



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

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

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

Voting Members Present: Rock Blanchard, Susan Bowyer, Frank Ferriolo, Linda Gamage, Kim Russell, Hank Van Ager

Voting Alternates Present: None

Non-Voting Alternates Present: David Becker, Lynn Loebs

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: None

Voting Members Absent: Donni Steele, Jeff Stout

Alternates Absent: Chris Barnett, Robin Buxar, Ben Giovanelli, Chris Hagen, Martha Olijnyk, David Walker

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.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: As Orion Township is not represented tonight, it was suggested that #8 -Approval of the Budget Amendment, be postponed to the next meeting so all member communities are represented.

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Bowyer, ***Moved***, to approve the February 19, 2019 agenda as amended.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. Minutes – December 18, 2018 Regular Meeting, approve and file
- b. Treasurers Report – December 2018, receive and file
- c. Treasurers Report – January 2019, receive and file

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

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Ford presented the list of invoices totaling \$2,849.22. This Mannik Smith Group invoice for the trail resurfacing project, reimbursement to the Friends Group for Labor Day Bridge Walk refreshments as this accidentally paid by their credit card, and the website domain renewal for three years. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$86,855.

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved in the amount of \$2,849.22 and orders be drawn for payment.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL: Temporary Permit, Aaron Palaian – Onurmark Race Productions – Lake Orion Turkey Trot, November 28, 2019: The application and race route is in the packet, and Mr. Palaian, 3735 Rolling Hills Rd., Lake Orion, came forward and explained the 5k/10k event will occur through the streets of Lake Orion including the trail. He is a full-time event director and would like to have an event in his own community. The Village of Lake Orion is voting on this event at their next meeting. He has spoken to the DDA and the police department, and they are on board. He has also spoken with Orion Township and the Sheriff's office will be on site at Kern Road. He would like to put up signs as early as possible, and the morning of the race he plans to place survey flags along the trail. These flags will be removed by a "tail runner" at the back of the race. There will be two water stations, each with a medical person at the turnaround areas, and one roaming medical person. The 5k participants will be able to walk. It was asked how the 1,500 participants, but that only 1,000 will show, was estimated. Mr. Palaian has no idea of the number of people, as this is the first year for the event. It could be as little as 200, as this is Thanksgiving morning. He will donate as much as he can to the Lake Orion School District, but is not sure of the amount now. He has approval for parking at St. Joseph Church, with a shuttle transporting participants. As far as removing trash, the company that supplies the restrooms usually offers trash service. Most of the trash should be at the water stops, but the tail runner will also pick up trash. He assures it will all be picked up. A portable restroom will be near Hanson's. He asked if another restroom can be placed near the Archery. Mr. Palaian was asked to work with Ms. Ford on locations. The race will be timed, and the start and finish will be in the Village. Mr. Blanchard expressed appreciation for the early request. He also has a concern that this is a for-profit event as the Commission spends a lot of money for maintenance, the trail will be newly resurfaced and there could be damage with the number of participants. He is leaning toward denying the request. Ms. Russell's concern is that the applicant is using a trail that costs him nothing, and would like to see something in return. She asked about the proposed signage and commented the ground will probably be frozen. Mr. Palaian is not sure of the design/size at this point, but will abide by Commission direction. He will work with Ms. Ford on this issue. Ms. Russell asked how check-in will occur. The applicant explained the information can be mailed to the participants, and their packet can be picked up at Hanson's prior to the event, which will eliminate check-in. Mr. Ferriolo is comfortable with the event as the applicant has put on many events in the past and is experienced. He suggested that promotion of the Paint Creek Trail be included in the marketing information. Mr. Palaian will comply – he can put information in the packet information, could put the trail logo on the back of the T-shirt and include the logo on his website with a link to the trail website. He will work with Ms. Ford.

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Van Agen, *Moved*, to approve the temporary permit for the Lake Orion Turkey Trot event on November 28, 2019, contingent upon receiving proof of insurance paperwork naming the Commission as additionally insured.

Ayes: Bowyer, Ferriolo, Gamage, Russell, Van Agen

Nays: Blanchard

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: 2019 Resurfacing Projects: Ms. Ford outlined on a chalkboard the three resurfacing projects slated for inclusion in the resurfacing bid, and where the Commission stands

on funding. This is in addition to the main trail resurfacing. Listed are what Mannik Smith quoted on these costs, what funding has been secured, and what is unfunded. For the Moutrie/Tienken Side Trail quote of \$60,514, the Friends Group has allotted \$8,560.60 toward this project. The unfunded amount is \$51,937.40. For the Clinton River Access Trail, Ms. Ford understands Ms. Myers had been in discussions with the City of Rochester about their funding resurfacing amount - \$17,448. She had talked with Rochester in December, called them today, but has not heard back. This amount would be put in Rochester's 2020 budget. Ms. Russell said she did not see this project included in the budget, but there is another meeting relative to goals and objectives. If not included in the budget, the Commission would have to secure these funds. She will check to see if it's included in the Parks budget, and if not, it needs to be decided and put in the budget ASAP as their fiscal year ends in June. For the Clinton River Observation Deck quote of \$29,260, the Commission is using \$25,000 from the fund balance, leaving \$4,260 unfunded. This is only a cost estimate as these budgets have not gone out to bid yet; so the costs could come in higher or lower. For all three projects, the unfunded amount is \$56,197.40 – that is if Rochester approves paying the \$17,448. Mr. Ferriolo asked if there may be grant funds approved to offset some of the unfunded amount. Ms. Ford explained the grant request submitted is just for the bridge and the main trail resurfacing. The Commission requested \$407,053 for the grant, and included in that is about an \$8,000 grant administration fee for the Rochester Area Community Foundation as they will be administering the grant for the Commission. Because the bids for the bridge came in lower than the estimate, we have about \$88,000 that hasn't been allotted to anything – but the bids have not been sent out for the resurfacing. Mr. Ferriolo pointed out that a line item for an additional estimated cost for the bridge material as weathered steel was listed at \$113,270 and was included in the mix to get to the \$88,000 – this line is not appropriate, because we approved galvanized steel. Ms. Ford explained Ms. Milos-Dale put the spreadsheet together, and believes she was trying to show that we would have the funds available if the Joint Commission decided to approve the weathered steel, and we received the grant. As this is no longer an issue, the \$88,000 is not correct, it would be more like \$200,000. Ms. Ford said we would have to approach the grant foundation – it is a potential opportunity. Mr. Van Agen commented any overages on the bridge that aren't covered by this estimate, comes out of Oakland Township's budget, which will be difficult. Mr. Blanchard asked if there was money in the Commission's budget for the Moutrie Side Trail. Ms. Ford indicated there is \$3,000 allotted in the budget for the Tienken Pathway art project, so approximately \$11,000 is available for this project. This is not for the Flagstar site. Ms. Ford explained the Friends Group is not on board with having the Moutrie project at Flagstar; they are leaning towards the Tienken site. The estimate for the Flagstar project came in really high. Mr. Blanchard said when the Commission first started talking about the Moutrie project, it was at Tienken, and it wasn't that expensive. Now, the Tienken resurfacing is estimated at \$60,000? The Commission had a presentation of the Flagstar project, which included the Moutrie memorial – that's not going to happen now? Ms. Gray explained support from the Friends Group has wavered for that location. Mr. Blanchard likes the Flagstar site, but that's been blown out of proportion. \$60,000 for resurfacing the Tienken site is way too expensive, and he is not in favor of spending this amount of money on a side trail. Ms. Ford clarified the \$3,000 in the budget for this project is for the signage. Ms. Bowyer said if the Moutrie side path is now the educational side trail at Tienken, she's not in favor of spending the money on resurfacing. Mr. Ferriolo referred to the Moutrie project presentation at Flagstar, which could be done in phases. The Commission was going to merchandize this project so there might be opportunities for future grants to complete it in the future, but at least the Commission would have the whole plan. He understood this was coming from the Commission and there would be a supplement from the Friends Group. Tonight he heard that the Friends said this project site is out, and will be moved to Tienken. Where are we as a Commission, and where is the Friends Group in support of us? He suggested this be an agenda item for discussion – where do we stand on the original presentation of the Flagstar site. If we

like the Flagstar/Moutrie idea, the Commission can go then go back to the Friends Group to help out. Ms. Gray indicated this occurred during the transition between Managers, and things were up in the air as to which direction we were going to pursue. Perhaps the Friends could come to a meeting for clarification. Mr. Becker asked for the status of the Tienken project. Ms. Ford explained the only thing the Commission would be funding is the resurfacing/grading. She feels that the Friends Group thought a more appropriate memorial for Moutrie would be a bench as opposed to a big project at Flagstar. Ms. Gamage agrees with putting this on a future agenda as she doesn't remember a plan that included \$60,000 for resurfacing. She would like to revisit this whole issue. Ms. Gray indicated the Friends Group paid Earth Environment for the Flagstar design work. Ms. Ford added that the Friends Group will be discussing this issue at their March meeting. Due to the timing of sending the resurfacing bid out, Ms. Gamage asked what if we don't include the Tienken resurfacing. Ms. Ford said if all projects are included in the bid, and then decide later we didn't want to do them, that could be problematic as it could increase the cost. The Commission can amend the bid proposal prior to the due date, but not after the bids come back. Ms. Russell said we have to consider legacy costs that we're putting onto the Commission to do a side trail that was supposed to be an educational path with flowers and a bench for walkers/bikers. This trail is basically parallel to the main trail, and she doesn't feel this is a good use of resources for the Commission. She is not for resurfacing this side trail. Ms. Gray explained about four-five years ago, livingLAB developed a suggested plan for development of the Tienken pathway. About the same time, the Rochester Junior Women's Club gave the Commission \$5,000 to be applied in developing that plan. The Moutrie family gave the balance of \$3,500 to come up to the \$8,500. When Tienken was replaced, there was hope that we could use the asphalt to put on the path, but that didn't happen. We still have these restricted funds for this area, but could ask them if it could be used for something else. Ms. Russell said it was not the intention to have a surface on the side path; you can still have a garden on a walking path. Mr. Van Agen said this project precedes him and was called the Tienken pathway – which is already a pathway. Resurfacing costs of \$60,000 for this project is larger than what this project was supposed to be, and he doesn't feel this should be included in the bid. This could possibly be added on as a change order. Mr. Blanchard feels this project should be removed from the bid. There could be a short side trail to a bench, not the entire path. He suggested a meeting with the Friends – not with the whole Commission, but possibly a committee to talk about the project. Mr. Becker said this issue should be brought back as an agenda item, to revisit both design plans. It is the consensus of the Commission to remove the \$60,000 resurfacing cost for the Tienken Educational Side Path from the bid packet. Mr. Blanchard indicated the Commission took a vote last week to send the bid out which included this project. Ms. Ford clarified the Commission only voted to proceed with the resurfacing bid.

MOTION by Russell, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to remove the \$60,000 Moutrie Educational Side Trail resurfacing costs from the bid process.

Mr. Becker asked if the Commission voted on the Motion resurfacing bid last week that included all projects. Ms. Ford indicated the Commission only voted to proceed with the bid. Mr. Becker said if we voted to proceed with a bid which included that project, to be proper, we should make a motion to reconsider the original motion.

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Ferriolo, *Moved*, to reconsider the Motion from last week regarding the resurfacing bid.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION by Blanchard, seconded by Gamage, *Moved*, to approve sending out the bid not to include Moutrie Educational Side Trail project.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Gamage wants to assure that the Rochester portion between Lipuma's and the park is included in the bid for resurfacing, as this was not done at the same time as the last resurfacing. Mr. Becker remembers a Letter of Agreement with the City of Rochester to manage that trail section, especially for things like resurfacing, as this portion is owned by Rochester and not the Commission.

DISCUSSION: Master Plan Update:

Request for Proposals – Planning Services – Ms. Ford indicated she sent out the RFP last week to six different planning firms that we are interested in submitting proposals to be the consultant. She came up with the list based on talking to the County, SEMCOG and the Michigan Planning Association. Proposals are due March 5th. The RFP was sent to Carlisle Wortman Assoc., Giffels Webster, The Greenway Collaborative, livingLAB, McKenna and Wade Trim. There is \$7,000 budgeted for the Master Plan. She asked if there are any amendments to the RFP; if so, they could be sent out prior to the due date. Mr. Blanchard feels we should ask for more than one copy of their proposal. Ms. Ford indicated the proposals will be submitted via email. There is money in the budget for the printing of the actual Master Plan. Will the consultant be required to attend any Commission meetings? This is not listed as a requirement for the selection process. They will attend during the Project Initiation Administration period. The Plan must be adopted by February, so a January meeting might be required if the Plan is not ready for the December meeting. The first draft of the Plan will be available for public review November 14th, and will also be sent to each community. Mr. Ferriolo commented this is an update to the Plan, and not a complete re-do, which should be a big difference in the cost. He suggested this should be as minimalist an update as possible. Ms. Ford indicated the consultant would handle the public input, the survey and forum that are required. What is the process for getting the information to the public for input? Ms. Ford indicated the consultant will be providing the best way to interact with the public. She assumes there will be an on-line survey and we will ask the communities to put it on their website and social media. The new projects will be included in the goals and action plan section of the Plan. It was suggested that the Manager's Report include a section about Master Plan progress.

Committee Structure – Ms. Ford and Mr. Becker have discussed having a rotating committee. The idea is to bring a different chapter to every meeting. There would be a committee for each chapter, they would get the chapter a week before the meeting, have time to review it, come up with any questions or comments, and would then present it to the rest of the Commission at that month's meeting. Ms. Ford would also like to set a committee to review the proposals received from the consultants. Mr. Becker and Ms. Bowyer offered to be on the review committee. Ms. Ford will ask Ms. Steele if she would be willing to serve. She asked if this committee will review the first chapter, or chose three different people. Mr. Blanchard, Ms. Gamage and Mr. Van Agen will review the first chapter.

Master Plan Schedule – There were no questions on the schedule.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL: Trail User Survey/Intern: Ms. Ford indicated there was a user survey done on the trail about 15 years ago by Michigan State. She feels this is a great time to update that information. The previous survey was done by having volunteers stationed on the trail at six locations and stopping trail users to answer certain questions. She spoke to the professor at MSU who worked on the last survey. He had two suggestions – one was to have an intern do it – around \$4,000-5,000, or to have MSU complete it at a much higher cost. Both Ms. Ford and Mr. Becker feel the intern would be the better option. Half of the intern's time would be on the trail and the Commission could use the intern for other projects on the trail for the other half of time. The thought was to use about \$2,000 of the funding budgeted for the Master Plan towards the intern, and then decide where to come up with the other portion of the stipend. Mr.

Blanchard likes the intern idea, and the last time the survey was done there were people out on the trail. He is concerned where the money will come from as there is only \$7,000 for the Master Plan. Ms. Ford said the last Master Plan cost around \$4,000. Mr. Becker indicated an on-trail survey does provide a random sampling. SurveyMonkey is useful but reflects users that are very happy or very mad. He feels the survey is not only good for the Master Plan but is helpful in giving direction, and is in favor of the intern. He likes the idea of a random sampling of trail users. Ms. Ford added that the user survey information was very helpful when applying for the grant. Mr. Ferriolo indicated maybe the people we hire or MSU can give advice in terms assuring that the approach we're going to use will provide a good sampling technique. Mr. Becker commented the people that do this are the experts. Mr. Blanchard asked if the consultant would do the survey as part of the Master Plan. Ms. Bower is not sure we'll get a lot of people to respond to a survey this year because of all the trail work. She's not sure if a survey this year is worth it. Mr. Becker asked that Ms. Ford put together a specific proposal for hiring an intern for a certain amount of time for a certain task with a certain salary, and bring this information back to the next meeting. Ms. Russell indicated if we are doing the on-trail survey, it should be done before the bridge work begins. If this isn't possible, she doesn't believe the survey will be helpful to the Commission. The goal is to get a good flavor, not to hear user frustration. Mr. Becker suggested we ask the survey people for timing. Ms. Ford indicated the student would do it for credit, so it would be their summer term – May through September. Mr. Becker suggested we ask them if they think our concerns would give an invalid survey result. Ms. Russell indicated there is no part of the trail that will be open. Because the resurfacing will be a rolling closure, Ms. Bowyer is not in favor of a survey this summer. Mr. Blanchard indicated the survey also depends on the kinds of questions that will be asked. If we ask what the most part important part of the trail is – improvements, maintenance, restrooms, etc., construction shouldn't have any effect on that. He feels the consultant should handle the survey to help develop the Master Plan. Mr. Ferriolo commented we are resurfacing the entire trail in addition to the bridge, and agrees this is probably the worst year to conduct a survey on the trail. Mr. Becker suggested we ask the experts. He said the Master Plan can be amended, so if the survey doesn't occur this year, the Plan can be approved on time, and then amended later. Ms. Ford was asked to talk to the MSU professor to see if the survey should be done this year. Ms. Loeb asked if the intern would be developing the survey or just administering it. Ms. Ford explained the intern would be developing the survey, and volunteers would be administering it. So, the intern's job wouldn't start until school is over in May. Ms. Loeb asked if the survey has to be completed over a certain amount of time. Ms. Ford believes they are proposing 60 blocks of three hours of time, so that's 180 hours of volunteers on the trail administering the survey. Ms. Loeb said an option would be to have the survey takers on opposite ends of the trail away from the construction. Mr. Becker suggested this issue come back to the next meeting after Ms. Ford has talked with MSU. Ms. Ford is not sure when the intern has to register to do the internship. The thought is that Ms. Ford would write up the project description and send it to the professor, and he would get it to potential interns, and the person would be chosen by April 1st. Mr. Blanchard feels the survey is important to do at the same time as the Master Plan, and to use the information to develop the goals and objectives. Ms. Gamage suggested an electronic survey to gain information to help develop the Master Plan. Ms. Loeb feels we need to act on hiring an intern sooner than later. Mr. Ferriolo said unless whoever we are talking to can eliminate the built-in bias's that are coming with the resurfacing the bridge work, we won't appreciate the survey results. If he can be convinced, he's for the survey, but until then he's uncomfortable with it. Mr. Becker asked if we can move ahead with the intern contingent upon information from MSU that the biases can be taken care of in a satisfactory way. Ms. Bowyer does not think so and does not agree spending money on an intern. Ms. Russell agrees, and suggested an electronic survey this year, and amending the Plan after a trail survey next year. Mr. Blanchard asked if there was any objection in talking to the planning firms about the survey – we always did a community survey and focus

groups when developing a Master Plan. Ms. Ford feels this is what's proposed with the consulting firm. They aren't doing the user survey on the trail, the thought was that MSU would do that. Mr. Blanchard is not sure we need to do a user survey, if this can be done through the focus group and SurveyMonkey.

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Russell, *Moved*, to not approve an intern doing a survey on the trail this year because of construction, but perhaps next summer.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION Ad Hoc Committee Assignments: Ms. Ford provided a list of the Ad Hoc Committees as they stand, and asked if there was any changes. Also included is the Rotating Master Plan Committee, which has already been set up, as well as a possible Resurfacing Committee, which Mr. Becker agreed to sit on. Ms. Ford will send out an email to those not in attendance tonight to see if they would be interested in serving. Mr. Van Agen indicated the Encroachment Committee was not included on the list. Ms. Gamage expressed interest in serving on the Resurfacing Committee. Mr. Blanchard would like to be removed from the Labor Day Bridge Walk Committee, and asked to be put on the Trail Improvements Committee instead.

DISCUSSION 2019 Goals: Ms. Ford put together a progress list of 2018 and 2019 goals. Mr. Becker commented that Master Plan completion is not listed. It was suggested to remove Mr. Mourtie's name from the Flagstar project, and have the Moutrie memorial as a separate project. Mr. Becker feels at some point the Commission needs to prioritize these goals, and asked the members to review and prioritize them, and bring this back to a future meeting.

MANAGER'S REPORT: In addition to her written report, Ms. Ford updated the Iron Belle Trail grant – the Committee met last month to discuss, and questions were posed to the DNR. She did a webinar today with Rails to Trail relative to signage guidelines. This RFP is being worked on and not ready to go out yet. She indicated the Joint Committee approved the construction administrative change order for the bridge project schedule, the contractor is preparing shop drawings and the tentative schedule is that tree clearing will occur during March for 2-3 days with no trail closure. There is a pre-construction meeting on March 5th. Construction will tentatively start the second week of May, but will not start construction earlier than four weeks before bridge delivery, which is scheduled for June 10th. That section of the trail will be closed as of the second week of May. The hope is to reopen the trail at the bridge site by Labor Day weekend. The resurfacing of the bridge section of the trail will occur after the bridge is completed. Ms. Ford reported that Ms. Hamameh recently had some health issues and has a card for the Commissioners to sign. She also thanked the Commission for the floral arrangement and cards that were sent when her father passed away. She announced she is expecting in July. There is no update on the Solaronics property regarding the easement. Mr. Becker remembers the easement was specific to the current owners and expires with the sale of the property. Ms. Bowyer remembers differently. Ms. Russell will bring this issue to the Planning Commission's attention and ask their attorney to get with the Commission's attorney about this issue.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Ms. Russell and Mr. Blanchard feel the Turkey Trot may impact the trail. As this is a for profit event, this is something the Commission needs to think about. Ms. Gamage does not see the section of the trail near Lipuma's included in the resurfacing documents, and wants to make sure it's included in the RFP.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Blanchard, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT MEETING: March 19, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill
Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

HANK VAN AGEN, Secretary