



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, October 19, 2021 Regular Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steele at 7:00 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Robin Buxar, Ken Elwert, Steve Sage, Donni Steele, David Walker
Voting Alternates Present: Julia Dalrymple, Dave Mabry
Non-Voting Alternates Present: Theresa Mungiola, Chris Shepard
Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Present: Jason Peltier
Voting Members Absent: Brian Blust, Linda Gamage, Jeff Stout
Alternates Absent: David Becker, Martha Olijnyk, Ann Peterson
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:

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

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. Minutes – September 21, 2021 Regular Meeting, approve and file
- b. Treasurers Report – September 2021

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Buxar, ***Moved***, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL: Resolution Approving and Authorizing an Amendment to a Development

Project Agreement: Ms. Ford explained the MNRTF grant from the DNR needs to be extended to January 31, 2022 because we have not yet received the final invoice for the project. MDOT has sent it to the Road Commission; it should be returned within 90 days. The DNR just needs the paperwork extending the grant agreement so we can continue with the reserved funds for us.

PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
RESOLUTION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING
AN AMENDMENT TO A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AGREEMENT
RESOLUTION NO. 2021-002

At a meeting of the Paint Creek Trailways Commission, Oakland County, Michigan, held at the Paint Creek Cider Mill, on the 19th day of October, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Buxar, Dalrymple, Elwert, Mabry, Mungoli, Peltier, Sage, Shepard, Steele, Walker
The following resolution was offered by Elwert and seconded by Walker.

WHEREAS, the Commission has undertaken a project entitled the Paint Creek Trail Bridge 33.7 Renovation, #TF16-0008 (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, on August 15, 2017, the Commission adopted a Resolution Regarding the Development of Property through the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund, pursuant to which the Commission approved entering into a Development Project Agreement (the "Agreement") with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (the "Department") to obtain a grant for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Department and the Commission entered into the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Commission began work on the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement called for completion of the Project by July 31, 2019, but the Project completion has been delayed; and

WHEREAS, the Department and the Commission are willing to amend the Agreement to extend the Project completion deadline to January 31, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the public, health, safety and welfare will be served by extending the Project completion deadline.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Commission approves and authorizes an amendment to the Agreement in the form attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.
2. The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to execute the Amendment on behalf of the Commission, to make such minor changes to the Amendment as required or requested by the Department and to take such other actions, as may be necessary or appropriate regarding the Amendment.
3. All actions heretofore taken by Commission officials, employees, and agents with respect to the Agreement are hereby ratified and confirmed.
4. Any and all resolutions that are in conflict with this Resolution are hereby repealed to the extent necessary to give this Resolution full force and effect.

YEAS: Buxar, Dalrymple, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Walker

NAYS: None

THE RESOLUTION WAS DECLARED ADOPTED.

DISCUSSION: Limited Access Permit Request, 3942 S. Ellamae, Oakland Township:

Chairperson Steele indicated the application, pictures of the fence and the Commission's survey are included in the packet. Ms. Ford indicated she gave the members tonight photos of the current fence as the pictures in the packet were from the actual listing showing the previous fence. Mr. John Regole, the property owner came forward and stated he moved into the home last December; there was a fence and gate already there. He wanted to replace it as he has two dogs he wanted to fence in. Once he got his boundary survey back he realized he had encroached on our property but figured since there was a fence and gate already there, it may not be an issue. Ms. Ford indicated the bike patroller noticed the fence and brought it to staff's attention and notified the applicant he needed to fill out the permit application. Ms. Buxar noted it appears the fence was moved inward toward the applicant's property. Mr. Regole said he did move it back a bit towards his house so it was on flat ground as the original fence was leaning towards the trail. Ms. Buxar said the fence on the north side is a 12 encroachment and on the south end it's about 15 feet. Mr. Regole said he didn't want to cut down any trees. Ms. Ford added the trail's boundaries vary in this area. Speaking for the Encroachment Committee, Mr. Walker asked Ms.

Ford to give a short history of the 2008 survey. Ms. Ford indicated there was a wire fence there at the time of the survey. The Commission asked the homeowner at that time to remove the fence and they complied; sometime between then and now another person purchased the home and put in a new a fence – this is the fence that Mr. Regole had on his property when he moved in. The original fence went across several different parcels at that time and all the property owners had to remove it. At some point the previous owner of Mr. Regole’s home put in another fence and no action was taken at that time. Ms. Buxar indicated there are other fences in this area. Mr. Walker said we’re not talking about an elaborate fence, it’s a wire fence. Mr. Regole explained it’s an agricultural fence; essentially the same fence that was previously there. Mr. Walker said the applicant now has a survey of his property, and if requested to put the fence on his property, could this be done. Mr. Regole said he could comply with this request, but would need time until next spring to complete it as he’s working two jobs. Mr. Walker shared the trail is a linear park for the public and it’s not in the Commission’s best interest to have individual access points on the trail. Mr. Regole agreed, said he moved from Chicago and because of the trail, he bought his house. Mr. Walker noted there are steps on this property to the trail, and the applicant indicated you can hardly see the steps anymore as it’s so overgrown. Mr. Walker said we need to keep the trail as natural possible, and the steps would not be allowed as we don’t want to disturb the vegetation. The Licensing Committee agrees it’s not in our best interest to continue to allow these encroachments, and it does not seem to be too much of a burden to ask the applicant to move the fence onto his property line. Mr. Walker agreed to grant some time to complete this. **MOTION** by Walker, seconded by Sage, *Moved*, to require the applicant by May 1, 2022, to move the fence onto his property and to have any man-made or man added materials removed.

Discussion on the Motion: Ms. Buxar agreed with moving the stepping stones and the mulch and commented it doesn’t seem like moving the fence would be burdensome if we allowed enough time. Mr. Regole said if that’s what the Commission wants, he can definitely do that. Ms. Buxar’s only concern is the other homeowners who are encroaching. It was suggested these other properties be looked at and the policy re-reviewed.

Roll Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: Elwert, Sage, Steele, Walker

Nays: Buxar, Dalrymple, Mabry

MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Ford asked if the Motion did not pass, would we have issues with the DNR with the conversion process because our property would not be being used for recreational purposes. The answer was yes especially in the case of a fence. Ms. Steele said we need to keep that in mind with other applications as this makes it hard to follow for future management and the Commission moving forward. It was suggested a list of all limited use permits be available for future generations.

UPDATE/DISCUSSION: Friends of the Paint Creek Trail – Paint Creek Crawl 2022: Mr. Louis Carrio, President of the Friends of the Paint Creek Trail came forward and indicated seven individuals met regarding this event, and he provided an outline of what transpired. The objective tonight is to get some consensus around the concept, the date, the merger of this event with the Trails Day with a bike and running event, and to answer any questions. Mr. Sage said we initially agreed on the date and the format but we also discussed about whether we could do something at both ends of the trail. He understands it’s probably easier to do it at one end of the trail, but asked if there was a way to do something at both ends in some form. Mr. Carrio said they talked about engaging businesses at the other end of the trail, specifically about approaching Rochester Mills. Ms. Gamage attended the meeting and made this point as well; that we need to engage the City of Rochester so that both ends are benefiting from the event, and people

participating in the event get to see what the entire trail has to offer. This will be one of the steps along the way. The other point made is that we should consider how we might alternate from year to year between the starting point, although it was noted that the Trails Day event has been historically held in Lake Orion. Mr. Peltier commented Trails Day already exists in Orion, so we are expanding on that; separating from the existing event or dividing it in two, you lose a lot of participants. The goal of the event is to raise awareness, educate and raise funds that will help purchase what's needed, so you need everyone in one place at one time to get this attention. Someone brought up the passport – having everyone go to the businesses. If you have 400 participants, you don't want all these people going there to the businesses as you're thinning the crowd and losing that attention. What was suggested was creating a passport that could be handed out to everyone at registration encouraging them to visit businesses all along the trail and then turn them in at points at the end of the month or when finished to get prize, so it's like a coupon book to visit the Rochester and Oakland Township businesses. They thought the coupons would be a compelling tie to bring people into businesses along the trail. Doing an event in Rochester is a great idea, perhaps this could be done in the fall. Ms. Steele added this is a Friends event, and that the Commission could be a participant and maybe help with the education piece of the Friends' objectives. Mr. Carrio thought there could more than one event booth, focused on education, etiquette, etc. He would like to keep the current subcommittee together and add one of the Commission staff for representation, so as we develop the next steps we have both sides engaged. Ms. Steele thought the event planning portion was going to be completed by the subcommittee. Mr. Carrio feels that's a decision to be made, but if you're tying the two pieces together it would make sense to have both sides engaged. Ms. Steele asked how staff feels about this with so much else going on. Ms. Ford's thought is to have a Trails Day event at this event that we would be putting on similar to the past, but fitting into the Friends goals, and the majority of the planning, sponsorships, etc., would be done by the Friends Group. This is also Mr. Carrio's understanding. Ms. Steele reached out to the Parks & Path Chair who conducts an education rodeo for kids on how to safely ride a bike, and he offered to take this piece on; she will pass on the contact information. Ms. Buxar thinks the event will be fun and agreed that alternating the event on different ends of the trail is a good idea. She thinks as long as Commission staff is in the loop with emails that is sufficient. Mr. Carrio said the next step is for the subcommittee to meet again, and define what the expo might look like and how to engage different businesses, come up with a to-do list and volunteers. Ms. Steele asked if we formally adopted this event to happen on Trails Day; Ms. Ford said the motion was to save the date. **MOTION** by Buxar, seconded by Steele, **Moved**, to formally adopt June 4th as our National Trails Day event in Orion, with the Friends being the lead on their event, with participation of staff and the Commission as needed.

Discussion on the Motion:

It was suggested the Motion include the name of the Friends event; Ms. Buxar amended her Motion to include the name of the Friends Group event, the Paint Creek Crawl. It was suggested that the name of this event be changed as this signifies a pub/beer crawl when this is a family oriented event. In the future we will have to have a Motion to adopt the Friends event, whatever it's so named, on this date. Mr. Carrio said the subcommittee will discuss this and come back with a name. Ms. Buxar rescinded her amendment to name the Friends event. Ms. Steele supported this.

Roll Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: Buxar, Dalrymple, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Paint Creek Trail Signage Project – Road Crossing Signage &

Installation: Ms. Ford said a copy of the quote for the road crossing signage including installation was handed out tonight – it's the same amount we looked at last meeting. The designs have been approved by the Road Commission and she spoke with the DNR who had input because it included the Iron Belle Trail Trail logo – they approved it this morning. Once we approve payment for the deposit, the project can proceed.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Buxar, *Moved*, to approve the invoice as presented with the funds coming out of the fund balance.

Roll Vote on the Motion:

Ayes: Buxar, Dalrymple, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES: Ms. Ford presented the list of invoices totaling \$36,181.62. In addition to the recorder's fee, this amount includes credit card charges for Facebook advertisement for the LDBW, frame for Recognition Ceremony, safety cones, the fixit station at Paint Creek Junction, supplies for the ribbon cutting ceremony and a new adaptor for the projector; annual fee to Accident Fund Insurance for Workers Compensation premium, trail brochure printing, Mounted Patrol for July, 3rd Qtr. wages and FICA for three staff positions, 3rd Qtr. staff shared copier costs and deposit to Rochester Sign Shop for the road crossing signs installation. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$86,000.

MOTION by Buxar, seconded by Elwert, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved as presented in the amount of \$36,181.62 and orders be drawn for payment.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Buxar, Dalrymple, Elwert, Mabry, Sage, Steele, Walker

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION: 2022 Draft Budget: Ms. Ford would like discussion tonight and any changes can be made and be brought back next month for approval. There are no changes proposed to the operations budget or the patrol program from the communities. Mr. Elwert asked when the last time rates were raised for the communities. Ms. Ford said 2019, but the patrol program has been raised. Mr. Elwert questioned if we should have a percentage increase to the members as we don't have much in contingency. If we're proposing a 2% raise in wages, maybe there needs to be a regular increase to the communities so we don't get behind. Mr. Walker said there's nothing under revenue from the LDBW donations. Mr. Ford explained this is what she normally does because there is no guarantee for these funds, and this year the donations will go into a restricted fund. Mr. Walker said under license fees, \$12,267 is projected for 2022 which is a flat line from 2020, and if we get to collect what we really are going to collect in our new license fees, it will be more – it should be \$14,000. He then asked if we are taking over the Pollinator Garden, and if so, shouldn't we budget for it. Ms. Ford said the special project budget was for the building of the garden, and because we do a three year budget, that's why it's still listed. Under the 2022 restricted funds, the maintenance of the garden is listed there for \$974. Mr. Carrio indicated the help of the volunteers will help determine what is needed in future years. Mr. Walker said the courts can allocate the criminal element to doing volunteer work for a 501c3's – as part of community service they can assign people to the Friends to help with the garden. Ms. Steele said the WWAM group is a great source of assistance. Mr. Carrio said people coming into the garden to work need to know how to do gardening work, but will keep this suggestion in mind. Ms. Mungioli asked if an increase was budgeted for expenses. Ms. Ford said salaries are increased, but expenses are based on what was spent last year and what the anticipated needs are going to be next year, so a percentage is not built in for inflation. Ms. Mungioli said with how prices are going up, she's concerned if don't have enough built in to the increase, things might cost a lot more and the contingency might be absorbed quickly by some of the other purchases you need for

operations; she suggested checking with vendors. Ms. Ford indicated the telephones and computers are through Oakland Township. Ms. Buxar said this is built into the Township's budget. Ms. Steele thought the increase from the license fees could go toward the contingency fee. Ms. Buxar noted the line item for bonuses has been zeroed out after 2020, and then if bonuses are granted in December, we'll have to redo the budget and re-approve it with the bonuses. She indicated bonuses are illegal. Ms. Ford said this is not typical, last year was the first time bonuses were given. Ms. Buxar suggested adding bonuses into the budget; it could always be adjusted. If not used, it could be added to the fund balance. Ms. Steele will find out if bonuses are illegal as stated by Ms. Buxar and we can adjust the budget. For right now, leave this out. Ms. Ford summarized the only change right now is to add additional money into the contingency line item from the license fee increase. Mr. Elwert asked if we should consistently budget a 1% or 2% increase to the communities each year so that can be expected. Ms. Ford will forward to the Commission historical information on when increases occurred. Ms. Steele agreed we should put in a 2% increase automatically each year. Ms. Ford will adjust the budget. She said we have not gotten the contract for the patrol program, but is anticipating a 2-3% increase for mounted patrol; hopefully this will be on next month's agenda. She asked if there should be a change in the cost of the patrol program to the communities as no increase is included in the draft budget for them, but a 3% increase is included in the line item expense. Ms. Steele suggested adding 2% to each community for the patrol program. Ms. Ford said it's \$10,000 for mounted patrol but it's \$15,706 if you include the bike patroller's salary, FICA and equipment, so it's \$1,000 less from what we're asking from the communities, with the Commission paying the difference. Ms. Steele suggested the communities' expense be increased to cover this. Ms. Ford commented the last time the patrol contract was presented, a representative from the Sheriff's office was present to answer questions, and asked if we should invite someone here next month. The consensus is to have a representative present. Ms. Ford then asked if anyone had thoughts about her adding in the document scanning as a project for next year. The consensus was to leave it in. The draft budget will be brought back next month for approval.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: PCTC Bench Donation Policy: A memo was included in the packet. Ms. Ford indicated it came to her attention last week a bench on the trail was in really bad shape, so Oakland Township Parks went out and they recommended it be replaced. She doesn't know what to do as the benches are purchased by donations and the Commission does not budget for replacement. She reviewed the current bench donation policy and made a few changes based on what we are doing with bench donations in the office as well as coming up with a policy when these situations happen. She suggests we contact the donor to see if they would like to make another gift to replace it, and if we can't reach them, we'll ask them to give us a secondary contact, and if both parties say no, then we would let someone on the donation list (20 people waiting) to take over the spot and purchase the bench. This was based on the City of Rochester's policy, so they maintain it for 10 years and then give people the option to continue if it needs to be replaced, and if not, another donor takes over. She also suggests changing it from payment due on delivery to a 50% deposit in case someone changes their mind. Mr. Elwert suggested we require 100% deposit as Rochester Hills does. He was also surprised to see different costs associated with the bench, as Rochester Hills charges a flat fee. Just charging \$1,500 for a bench for 10 years is an idea – Rochester Hills has been charging \$1,000 for the last few years, and are raising the cost to \$1,500 next year; they are also looking doubling the fee to have the bench in perpetuity. This also makes it easier for staff. Ms. Steele asked if we are still offering \$100 to the municipalities to do the installation. Ms. Ford said \$100 to each municipality is still included for installation and added a \$100 administration fee, because the Commission gets nothing right now. Right now, the donors write a check for the cost of the bench, the plaque, the freight and \$100 for installation. Mr. Elwert asked what the cost is. Ms. Gray said about \$900. Mr. Elwert said a flat fee of \$1,500 would include all these charges and staff would not have to track them.

Ms. Buxar asked who the subject bench is for; Ms. Ford indicated the Nicholsons. Ms. Gray asked if anyone knows if any of the family is still in the area, as she has not been able to locate anyone. Ms. Buxar do her best to get will contact information. She likes the idea, but doesn't think a memorial should be a profit making venture; maybe if we add an administration fee. She likes the perpetuity idea because it's a memorial and who is supposed to keep the benches maintained. If the extra money is being charged for maintenance, that's one thing. Ms. Ford said the policy says the bench should be maintained in cooperation with the local municipality for a minimum 10 years in or near their original location. Ms. Buxar asked if the donors know this. Ms. Ford doesn't know if the policy has been handed out to the donors, but it is on the website. She will implement handing out the policy to all donors. Ms. Dalrymple asked if the benches are recycled plastic and Ms. Ford responded yes. Ms. Dalrymple said in theory there shouldn't be any maintenance; clearly the bench in question is an old one made from wood. Ms. Steele said the one suggestion was to raise the fee to \$1,500. Ms. Ford added the plaque can be given back to the family should they not want to purchase a replacement bench. It was suggested this also be added to the policy. Mr. Sage agrees with having one fee referred to assembly, installation and administration for \$200. Mr. Elwert again commented he likes the idea of one flat fee to include everything. Ms. Ford indicated the cost of a bench now is \$900 which includes the \$100 for installation to the municipality, and she's proposing another \$100 for staff administrative time, which is \$1,000 total. Mr. Elwert said we could amend his suggestion down to a \$1,250 flat fee per bench with payment due at time of order. He said the policy states arm rests are optional, but they are required by ADA rules. This statement will be eliminated from the policy. Ms. Ford will also make sure the list of donated benches/families is put on the website. The policy, effective January 1st, will be revised per suggestions and a clean version as well as a red-lined version will be brought back to the Commission for approval next month under the Consent Agenda. Ms. Buxar commented we are sitting in a whole building donated by the Nicholson's. If the family can't be located, the plaque could be displayed in the building.

DISCUSSION: Upcoming Grant Opportunities & Trail Capital Improvement Projects:

Ms. Ford explained there are two upcoming grant opportunities, the first one is the Ralph C. Wilson Legacy Funds which is a design and access fund administered by the Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan – these funds can be considered for pre-planning development and/or construction costs of projects related to increasing the walk-ability and bike-ability of local communities and/or increasing outdoor recreational activities within the region. These grants are going to range between \$10,000 and \$50,000, the application deadline is December 10th. The awardees will be notified in late April, and the grant time period is May 1, 2022 through April 30, 2023. The other one is the Oakland County Community Grant Program for Trails and Parks Improvement; these guidelines have not been put out yet, but she looked at the Oakland County Parks Commission meeting packet, so the proposed guidelines may change depending on what those Commissioners decide, but it gives a base on what they are looking for. The funds can be used for trail planning design or engineering, so pre-development or development and construction. The priority for that program is closing gaps or making connections to planned trail networks and systems within Oakland County. Projects should fill gaps, connect key locations or existing pathways, or otherwise be part of a larger trail planning effort. No stand-alone projects will be considered unless they are part of a larger coordinated effort. For fiscal year 2022, there's 1.2 million dedicated for these programs, \$750,000 of this is allotted for the Trailways Grant program. For pre-development grants, they are proposing \$5,000 minimum with \$20,000 maximum; for development grants is \$5,000 minimum, \$200,000 maximum. This grant does require a 25% match for these grants. The first round of funding applications is due in mid-January. It does require that grant applications must be submitted by a village, city or township – there was nothing in there about a trailways commission, so she's not sure how this plays out. The projects also must be approved in an adopted plan including the

five-year Parks & Recreation Plan that we complete, and they will be announcing those in April 2022. Also included in the packet is our capital improvement schedule for the current Master Plan, and we've completed quite a bit of it. There are only three projects that are not completed or in progress, the development of the Southeast Rochester property, a Phase Three Art Project in Orion Township and replacing Bridge 31.7 in Rochester at Dinosaur Hill. She asked for Commission thoughts on whether we should apply for either of these grants and what projects we should apply for. For the county grant, projects should start no later than the date the grant agreement is executed anticipated in May the following year for costs to be eligible for reimbursement; completion of development projects should last no longer than one year, development projects should last no longer than three years. Ms. Steele said in previous discussions, Rochester had said they didn't want to maintain the park across from Bloomer Park and we took it off the table when we had funds, but now we have the opportunity and asked what Rochester thinks. Mr. Sage said he thinks they could fund this and will approach his Council. Ms. Steele commented the engineering for this project has been done. Ms. Ford indicated the engineering and plans were done for this project as part of the resurfacing project in 2019, but it was taken out because we didn't think we had enough funds for the resurfacing, which was wrong as we had \$100,000 extra done when done. These plans were done, which included an observation deck overlooking the river, resurfacing the existing trail and also putting in an access path down to the river with a kayak landing site. The City had said they had spoken to the Clinton River Watershed Council and they thought it was a dangerous location to launch kayaks from. Mr. Carrio commented there were also plans at one time to do a development that overlooked the river as part of the Moutrie memorial, and this plan was designed. Ms. Ford indicated this would not be eligible for the County grant because it has to be in the Master Plan. For the Wilson Funds, she doesn't remember how much the cost of the project was, but they only do up to \$50,000. Ms. Steele asked about the bridge – Ms. Ford said we don't have any engineering studies done on the bridge, the last inspection was done several years ago, and thought Rochester was going to do one next year, but there are a lot of trees stuck there again, this is a continuing problem and part of it is the design of the bridge because the footings are in the river. Ms. Steele asked if we're at the point where we get a grant to do the engineering study for the bridge. Ms. Ford said in order to apply for an MNRTF grant we have to have this in place. The Oakland County grant includes trail planning, design, and engineering pre-development. A question was asked if we get the engineering done are we obligated to complete the project. Ms. Ford will ask the grant coordinator. The grant requires that the municipality has to be the one applying, so she's not sure if Rochester would have to apply on behalf of the Commission or complete the application themselves. Ms. Steele asked if there was a grant we could apply for, for the project at Bloomer. Ms. Ford said the quotes were approximately \$80,000 for this project, and doesn't know if we took out the path to the water how much that would save. She's assuming it would be higher now as the quotes are from two years ago. Ms. Steele asked what is needed to move forward with the bridge engineering and the Bloomer project. Ms. Ford needs a commitment from Rochester that they are willing to apply for the County grant, if the grant guidelines come out and say only municipalities can apply. If we want to apply for the Wilson funding, what project should we apply for. Ms. Steele suggested we apply for both the bridge engineering study and the Bloomer project. Mr. Elwert asked what the maximum grant is for pre-development projects; Ms. Ford responded \$25,000 and you have to put up 25%. Mr. Sage indicated \$25,000 probably won't be enough. Ms. Ford said we could apply for both grants for the same project. Mr. Elwert suggested asking if the Wilson funding would cover the bridge engineering. Ms. Ford will find out if this project would fit the parameters of the guidelines; the deadline is December 10th. Ms. Steele asked if staff has enough direction to ask questions and get with Rochester to see what we do, and bring back recommendations based on the findings at the next meeting. Ms. Ford said yes, and may start on the application in the meantime. She indicated the guidelines for the County grant are coming out soon so there will be more guidance

on this. It is the consensus to apply for bridge engineering to both grants at this time. Ms. Mungioli said last year we listed the priorities for this year, and asked if this will be done again in January because some of the grants say it has to be part of the Master Plan. Do we need to add any new priorities to the Master Plan? That way, they would be in the Master Plan, so when a grant comes along it's already in the Plan. She suggested amending the Master Plan to include other projects that should be added even if it's five or 10 years out. Amending the Plan involves public input that a consultant would assist with. The DNR requires a five year plan, and is updated at the end of this period. Ms. Ford indicated our Plan is good through 2024, and we'd have to go through the whole process to amend it. Ms. Ford will get the questions raised tonight answered, get back with Mr. Sage relative to the bridge and bring recommendations to the next meeting. If the engineering project doesn't meet the guidelines, we could find out if the Bloomer project would.

REPORT: Bald Mountain Recreation Area – Proposed Paint Creek Bridge Plans: A plan for the Bald Mountain Recreation proposed Paint Creek Bridge was included in the packet.

MOTION by Walker, seconded by Buxar, *Moved*, to receive and file the report.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MANAGER'S REPORT: Summarizing the written report, Ms. Ford indicated there has been graffiti in Rochester Hills and Oakland Township and has commitments from both communities this will be cleaned up. All the license invoices were sent out. The Lake Orion DDA Turkey Trot event has been cancelled. A second Invasive Species treatment for phragmites in Rochester Hills occurred on the trail on October 5th. Ms. Gray had a conversation with the people who provided the spikes for the Recognition Ceremonies, and they are willing to sell the mold for \$150; the spikes we would have to locate elsewhere because he gets them off a rail track. He offered to produce 30 of the shields which are attached to the spikes for \$2.00 each. Staff wants to continue to support his business if we have the need to make more spikes, but we may not need anymore as we have enough for the next recognition ceremony in December. Ms. Ford will go ahead and purchase the mold and shields. She reminded everyone of the next Friends Group meeting on December 9th, and confirmed our December meeting will be held as planned on the 21st. Clearing has been completed at Paint Creek Junction, grading and installation of most of the culverts is done, the well and hydrant installation and most of the aggregate for the parking lot and connector path has been laid, parking blocks and concrete work except for the pad around the restroom are complete. They still need to finish grading, rain garden, landscaping, asphalt, installation of restrooms, signage and removal of debris from the site.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Mr. Peltier indicated he's holding a fund-raiser A Mother's Wish. Ms. Steele is excited about the trailhead, and thanked the Commission for all their hard work. The Personnel Committee needs to meet soon.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Walker, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

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

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

DAVID BECKER, Secretary

