislation said that e-bikes were not motorized vehicles. Ms. Olijnyk pointed to the policy in the packet where it says in the preamble that the definition of electric bicycles in the law says that they are considered non-motorized, and that's how it was written, to

consider all of the non-motorized vehicles, it's not a powered device. That's why we allow them on the trail, based on the definition. Mr. Elwert acknowledges the risk Mr. Simon indicated, and the comment Ms. Gamage made about creating an unnecessary policy. A quick read of this is that these devices aren't included in any of our policies, and suggests we move ahead with the proposed language as presented.

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Stout, *Moved*, to accept the language as presented as a policy for going forward.

Discussion: Ms. Buxar agreed with Ms. Gamage's comments as far as increasing policies; however, she feels there is some delineation where people see non-motorized, they say this electric – this is new technology electric/motorized. She feels this is a good policy to adopt to define what we want on the trail. Ms. Olijnyk added it's good to have something to point to if we ask someone not to use these devices; they are restricted. Mr. Simon asked if the patrol people have some sort of a radar device so if they do see someone that might be exceeding the speed limit, they are allowed to intercept. Ms. Ford stated they don't have any kind of radar device. Ms. Olijnyk said if it becomes a big problem, maybe we could ask the Sheriff's office to put up one of their signs, but is not sure if it's necessary at this time. Ms. Buxar said the Township has one. Mr. Simon said if the sign is not being used, it could be located in Rochester where it's very congested. Ms. Olijnyk suggested that these machines encourage people to go faster to see how high they can get the speed up. Mr. Stout added if we're expecting enforcement on anything, there has to be an ordinance that an officer can point to, such as the suggested language, for anything to happen. This language is good.

Vote on the Motion:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Website Hosting Contract: Ms. Olijnyk explained we've had issues with the slowness and security of the website. Ms. Ford stated we've had quite a few issues with the website over the last year and implemented a couple different things to try and correct that, but that caused different problems. The consensus is to find a new host provider for the website. Time is of the essence, because our current contract with WebHostingPad is set to expire in early February. One of the issues we had with our current provider is it's a really large company, so we are just one client among many others and didn't get the attention needed in a timely manner. She had to resort to Google a lot of the time to try and resolve the issues, and would spend an entire day trying to get things back up; being part-time, this is not a good use of her time when so much else is going on. She and Ms. Gray feel that a smaller provider that could give more personal attention might a better option. They did reach out to get a few quotes, unfortunately they only have one to present tonight, from Pro Web Marketing, which is based out of Traverse City. They host the website for the Friends of the Sleeping Bear Dunes, but their price is quite a bit higher than what we were paying with WebHostingPad. We could go with them or the other option is to go with another company similar to them at a cheaper price. We could try them or staff could continue to research other local options to see if we can find someone who has a better price but will offer the services we need. They found an option with In Motion Hosting, which has a 90-day money back guarantee, so if we find they are not providing the services we need or we find another smaller provider we think would do the work, we could present their quotes at the next meeting. Mr. Sage asked if we could transition the services through Pro Web or In Motion prior to the expiration of the current contract. Ms. Ford responded yes, both companies would assist us in switching it over. She understands switching hosts is pretty seamless; it shouldn't be hard to do. Our website is based on Wordpress, and they both are

able to use this platform to transfer. Ms. Mungioli indicated she sent an email to staff about this, and today she posted help on the Rochester Community Cares site looking for somebody, and found someone. She thinks there are a lot of other vendors out there and that through the Chamber of Commerce or other local commissions, we can find someone who is local to help. She understands the frustration of dealing with a technology person that is not local. Not only do you want to have a vendor that can work in Wordpress, you want to make sure that it's easy enough for staff to do the updates, not have to pay someone an hourly rate every time you want to change something in the website. She would like to see other options before we commit to a year long contract with someone who is more expensive before looking at other options. Mr. Elwert commented he has a background in this and has previously managed websites, and is willing to talk to tech people. He asked where the actual domain name resides, with the company that's hosting us? This can sometimes make these transfers more challenging than you think. We might want to look at separating the ownership of the domain name from the hosting company as it could be difficult especially if the company goes out of business, as the domain name resides with them. He looked it up on an international website and the domain name doesn't register to us as a group. He has concerns about this. He also asked why the site is set up for Wordpress, is it for ease of modification? This also could have been slowing the site down. Ms. Olijnyk said yes, but we are looking for something user friendly. She agreed Mr. Elwert makes a good point about the ownership of the domain name, and said we can register it ourselves with the domain name registry. Mr. Elwert offered his assistance to staff to evaluate their needs. Mr. Simon is pretty impressed with Pro Web's marketing brochure. We have numerous people using our website. We might as well spend a little more money and hire a professional sounding marketing group, as they know what they're doing. Ms. Olijnyk noted that In Motion quoted \$9.95 per month for the first year and asked if they require a year long commitment for that rate. Ms. Ford responded they require a year contract, but have a 90-day money-back guarantee. If we call within the 90 days and say we're unhappy, they will cancel the contract with no questions. We would have the 90 days to decide if we wanted to go with someone else. The rate would probably go up in the second year, as the \$9.95 is probably an introductory rate for the first year. Ms. Olijnyk asked if they quoted web redesign costs. Ms. Ford doesn't believe they do web design, we would have to source this out, whereas Pro Web Marketing could do that for us for an additional fee. Mr. Stout asked how much is budgeted for this work in 2021. Ms. Ford said nothing is budgeted for a web redesign; \$1,500 for hosting service costs. Mr. Sage agreed that Pro Web Marketing submitted a very professional proposal, but they do recommend a complete redesign at a cost of \$1,200, which is not budgeted. We may need to look at other providers as well, and break out the costs of a redesign and the hosting services. Ms. Ford feels we don't have to necessarily redesign the website this year, but have to find a new hosting provider this year because of the issues. Mr. Elwert agreed that we can look to do a redesign later, but the hosting is more crucial. The local company is primarily a design company that provides hosting as a service they need to do with the design. The national company provides hosting, but not design. He asked what level of support would be provided by the Township's IT Right. Ms. Ford indicated because we host our website on an outside organization, no support would be provided. She has two email addresses, one associated with the website and the one through Oakland Township – if she has problems with the Township email, she can get support for that from IT Right, but no support on the trail's email because we pay another provider for that. Ms. Buxar would like to recommend that Mr. Elwert work with staff to help us out with where we need to go on this issue, as something needs to be done with the hosting, and come back to the next meeting after some feedback. Mr. Elwert is happy to comply on a limited scale. Ms. Ford indicated this decision needs to be made tonight, as the hosting contract expires prior to the next meeting; if we go with In Motion Hosting now, we have 90 days to make the final decision. Any other proposals could be brought forward next month. Mr. Walker agreed we don't want to stay where we are

and have a time sensitive decision to make. Without knowing where we want to go with this, we need an interim decision, and In Motion provides this interim decision.

MOTION by Walker, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to not renew the contract with the current provider, move to In Motion Hosting under the premise that we will evaluate any alternatives presented at the next meeting.

Discussion: Mr. Simon asked Mr. Elwert to offer his resources and experience to staff when he has time. Mr. Elwert will touch base with staff tomorrow. Mr. Walker reached out to the Chamber of Commerce and there are local resources available. We can find companies to determine where the best home would be. He asked the members to reach out and get any contacts to staff. Ms. Mungioli asked if we have a comprehensive technology plan in place, and if there are any other vendor contracts coming up for renewal. Ms. Ford replied we do not have a comprehensive technology plan in place, and the contract with IT Right is managed by Oakland Township. Ms. Mungioli added we also need to check on the domain name ownership to make sure it belongs to us.

Vote on the Motion:

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: Ad Hoc Committee Assignments: A chart of the members who currently serve on the Ad Hoc Committees included in the packet. Since Mr. Simon announced he will be leaving, this leaves a spot on two Committees that also need to be filled. Everyone currently serving on Committees agreed to stay on. Alternate members as well as voting members can serve on the Ad Hoc Committees. No additional members volunteered for the Recognition Committee. Ms. Ford added that Ms. Steele asked that this Committee meet before the February meeting to develop a list of people that need to be recognized. Mr. Walker said he would serve on the Personnel Committee as this usually consists of the officers. Ms. Mungioli and Mr. Shepard volunteered to serve on the Rochester Hills Art/Pathway Project Committee. Mr. Elwert agreed to sit on the Development of Property in SE Rochester Committee. Mr. Elwert and Ms. Buxar said they would serve on the Labor Day Bridge Walk Committee. Mr. Narsh agreed to serve on the Lake Orion Committee. Mr. Sage said he would serve on the Trail Branding & Signage Committee. Ms. Buxar volunteered at this time for the Licensing Committee, until one of the new members from Oakland Township can take over, as this usually has a representative from each member community. Thank you to everyone for volunteering.

DISCUSSION: 2021 Goals: Ms. Ford indicated a list of the goals from last year was included in the packet, and had asked all the members to arrange them as an initial ranking. The goals in red have been completed and will be eliminated. She asked for thoughts on this and if there are any other goals that should be added. This list can be submitted to Ms. Ford once the Commissioners have ranked the goals. Also included in the packet is a copy of the Master Plan Action Program for reference. Ms. Olijnyk asked if staff is seeking input tonight or asking that members do the rankings and submit them for the next meeting. Ms. Ford is looking for initial thoughts tonight on what to eliminate or add, and then go home and do the final rankings based on tonight's discussion and submit those for compilation for the next meeting. Mr. Simon recommended we never hire MSG for another project based on what happened over the last couple of years. Mr. Becker feels we should get another survey of trail users by a professional group, as we did ten or 15 years ago, as this would be helpful in policy making and management of the trail. It's also important in grant applications. He suggested that the last survey be sent to the new members. Ms. Gamage indicated that Rochester is going through a Master Plan update

and has requested that the chairs or managers of some of the Commissions participate in the steering committee for this update and requested that Ms. Ford participate. If the Commission agrees, she thinks her participation would be important to advocate for things that are consistent with the trail mission statement as well as the parks and natural areas. In the past, there have been decisions made by the Planning Commission and Council where things have fallen through the cracks – this is a good way to ensure we stay informed and advocate for what the Commission feels is important. One of the things she refers to is the change in trail setbacks. She would like to see this added as a goal. Ms. Mungioli asked about security on the trail – is there a need for putting up a blue light signage or something where people can contact law enforcement? Ms. Ford indicated if someone gets hurt on the trail, they should call 911 and use the mile markers location. Mr. Simon referred to Mr. Becker’s comments relative to a survey and indicated there are several encroachments in Oakland Township and wonders if there is a staking program for people who have access to the trail to show property lines. Ms. Olijnyk explained that Mr. Becker is talking about a user survey, not a real estate staking survey. She added that the Commission had a whole trail survey done in 2008 when resurfacing, found numerous encroachments, and resulted in a lawsuit against some homeowners. Ms. Gamage suggested the Licensing Committee can look at this rather than make it a goal for staff. She also suggested the website issues be added as a goal for this year. Ms. Mungioli asked if we’ve reached the targeted goal of \$25,000 on the Fund Balance. Staff responded yes. Ms. Olijnyk stated the members need to provide Ms. Ford with the goal rankings by February 2nd. Added goals are the user survey by a professional group, staff participating in the Rochester Master Plan Steering Committee to advocate on behalf of the trail, and resolving the website issues. Regarding security on the trail, this could be a question on the user survey to see if this needs to be worked on.

MANAGER’S REPORT: In addition to the written report, Ms. Ford indicated that the new trash and recycling bin was placed at the bridge site; everything required by the grant is now in place. She met with Linda Moran, Polly Ann Trail Manager, and the DIA to select the sites for the Inside Out artwork project. The Moutrie Garden was approved by MSU as a site for their Master Gardener Program and has been certified as a Monarch Waystation. A sign is forthcoming, which the Friends Group is paying for. The Commission thanked Mr. Carrio and Ms. McBride for all their work towards this effort. Ms. Mungioli suggested we reach out to the schools relative to graduation signs along the trail this year. Ms. Ford indicated Orion had a lot of vandalism issues with the signs last year, and Rochester had not approached the Commission. She will keep this in mind as we get closer to graduation season this year.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: The members welcomed the new Commissioners, thanked Mr. Simon for his service and input during his tenure and said he will be missed. Mr. Simon indicated it was great working with everyone.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: February 16, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

DAVID BECKER, Secretary