



4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306
(248) 651-9260
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, November 16, 2021 Regular Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steele at 7:00 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Brian Blust, Ken Elwert, Steve Sage, Donni Steele, Jeff Stout, David Walker

Voting Alternates Present: David Becker, Dave Mabry

Non-Voting Alternates Present: Theresa Mungiola, Martha Olijnyk

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: Jason Peltier

Voting Members Absent: Robin Buxar, Linda Gamage

Alternates Absent: Julia Dalrymple, Ann Peterson, Chris Shepard

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

Others Present: Melissa Ford, Trail Manager, Chris Gray, Assistant Trail Manager, Louis Carrio, President of the Friends Group, Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Chairperson Steele added Review of Compensation Letter discussion before the 2022 Draft Budget, and the Dillman & Upton License Agreement and Press Release after the Solaronics update.

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Sage, ***Moved***, to approve the November 16, 2021 agenda as amended.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. Minutes – October 19, 2021 Regular Meeting, approve and file
- b. Treasurers Report – October 2021
- c. Resolution #2021-003 – 2022 Meeting Schedule
- d. Redlined PCTC Bench Donation Policy
- e. Clean PCTS Bench Donation Policy

Mr. Becker indicated he had a grammatical change to the Bench Policy which will be relayed to Ms. Ford, but there is no need to remove it from the Consent Agenda.

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

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Becker, Blust, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Ford presented the list of invoices totaling \$1,830.23. In addition to the recorder's fee, this amount includes credit card charges for GoToMeeting fees for October and November and Sign Location Marking Supplies; Mounted Patrol for August and legal services for the letter drafted to the City of Rochester regarding Solaronics' potential sale and our position on this issue. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$86,000.

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Walker, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved as presented in the amount of \$1,830.23 and orders be drawn for payment.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Becker, Blust, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL: Temporary Permit, Tim Dering, Giffin USA – Fun Run/Walk, November 18,

2021: Mr. Dering came forward and explained he is the Program Manager at Giffin USA, a company in Auburn Hills that makes automotive paint systems. They have a community outreach called Giffin Gives Back and this year partnered with Walton Charter Academy, a K-8 Pontiac Charter School that has identified 12 families that could use help this Christmas. When he was approached about having a fun run for the fundraiser, he immediately thought of the Paint Creek Trail as he has used the trail for the last 30 years. He originally filled out the form indicating 30 participants, but ended up with 92 people. As the route will be from the Tienken Road crossing, north 1.5 miles and return, the owner of Avon North Hill Lanes has agreed to let the participants park there, and they will be shuttled back and forth from there. Ms. Ford indicated all paperwork has been received.

MOTION by Becker, seconded by Blust, *Moved*, to approve the temporary permit for Giffin USA's Fun/Walk event on November 18, 2021.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: Oakland County Sheriff's Mounted Patrol: Ms. Ford indicated Lt. Miles from the Sheriff's Department is present to answer any questions about patrol on the trail. At the present time, a new contract is not available as negotiations are on-going; hopefully it will be completed and discussed at the next meeting. Lt. Brent Miles came forward, introduced himself and explained he's been with the Department about ten years, most of his time has been spent in undercover narcotics and he was recently put over Parks, so this is new to him. This year, the mounted deputies put in 342 hours of patrol on the trail, all shifts were covered except for three due to inclement weather. The budget was \$8,262.64 and they came in just under because of the shifts that weren't filled. They provide two mounted deputies at a time, patrol six hour shifts on sporadic days at different times and provide police services on the trail. Upon a question where the staging area for horses is, Lt. Miles indicated it is at the sub-station now. Ms. Ford added the new Paint Creek Junction trailhead is opening next spring and will have spaces for horse trailer parking. Mr. Becker asked if there were any ways the interactions between the officers and the Commission could be improved. Lt. Miles indicated there are very few problems; the users like to see the horses on the trail. He went through the log sheets today and there are a lot of positive citizen contacts. If you wanted to add patrol bikes, this could be added; whatever the Commission wants, they will provide the service. Mr. Elwert asked if the log records contain the total number of interactions or any violations that occurred. Lt. Miles indicated he can get the data from the log sheets; there were very few criminal issues, mostly warnings. They would rather talk to someone causing issues as opposed to issuing tickets as it's a family environment. He was asked about e-bikes or scooter issues. Lt. Miles talked to a few of the mounted patrollers in preparation for tonight's meeting, and e-bikes driving too fast for the trail or cutting people off was one of the biggest problems. Mr. Mabry asked if it was cheaper to pay the mounted deputy versus a bike patroller. Lt. Miles responded yes, mounted deputies make a couple dollars less

than park deputies. Park deputies make \$25.06 and a mounted deputy is around \$22.46. He believes they've settled the part-time contract with a 1.5% raise for three years, the deputies have not yet settled their contract but are speculating a 4 or 5% increase. The mounted deputies on the trail are part-time. Regarding budgeting, Chairperson Steele said depending on where it lands, the Commission could reduce the number of hours to maintain the budgeted amount. Lt. Miles said this can be worked out. Chairperson Steele then said she's concerned about the vandalism with spray painting especially in the Orion section - the vault toilet and under the bridges, and asked the patrol to keep their eyes open for this issue. Lt. Miles would like to be updated on the areas where this is happening, so the deputies can specifically focus on that area. Mr. Carrio, President of the Friends Group, commented he also has observed issues with the e-bikes, and said if Lt. Miles makes notes of infractions, he might differentiate between the type of e-bikes, as his observation is the ones that have a throttle that you don't have to pedal can go at higher speeds and represent a different hazard risk. He also mentioned that users cross Tienken Road on the trail and people often run the red light. Lt. Miles mentioned the class 1 and 2 e-bikes can do up to 20 mph, while the class 3 can go 28 mph - class 3's are not allowed on the trail. Chairperson Steele said the Commission has the option to ban some e-bike types on the trail. Mr. Carrio said the State trails allow class 1 and 2 e-bikes. Ms. Ford indicated the Commission could also ban the class 2 e-bikes or e-bikes altogether. Ms. Steele asked if down the line this gets to be a problem, if it would be easier to eliminate them completely rather than the class 1 versus the class 2. This can be discussed in the future based on the deputies' findings. The Commission thanked Lt. Miles for his presentation. Lt. Miles said the Commission can call him at any time with any issues, and he will ask the mounted deputies to be more thorough in their notes regarding e-bikes and will pass the stats on to the Commission.

DISCUSSION: Review of Compensation: Chairperson Steele indicated everyone received a memo tonight outlining the recommendations made by the Personnel Committee relative to staff salary increases for 2022-23, which is necessary for completion of the draft budget. The Personnel Committee meeting, consisting of a member from each member community, was held via Zoom on November 11th. They talked about what each community is doing with their salaries and the raises they are giving, reviewed Ms. Ford's contract, who was hired in October 2018, and given a 2% raise from that time. In 2020, we gave a stipend of \$1,000 to Ms. Ford and a stipend of \$797 to Ms. Gray. She talked to Orion's attorney and asked about giving a stipend, and he said if this is done in advance versus doing it in the arrears and call it a longevity stipend, this is acceptable, but you don't want to do it and change the budget to pay after the fact. Based on this information, and the cost of living and inflation, she looked up the CPI which is 2.1%. The Committee made seven recommendations – to increase the Manager's 2022 salary by 2.5%, to increase the Assistant Manager's 2022 salary by 2.5%, to pay a \$1,000 longevity salary for the Manager on 1/1/2022, to pay a \$800 longevity salary for the Assistant Manager on 1/1/2022, to repeat these increases as a placeholder for the 2023 budget (although we are not voting on it tonight and will be discussed next year), to maintain comp and flextime providing the hours per week do not exceed full time status, and to complete a written Manager review with Commission input prior to the October 2022 anniversary. A question was asked what the definition of full time is under recommendation #6 – the answer is 29 hours. Ms. Mungioli thanked the Committee for this work as she had asked to double check on the stipend process, and is glad to see it's part of the budget so we don't have to approve it later and re-approve the budget as a result.

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Stout, **Moved**, to implement the letter from the Personnel Committee as submitted and to make the changes to the 2022 budget.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Becker, Blust, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: 2022 Draft Budget: Based on last month's discussion, Ms. Ford amended the budget as follows – increased the request from each member community for operations by 2%, increased the request for the patrol program to reflect the anticipated 5% increase in the deputies' rates, increased the amount budgeted for miscellaneous/contingency expenses, and revised the revenue from license fees to reflect the increases planned for 2022. The salary increases need to be changed, so what is reflected in the budget tonight is no longer correct. Chairperson Steele suggested the salary changes be reflected in a final budget and included in the packet next month. A question was asked if we should increase the enforcement budget for e-bikes. Ms. Ford indicated we don't have the staff to enforce this issue. Ms. Steele said this discussion can take place in the future after we see the Sheriff's data. Ms. Ford doesn't know how effective a mounted deputy is with e-bikes; maybe we should increase bike patrol. **MOTION** by Sage, seconded by Mabry, *Moved*, to accept the 2022 budget with the proposed salary changes and receive the final document at the next meeting.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Becker, Blust, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: Upcoming Grant Opportunities & Trail Capital Improvement Projects: A memo was included in the packet. Ms. Ford indicated grant opportunities were discussed at the last meeting. She spoke with the Director of the GreenWays Initiative at the Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan about the two projects the Commission was interested in submitting – the design engineering for the Dinosaur Hill bridge and the amenities at the southeast Rochester property. He thought both projects sounded like they fit the grant requirements and could be something they could support. However, we can only submit one application and would need to decide which project we would like to go forward with. He also said they were looking for projects that have an impact that is greater than the project itself, as well as something that has some type of match to it, as those are more attractive to the reviewers. This grant has a maximum of \$50,000. If the project is more than the \$50,000 they want to know where the additional funding is coming from to make up the difference. She then reached out to Rochester and spoke with City Manager Blaine Wing and two of the City's engineers from their firm to discuss these grants and the projects we are considering. The engineering firm has agreed to develop a proposal for the design engineering on the bridge that we can submit with the grants. She doesn't have a cost for how much this will cost; when Bridge 33.7 was done, that cost was around \$64,000 in 2017/18, so it will be much more now. We will be short if applying for the \$50,000 grant, so we need to determine where the balance will come from – fund balance or Rochester. She has not yet had a discussion about this with the City of Rochester. She wants direction to make sure the engineering is what we want to apply to the Community Foundation for before she has this discussion with Rochester. For the Oakland County Grant, they just released the guidelines and we have more time to apply for this one as it's due in January. The Community Foundation grant is due December 10th and she's started working on the generic portion of this grant. A third grant opportunity has come to her attention through Trout Unlimited. They reached out to Ms. Ford because they had seen we had a bridge project upcoming – the bridge was on the DNR list as an upcoming project. She responded we're talking about the Dinosaur Hill bridge, but it's in the early stages. The bridge they were talking about is the one north of Tienken. Ms. Ford explained they are replacing railings on that bridge but that's all right for now. She reached out to the DNR to find out what's going on. They maintain a list of priority projects, and this bridge is one of them – it has the same issues as the bridge at Dinosaur Hill where the pilings are in the stream and logjams are causing erosion affecting the fish habitat. Getting that bridge fixed is a priority for them. She mentioned we have another bridge with the same problems with additional structural issues that we are working to get replaced – what can we do to get this bridge on their list. She will talk more on Thursday with

them about this. They also want to talk about the bridge near Dutton. The reason they have their list is because they have a Fisheries Habitat grant that we can apply for and projects that are the priority list have a higher chance of getting funded. She's hoping to get the Dinosaur Hill bridge put on this list and we can apply for this grant for funding when we get to the construction phase. It also has a conditional commitment that you can do, so you can get the funds and use it to match other grants that need matches to get funding. We could also apply for that and have it conditional until we get all the funding in place. Mr. Elwert has a contact that has worked on these types of grants and will pass this information to Ms. Ford. He added that it would behoove the Commission to get as many bridges engineered as possible with the future grants available specifically for bridges. Ms. Ford commented there are 12 bridges on the trail, and only one has been redone. Ms. Steele commented that we need to get ball rolling now. Mr. Becker said the Dinosaur Hill bridge is one that is a serious problem and Rochester has been looking at for many years; we need to focus on it and get it done as quickly as possible. He then commented we can only submit only one application to the GreenWays Initiative – is that per year or forever? Ms. Ford said only for this year. They also have a trail maintenance fund, and in her conversation with them, they said very often people get the access and design fund grant and then apply the following year and get funded for the construction costs through the maintenance fund grant. Chairperson Steele asked if Ms. Ford talked to Rochester about the southeast Rochester project. Ms. Ford said this was brought up briefly because their engineers wanted to know if there was something they needed to do – Ms. Ford said no as the plans have already done. That's when they mentioned the City has some concerns about this project because of the slope and the design, so there are some unresolved issues with this project and the City; she needs to talk to them if we want to move forward with this project. Mr. Sage (can't hear) – that's a decision of this Board, and if needed he would approach his Council as well. If they can get the \$50,000 grant what would the match be? Ms. Ford does not know this yet – the cost proposal is supposed to be forwarded to her by December 1st. Mr. Sage agreed we should get the engineering done. Ms. Ford explained the \$50,000 would be used to pay Rochester's engineering firm to do the design engineering for the bridge. Mr. Stout asked if the bridge is comparable to Bridge 33.7. Ms. Ford explained the bridge has similar issues with the piers on the stream causing the logjams and structural issues. Mr. Stout said engineering costs is 10-15% of what the construction costs will be, so that's the number you're shooting for. Engineering costs for all bridges will be very expensive. Maybe we should start vetting different companies. Mr. Elwert asked if we have a priority list of which bridges are in worse shape than others, as Rochester Hills has done this. Ms. Ford said it's piece-meal, as everyone does their own inspections and she does not have the technical knowledge to evaluate the remaining 11 bridges as to ranking. We can apply for the Community Foundation grant, Rochester would have to apply for the Oakland County grant. Ms. Olijnyk asked if the Commission could apply for one bridge and Rochester to apply for another bridge. Ms. Ford would have to ask, but we would be competing against ourselves. If we don't get one this year, we could apply next year. Her thought was to apply for both grants for 31.7 bridge, so if we got the Oakland County grant, we could use that towards the remaining amount we would owe because it will be over the \$50,000, and that grant is up to \$25,000. Can the Oakland County grant money be used towards the other grant match? Ms. Ford has not asked this question of Oakland County; they have a meeting in early December where she could ask and the application is due in January. The Community Foundation design engineering is exactly what this grant is for; this application is due 12/10, but we need to specify where the extra money is coming from. She doesn't know if the Commission wants to say they will put up a certain amount, and then she will talk to Rochester to see if they will put up an amount – we don't know the total at this point. Regarding the Community Foundation grant, Ms. Olijnyk asked if we complete the engineering, when does the actual project have to be done? Ms. Ford does not know, but will ask. Ms. Steele asked if the Commission has the tolerance of using our fund

balance to be able to pay for the engineering of the bridge if Rochester doesn't. Mr. Sage feels this is a reasonable request of Rochester.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Becker, *Moved*, to approve applying for the Foundation of Southeast Michigan maximum grant of \$50,000 for engineering, with the remaining funding source to be determined.

Discussion: A question was asked about the third grant opportunity brought up. Ms. Ford explained that grant is due 12/10, but you had to have a pre-proposal in earlier this month, so we have missed that one for this year; this is something we can look at for next year – she just wanted to bring this grant to the Commission's attention. It's just the two grant opportunities at this time. Can the Oakland County grant be applied to the engineering costs? Ms. Ford will attend the webinar in early December regarding this grant and will bring back information next month as we have time before the application date January 10th. Mr. Walker asked if the Motion gives staff enough to apply for the grant. Ms. Ford indicated if Rochester says no to funding the remaining balance, then she needs a commitment from the Commission that the fund balance can be used as the match as she needs to indicate where the additional funds will come from on the application. Mr. Walker said the motion did not contain this information. Mr. Sage retracted his Motion and said he'd work with the City – they have a meeting on 11/23. Mr. Elwert suggested the Motion say a request of Rochester will be made for the match. Ms. Ford said if we don't have the commitment from Rochester, she just won't apply for the grant. Mr. Elwert said we could pass the Motion pending approval of Rochester's support at their 11/23 meeting. Mr. Sage recommended Ms. Ford attend their meeting and he will get this item added to the agenda. A comment was made that without Rochester's buy-in, this issue is dead. Mr. Sage reiterated this is something the City has considered for many years, and feels it is a reasonable request.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Becker, *Moved*, to apply for the Community Foundation's grant with the remaining funds to be determined.

Discussion: Ms. Ford wants clarification of her next steps – she will start working on the grant application, talk with Mr. Sage and Mr. Wing before the meeting on 11/23, attend the meeting on the 23rd and request up to \$50,000 from Rochester for the match, and if they say yes she will apply, and if they say no she will not apply.

Roll Call on the Motion:

Ayes: Becker, Blust, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Regarding the Oakland County \$25,000 maximum grant which is due in January, Ms. Ford stated this one requires a minimum 25% match and Rochester would have to be the applicant. In a meeting with Mr. Wing and the engineers, it sounded like she would do the legwork and the City would apply for the grant – but we need to determine if the City will provide the match, which will be a bigger match. She needs to tell Oakland County where the match is coming from.

MOTION by Walker, seconded by Sage, *Moved*, to prepare the paperwork to apply for the Oakland County grant in order to prepare Rochester to apply.

Roll Call on the Motion:

Ayes: Becker, Blust, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Stout, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Regarding the Fisheries Habitat grant, Ms. Ford has a meeting this week with the DNR's biologist to talk in general about the bridges and will ask if this bridge can be put on their list;

she's not sure if it's a 2021 or 2022 list. It sounds like it's based on staff observations from the field and that's how that bridge ended up on the list, so hopefully by bringing the Dinosaur Hill bridge to their attention, that can be added as well. They look at bridges in regards to the fish habitat, not structurally. Mr. Becker asked if the members could receive a copy of the bridge inspection reports done by the member communities so we can look ahead as to what needs to be done in the future. Ms. Ford will forward this information to the Commission and maybe one of the members could evaluate the information to start the process.

UPDATE: Solaronics: Ms. Ford indicated a memo was included in the packet explaining the Solaronics property was on Rochester's Planning Commission's agenda for discussion of future redevelopment – documents from that meeting were also attached to the packet. Based on this development, Chairperson Steele requested staff contact our attorney and have her draft a letter to the Planning Commission reiterating the Commission's stance on returning the trail back to its natural state and reclaiming our property (also included in the packet). Ms. Ford did not hear how this meeting went. Mr. Sage explained the Planning Commission does not usually have an open discussion with an applicant without a site plan. They granted that opportunity to the applicant based on knowledge some of the Commissioner's had with him previously. The plan at this time is conceptual, divided up into different buildings – it gives some visual idea of what is to be done with each building, but the plan is to develop one part of the property and then to allow it to fund the next development of the property. The overwhelming agreement by the Planning Commission was that unless we have whole plan, it makes no sense. So, they're waiting to see if the applicant returns with a site plan for the whole property, otherwise Mr. Sage doesn't see it going any further than the initial discussion. He feels the applicant left understanding this, and knows if he purchases the property it will revert the land back to the Commission. This is where it sits right now; we'll see if he returns. Mr. Sage feels the letter sent by the attorney was very appropriate. Mr. Sage was thanked for his input.

DISCUSSION: Dillman & Upton License Agreement: Ms. Ford indicated the press release and license agreement was sent to the members via email yesterday. The press release indicated that Dillman & Upton has been acquired by Mans Lumber and Millwork. She's not sure what the business structure is – is it a partnership, will they own it, or if the name is changing; it's not clear in the press release. She forwarded it to our attorney for her to take a look at in terms of our license agreement, but did not receive a response in time for the meeting. Mr. Sage commented it mentions a partnership, but then goes on to explain the acquisition of Dillman & Upton, so there is confusion there as he reads through the agreement in terms of how we can expire or terminate the license. To him, if there's a change in financial entity, it would trigger our ability to take action. He doesn't know what the partnership is or whether it's finalized or not. He's being told that the Upton brothers will exit in two years after the partnership, but there is no confirmation of that. He doesn't know enough on the legal side of how this came to be, so maybe we wait for a legal opinion. Mr. Elwert's reading is that it's an acquisition and a change of operation. Mr. Sage said it's kind of vague, so abandonment for non-use terminates the party after notice calling them in default – it doesn't mentioned anything about a change in ownership. Mr. Elwert pointed out on page 8, clause 5 says the licensee shall not permit any mortgage, pledge, security interest, lien or encumbrances with respect to work performed or equipment – it doesn't only apply to the actual construction, but to the operation of any facility. Mr. Walker referred to Exhibit B, 16(a) where it talks about the licensee leasing the adjacent property from Upton Leasing Partnership - if the lease of said property is terminated, assigned or transferred, the licensee shall notify the Commission within 10 days – the name change would provoke the termination. He asked what our intent is – even if Mans buys Dillman & Upton, changes the name and takes over, what is our intention with the property – do we leave it with them or take it back? Ms. Ford said she's not been in a discussion with Dillman & Upton about taking back our property, it was just about them

maintaining it to the standard the Commission requires. If we take it back, it will severely curtail the ability of the new company to do their business. Ms. Olijnyk asked if they satisfied the Commission with our fence issue. Ms. Ford indicated yes, they put up the supports to keep the fence up. Mr. Sage asked if we restore the land and restore it to natural habitat, are we going to use it? As it's being used now, we're getting paid for it – if we get it back, will it enhance our experience on the trail? Ms. Steele said right now, the fence, trees, grass and berm are all better, maybe we do better by getting the license fee. Mr. Becker asked if there was any liability to us by just continuing the lease? He doesn't see any problem with continuing with the same arrangement. Ms. Steele commented this may be a good time to have a conversation about the new license agreement and fees going forward. She suggested staff have a talk with Dillman & Upton about the press release and what's happening, and then bringing the new license/fees up with the new owner, once the details are finalized with the acquisition. Ms. Ford was also asked to touch base with the attorney about if there's an acquisition, merger or switch in ownership, if that terminates the license agreement. Mr. Becker suggested this may be a time to review the license stipulations to see if they can be structured to give us better assurances to keep the place neat, clean and attractive to trail users.

MANAGER'S REPORT: In addition to the written report, Ms. Ford indicated a sheet of photos was given to the members tonight showing two of the wayfinding signs, the timber approach rails at Bridge 32.3 (almost complete), and the fence at Foley Pond. Most of the wayfinding signs are up. License fees are coming in. She received the mold and the shields for the recognition spikes yesterday. She reminded everyone the Friends meeting is December 9th, so please register if you plan to attend. The Nicholson family has committed to replacing their bench on the trail. Progress continues at Paint Creek Junction, the restroom should be installed by early December. The materials for the road crossing signs have been ordered and should be installed before the ground freezes.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Mr. Walker said he was notified that the restroom at Kern Road needs cleaning. Ms. Ford indicated it should be closed for the season, but Orion has increased the cleaning by Turner Sanitation to twice a week. Thanks to all the Commissioners, Friends Group and staff for all their hard work. Happy Thanksgiving to all.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Walker, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 8:47 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: December 21, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

DAVID BECKER, Secretary