



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, February 21, 2023 Regular Meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairperson Walker at 7:00 p.m.

Voting Members Present: Brian Blust, Ken Elwert, Linda Gamage (*enter 7:04 p.m.*), Patrick Ross, Steve Sage, David Walker

Voting Alternates Present: Dave Mabry

Non-Voting Alternates Present: Russell George, Carol Morlan

Voting Members Absent: Robin Buxar, Julia Dalrymple

Alternates Absent: David Becker, Martha Olijnyk, Ann Peterson, Matt Pfeiffer, Aaron Whatley

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

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

Others Present: Melissa Ford, Trail Manager, Eryn Grupido, Administrative Assistant, Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Discussion of the Southeast Rochester Property will occur after the Public Hearing regarding the TAP Grant Application.

MOTION by Blust, seconded by Mabry, ***Moved***, to approve the February 21, 2023 agenda as amended.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. Minutes – January 17, 2023 Regular Meeting, approve and file

b. Treasurers Report – January 2023, receive and file

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Sage, ***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 \$10,796.00. In addition to the recorder's fee, this amount includes credit card charges for GoToMeeting monthly fee and the WebHostingPad annual fee; reimbursement to Rochester for Bridge 31.7 engineering review fees, the contribution into our Community Foundation of Greater Rochester account, and the cost of the public hearing notice advertised in C & G Newspapers. Estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$93,000.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Elwert, *Moved*, that the invoices presented for payment are approved as presented in the amount of \$10,796.00 and orders be drawn for payment.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING: Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Grant Application

TA2023037 – Paint Creek Trail Bridge 31.7 Renovation: A public hearing is required for the grant application. Ms. Ford indicated a copy of the application draft is included in the packet and was also available on the website, social media, at the City of Rochester, and at the Trailways Commission’s office for public review. **The public hearing was opened at 7:04 p.m. for any comments.** No comments were heard. **The public hearing was closed at 7:07 p.m.** The application is due tomorrow, and we have fulfilled the public hearing aspect. Ms. Ford added she also notified all the adjacent property owners of the hearing.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION: Southeast Rochester Property: A memo is included in the packet. Ms. Ford explained she has been working with the City of Rochester’s engineering firm to get an updated cost estimate for the property as we have a donor who is willing to finance the project, but wants an updated cost estimate before they committed pursuing it. AEW requested several documents from Mannik Smith including whether they applied for a permit from EGLE for the project. Mannik Smith responded they did not apply for a permit. AEW looked into it further and determined the observation deck would be in the floodway, which requires a permit. The deck is about 50’ west from the bridge, and the floodway limit per the FEMA map is about 110’ west from the bridge. AEW doesn’t think we’ll be able to get a permit as EGLE doesn’t allow fill/obstacles in the floodway. AEW has reached out to EGLE to see if they would accept the deck in the floodway. Ms. Ford feels we may have to rethink this project; if we can’t build in the floodway, the deck will have to be moved outside the floodway and would not overlook the river. Also, after reviewing the documents Mannik Smith had, Ms. Ford indicated AEW does not have enough information to give a cost estimate for the deck if EGLE allows it to be built at the proposed location. They would need to charge \$1,500 for their time to do that. The documents that AEW needs to give to a construction company have never been created; that would cost an additional \$21,000 to design the project and complete the necessary surveys. The Mannik Smith drawings are not adequate to construct the deck. Ms. Ford introduced Ms. Aseel Putros from AEW who is here and can answer any questions. Mr. Elwert commented the Mannik Smith plans weren’t construction plans, they were concept plans, and based on the \$21,000 cost for AEW’s construction plans, this project will potentially cost about \$250,000. Mr. Elwert is hesitant to move further until we have funding. Ms. Gamage asked what the original cost estimate was; Ms. Ford said it was a little less than \$60,000 and the bids came in between \$30,000 and over \$100,000. Ms. Putros said getting this EGLE permit is highly unlikely, but they are going to try. She sent an email with the observation deck location and asked if this is something we could even submit for a permit. Vice-Chair Walker asked if any action is needed tonight. Ms. Ford said at this point, we’re waiting to see what EGLE says to see if we proceed or not. Ms. Putros said she should have an answer from EGLE next week. Ms. Gamage commented this could be an opportunity to conceptualizing the project differently, as the available funding wasn’t for any specific project, just that it be along the trail, and the donor appreciated that the project was ready to go. If we could come up with a different project on that property that could be put together quickly and get this information to the donor, we could move in that direction – maybe the side trail to the river. Ms. Ford said this was presented to the donor’s attorney, but they are focused on a structure as it’s supposed to be a respite spot in honor of the donor. Ms. Ford asked how the Commission wants her to approach this with Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance who is acting as the intermediary between us and the attorney. The last update to them was we were working on the cost estimate. Mr. Sage likes the idea of re-imagining the project, and would ask the Commission and the donor their ideas. Ms. Gamage said the donor appreciated having a

project ready to go and doesn't really want involvement. Mr. Sage suggested the subcommittee meet on this issue. The Commission suggested Ms. Ford's update to the Michigan Trails is that we are waiting on EGLE's response to the conceptual plan we currently have, and that the subcommittee meet and report back at the next meeting.

APPROVAL: Temporary Permit, Deanna Skelcy, Eastside Racing Company – Train to Trails Half Marathon – September 10, 2023:

Ms. Deanna Skelcy, of Eastside Racing Company, came forward introduced herself and summarized the event. Mr. Mark Skelcy, her husband is also present. She explained Eastside Racing Company hosts local running events; this one is a half marathon starting from the Cider Mill going down to Rochester and then to the Clinton River Trail, to the Macomb Orchard Trail and finishing at Stoney Creek Metro Park. The event is in conjunction with a donor who wished to sponsor an event in memory of his wife who passed from pancreatic cancer and raise funds for the Pancreatic Cancer Action Network. She's excited as longer running events in this area have gone away, and feels they are filling a void in the running community and helping a charity. Mr. Walker asked if 400 participants is an accurate number. Ms. Skelcy responded there are over 120 people already registered, but will cap the event at 1,000 people, which includes the people for the 5k event happening at Stoney Creek Metro Park. She estimates 600 to 800 people participating and is working to find shuttle companies – people will park at Stoney Creek Metro Park and be shuttled to Cider Mill. The staging area will be at Flagstar Bank's parking area with a coffee cart and porta-johns. The participants will be walked up to the trail and start in waves. Mr. Walker said this will be an impressive number of people running down the trail, and asked if signs or water tables will be on the trail. Ms. Skelcy said yes there will be signs and one water stop between here and the Clinton River Trail. She is very conscientious about the environment, and will make sure nothing is left on the trail. Mr. Walker indicated we are not closing the trail to other users, so runners will have to be sensitive to this. Ms. Skelcy anticipates people will spread out quickly and will also let the participants know the trail is open to other users and to be mindful of other people passing on bikes or dogs. Mr. Elwert commented that participants need to be aware that they can't park at the Cider Mill. Ms. Skelcy said she talked with the owner of the Cider Mill to make him aware of the event and he was willing to open early to offer coffee. Mr. Elwert said because of the number of participants, they should be encouraged to leave a couple feet on the left side of the trail for other users. Mr. Skelcy said they like to put signs out on the trail, but they are taken if out too early. Ms. Skelcy asked what the policy is for when signs (such as yard signs) can be put up. Ms. Ford said we have never had an event of this level where that was necessary – it's usually smaller scale and it's just day of signage; possibly something could be put in the kiosks earlier. Mr. Skelcy said the signs would be placed in the parking lots, by Tienken and in the Rochester Park. He also commented that 99% of the time, people are courteous to event participants. Mr. Mabry indicated the applicants need to talk to Oakland Township relative to anything regarding the Cider Mill itself as they own the building. He then asked where the start strip will be located and how many waves are expected. Ms. Skelcy said the strip will be across the trail at Flagstar Bank and explained they could start in waves of 100 participants with a minute or two between each wave, lasting about 20 minutes. Mr. Skelcy said he could provide the Commission with registration numbers as time goes on – we will be in the information loop. Mr. Sage asked how competitive this race will be because if you're having 500 or more competitive racers on the trail, he's curious about good courtesy. Mr. Skelcy said they're courteous. Mr. Sage is not worried about the runners, but if he's riding on the trail – if something were to happen, who's to blame? Ms. Skelcy said CRAMBA is assisting the event and will inform their membership, and is in close contact with Infinite Multi-Sport who train for triathlons on the trail and will know about the event. Mr. Sage asked what's the largest event that's been held on the trail. Ms. Ford said the Brooksie event used a small portion of the trail. Mr. Sage commented we're talking about at least four miles of trail that will be used. Ms. Gamage's concern is that we try to keep the trail open for all users, not just races, and that bikers have space to continue on the trail, not just to get off

the trail in time for runners to come through, they still have space. She encourages knowledge to the racers that it's a shared space and they need to make room for other bikers or walkers as this is a busy time of the year. Ms. Skelcy said this is on their website and will be in the guide that is given to every participant, and also have signs posted and announcements at the start of the event. Ms. Gamage added she has concerns about the trail crossings and asked what is planned at the roads. Ms. Skelcy said this will be assisted by public safety, and is being handled by another partner in the event who will be contacting the police, but there will be law enforcement at the crossings. Mr. Walker asked in a timed event, how do you navigate the crossings? Ms. Skelcy said as the waves are coming, enforcement might stop traffic until there is a break for traffic. Mr. Skelcy said there have been soft or hard road closures until the last participant crosses. Ms. Gamage asked if there will be a cap on participants using our trail and if the waves are 100 participants. Ms. Skelcy said 1,000 is the max, and the wave count will depend on total participants, with 100 as the max. Ms. Gamage said if the event could be done with trail users in mind so that we don't have complete interruption of the trail for users, that is something we would appreciate. Ms. Skelcy said waves of 50 could be an option. She understands the Commission's concern about minimizing the interruption of trail for users is very important. Ms. Skelcy said she will try to keep the waves to a smaller size and maybe stretch the timing out. She feels a lot of the Commission's concerns will be alleviated by educating the participants. Mr. Sage said the problem is that the liability rests on the Commission. Mr. Skelcy said all participants sign a waiver for liability before the event. Mr. Elwert asked for references on previous races of this size that could be contacted. Ms. Skelcy said Bay Shore Marathon or Color of Wellness. Mr. Ross would like to see either the Oakland County Sheriff's Office or Rochester Police Department approval before the Commission approves this event. He also asked if there is a rain date, as he was involved in a cross country meet in precipitation that resulted in a lot of damage – and is concerned about what the trail condition would be left in afterwards in the event of rain. Ms. Gamage asked if the applicants would come back with information regarding the trail crossings and what will be done to mitigate trail interruptions. Vice-Chairperson Walker said we need to know how early signs are proposed on the trail, how you are going to limit the waves and how the Oakland County Sheriff's Office and the Rochester Police Department are going to respond. We have some unanswered questions, and asked if the applicant is willing to come back with answers in a month or two for approval. Ms. Skelcy agreed to return with answers to the Commission's concerns.

REPORT: Licensing Committee: Vice-Chairperson Walker said he, Ms. Gamage and Ms. Olijnyk are on this committee and tried to have someone from each municipality participate; they still needs someone from Orion Township to serve. A report is included in the packet, and Ms. Gamage summarized the findings. They are following up on the beach encroachment in Oakland Township and will continue to monitor the progress. On the Dillman & Upton issue, the Commission received plans to add fencing along their parking lot on trail property that is licensed to them. In reviewing the plans, they discovered an additional structure containing hazardous materials encroaching on trail property by three feet. The Licensing Committee recommends to the Commission that we send a written request that Dillman & Upton conform to our license agreement, including removing the hazardous material and the fuel tank from trail property in accordance with all local, state and federal requirements. They also recommend that rather than constructing additional structures on our property, we encourage additional native plantings as a buffer between the parking lot and trail property. Mr. Walker commented they were going to add over 100' of fence starting at 11' high, tapering down 9' and then 7'. This fence would come within 50' of the road, which is aesthetically unappealing, and we would not look for more structures on our property – it's not the intent of the trail. If they want to do a buffer from their storage area, plantings would be a better option and concurs with the recommendation. Mr. Walker explained the reason for the proposed fence is to shield what is stored on their property,

and on the back side of the existing fence they have shelves where they are able to store material against it; an additional 100' of fencing would allow an additional 100' of storage which is to their benefit. Regarding the hazardous materials, Ms. Ford reached out to the City of Rochester and spoke with the Ordinance Department – they said there wasn't anything in the ordinances that applied. Mr. Sage said after our last discussion, he reached out to Council and City administration saying the Commission would not support the fence and that the structure is on trail property.

MOTION by Elwert, seconded by Mabry, *Moved*, that the Commission send a letter to Dillman & Upton per the Licensing Committee's recommendation, with a copy to the City of Rochester.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Ms. Gamage continued with the Consumer's Energy Additional Gas Line Placement and Existing Pipe Abandonment - She did some research on abandoning a pipe or if it was in their best interest to leave it in, and didn't find information about risks of leaving the pipe in the ground other than it's sometimes not mapped out clearly where the pipe is, and when work is done the pipes are pulled up and does damage to equipment. The subcommittee recommends a request for removing the pipe and restoring the property, fully understanding that this may not happen. We don't have an application for the limited use permit – Mr. Walker indicated Consumers said they have filed with the Road Commission because it's in their right of way. Ms. Gamage noted the license agreement for the existing pipe was not located, so the committee requests that a license agreement for the new pipeline including fair market value be in place. It should also include the location, size, material and content of the pipeline and conditions for abandoning it or discontinuing use (removal and restoration of the property). The committee also recommends if our request to remove the existing pipeline is denied, an updated license agreement, or addendum to the new agreement, including the pipeline that will remain on trailway property. Mr. Walker said the subcommittee feels an application for a limited use permit is appropriate; if the pipeline is abandoned, the property be restored, and a license agreement should be in place for both the new pipeline and the existing pipeline if abandoned. Ms. Ford will draft a letter to Consumers Energy and send it to the License Committee for review and approval prior to sending it.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Mabry, *Moved*, that the Commission send a letter to Consumers Energy per the Licensing Committee's recommendation. Ms. Ford will draft said letter for review and approval by the committee prior to sending.

Ayes: All Nays: Nays

MOTION CARRIED.

General Recommendations of the Subcommittee – Ms. Gamage said a couple years ago we reviewed all the license agreements and recommended the fee schedule be updated; however, this was not accomplished last year. The subcommittee recommends that all license agreements are reviewed and updated, including a fair market value fee structure with the intent to put them in place in 2024, which fits in with our goals. Mr. Sage agrees as long as there's a date certain.

MOTION by Sage, seconded by Blust, *Moved*, that all license agreements be reviewed including a fair market assessment structure by September 1, 2023.

Discussion on the Motion – Mr. Elwert asked who reviews the licenses. Ms. Ford explained the issue was we were all ready to go until the conversion issue came up, and if all the licenses had gone through the conversion process – that was the hold up. Ms. Ford was trying to find the documentation for the attorney, but she had to go through all the grant agreements to make sure that has been followed with the licenses. She thinks she has found the document that goes with the original agreement for when the trail started that references a lot of existing license agreements from when they were with the railroad. This document needs to be sent to our attorney to make sure it's valid. Dillman & Upton went through its own conversion process, so that's taken care of. Solaronics is a separate issue because it did a quiet title. That's why this has

been on hold – we didn't want to increase the rates without making sure they were appropriately done in following the conversion process with the DNR. If the document gets confirmation from the attorney that it's correct and we're good, the timing is not a problem. If it's not the correct document, Ms. Ford will have to continue searching for it. **Mr. Sage retracted his Motion until we get further guidance from the Commission.**

Relative to the Bald Mountain Bridge Connection, Ms. Gamage explained the subcommittee still has questions about the project. Hopefully the next agenda item will address these questions. The concerns were mitigating erosion where the bridge abutment meets the trail, potential safety hazards with the abrupt connection to the trail including limited sightlines, appropriate space for passing traffic on the trail adjacent to the structure and potential railings close to the trail, appropriate signage announcing the crossing, and what best practices were implemented in the bridge design, specifically where it connects to the trail. The subcommittee does recommend a license agreement to cover maintenance and liability if the project is approved. Vice-Chair Walker closed this agenda item and moved on to the Limited Use Permit Request discussion for this project.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL: Limited Use Permit Request, Bald Mountain Recreation Area Bridge to PCT, Oakland Township:

Mr. Adam Lepp, Bald Mountain, and Mr. Steve Sutton, Nowak & Fraus Engineers, came forward and introduced themselves. Mr. Lepp indicated this project was discussed last month, but the Commission wanted specific questions answered by Mr. Sutton, the project engineer (a memo is also included in the packet with answers). Mr. Sutton explained Ms. Ford sent last month's questions to him, which he answered and sent a graphic of the interface of the bridge with the trail. Regarding mitigating erosion, Mr. Sutton said the concrete abutment will be up against the side slope and there will be heavy duty erosion matting on the sides of the slope, which has project been submitted as part of their EGLE permit, so they are on board with the slope stabilization. Mr. Walker commented the material used on the trail is very fine and he feels that when water comes off the cement pad, it can wash away the trail there. Mr. Sutton stated the slab will be pitched away from the trail on the side slope back toward the water. From where the slab interfaces with the trail material, it should be draining to the sides, not the trail. Mr. Walker commented the bridge at Clarkston/Kern has a nice gravel apron between the bridge and the trail and noted there is a 1'6" aggregate base between the concrete and the trail for this project. Mr. Sutton said they could expand the aggregate pad to the north and south of the slab interface if the Commission wants. The 5' concrete pad is an ADA compliance issue for a landing, and doesn't think it can be reduced. Mr. Walker asked if there will be a stop sign on the bridge as there is at Clarkston/Kern. Mr. Lepp doesn't know if this is an engineering decision, and asked what the Commission wants. Mr. Walker said when coming off the bridge, people are right on the trail with no transition. Mr. Lepp said they will be signage prior that people are coming up to an intersection with the trail. Ms. Ford said there is a similar warning sign at Clarkston/Kern along with a stop sign, and suggests using that project as a model for signage. She has not had any issues with that intersection. Ms. Gamage mentioned the railings – the subcommittee isn't sure if railings will be extended toward the trail that would limit passing; there is a concern bikers may run into a rail close to the trail. Mr. Sutton wasn't sure what the Commission's desire was as he can see it both ways. Right now, there are no side rails proposed along the bridge, but he has seen locations where there are railings to funnel people on and off a bridge. Mr. Walker said the subcommittee sees railings as a hazard. A question was asked about tree removals. Mr. Sutton said there might be some tree removals on the slopes to build the bridge, but nothing other than what they need in order to build the substructure. No trees will be taken down north or south of the intersection. Vegetation will be cleared out on both sides of the bridge to place erosion mats, which will be restored. Ms. Ford said for the Bridge 33.7 project, native Michigan seed was specified, and will forward the specs to them. Mr. Lepp said on the State side, they have their own stewardship division that dictates what needs to plant on their

land. Mr. Sutton reiterated that no railings or fencing are proposed that run parallel with the trail at the intersection. Ms. Gamage asked if people on the trail will be able to see anyone on the bridge. She's not sure if signs on the trail will be needed for users to know they are approaching a bridge because of the sightlines. Mr. Sutton suggested signs on the north and south side of the trail about an upcoming intersection, as no trees will be taken out on the sides of the trail. Mr. Walker mentioned the license agreement and asked if the applicants were the right entity to request an agreement from – who should be contacted for this? Mr. Sutton said the DNR has a real estate group that would probably be the best contact. Mr. Walker noted this is a structure on trail property so something needs to be in place for future generations. Mr. Lepp thinks the agreement would be a lot like the 30-year lease agreement that there was with the trail that runs off of the PCT, the spur. Ms. Gamage said the concern is the maintenance – to ensure the bridge falls under the jurisdiction and responsibility of Bald Mountain. Mr. Elwert said it's not a license agreement as there is no compensation, but rather a maintenance agreement. Ms. Ford said it's more of a memo of understanding for maintenance. Mr. Sutton asked if a temporary construction easement is granted for when the project gets to the construction phase. Ms. Ford indicated this is the Limited Use Permit, which the applicant has filled out. Mr. Walker said this permit is required as they will be closing the trail for a period of time and allowing the use of the trail, which still needs to be approved, and asked about the timing of the project. Mr. Lepp said he was in the process of securing funding, and it sounds like the project will happen in 2024, as the funding comes through the DNR and MDOT TAP grants. Mr. Sutton said the plans are with MDOT now for their review and doesn't know when the bid is scheduled to come out. He also learned that bridges are 52 weeks out from when the order is place, so he's looking at spring of 2024. Mr. Walker said we have some time, so let's investigate the maintenance agreement and not approve the temporary use permit until we are fully satisfied with all the items. Mr. Sutton said they will take the signage issues into consideration and include that in the project; he has feedback from Ms. Ford about restoration, and will include natural vegetation in the plans. Mr. Walker said we would keep this as an open item and continue to work on it because the Commission wants it to happen. Ms. Ford asked if approvals are needed by a certain time for any of the applicant's grants. Mr. Sutton said there could be a need to certify the right of way for the MDOT process, and may need something from the Commission. The Commission thanked Mr. Lepp and Mr. Sutton for coming to tonight's discussion.

UPDATE: Grant Opportunities & Trail Capital Improvement Projects: Ms. Ford indicated we were not awarded the Spark grant during the first round of applications and is waiting to get the scores back which will determine whether or not we pursue the second round of funding. The TAP grant application will be submitted tomorrow. Ms. Ford went to Rochester's City Council meeting last week and they agreed to serve as the lead applicant and also provide the 20% match for the project – thank you Rochester. The next step is to get the rest of the funding. Ms. Ford feels we should apply for the MDNR Trust Fund next. Based on information she's gotten about the Land & Water Conservation Fund; we can't apply for that if we're using the TAP grant as the match – you can't match federal to federal funds. The DNR also said in their webinar, if we send in both applications, they would only fund one of them and would choose what program it best matched with, so there's no point in doing anything but the Trust Fund. As part of the Trust Fund application, we have to host an accessibility workshop which is planned for March 9th at 6:00 p.m. at the Cider Mill, invitations will be sent out to disability advocates to get feedback. No new updates available on the Wilson Maintenance Fund; she has followed up with them as last year's application was due March 31st. Regarding the Fisheries Habitat Grant, Ms. Ford will work with them to get our project listed on their Priority Habitat Conservation Projects List for this year, and apply again in the fall if needed.

DISCUSSION: Ad Hoc Committee Assignments: Mr. Walker said the only reason this is on the agenda was to secure an Orion Township representative on the Licensing Committee so we have someone from each municipality. Unfortunately, only Mr. Ross is present tonight. This item will be discussed next month. Mr. Walker suggested the Memorial Program be included with the Trail Improvements/Resurfacing Committee and hopefully get some energy incited and get this implemented as a great report with ideas was completed by Ms. Grupido. The Ad-Hoc Committees are where all the heavy activity is accomplished.

DISCUSSION: 2023 Goals: The results of the 2023 goal rankings are summarized in the list included in the packet. Ms. Ford said there were some notes about eliminating some things. Vice-Chairperson Walker said we should narrow the focus on what is attainable this year in what timeframe; perhaps three to six items and focus our efforts and energy towards these. He suggested looking at priority 1 goals with a timeframe for this year, not necessarily on-going items. Ms. Ford said we have the bridge project, upgrading the website, and adding the license agreement review for 2023. We should also add celebrating the 40th anniversary to the goals. Mr. Walker feels the goal summary document is lengthy; Ms. Ford thinks it helps as when she does the Manager's Report, the members can see updates on what is happening, but agrees it's lengthy and could be reformatted. Mr. Sage said as far as the coordination with the Friends Group being a priority 1 goal, it's noted the Memorandum of Understanding is currently under review. Ms. Gamage said this review is in progress and near recommendation. It was suggested the 2023 priority goals be listed on the first page, then a calendar of events section for recurring events, and everything else afterwards as they are operational items. The 2023 goals are the bridge project, website upgrade and the license agreement review. The members concurred to the reformat of the document.

MANAGER'S REPORT: Ms. Ford summarized her written report included in the packet. She's met with the 40th Anniversary subcommittee to brainstorm ideas. The first event will be the ribbon-cutting at Paint Creek Junction in conjunction with the anniversary celebration for National Trails Day. Also discussed was a possible 5k race in Lake Orion in late fall; she's talking with Mr. Carrio about Friends involvement – we could also do an auction for the signs. Ms. Ford's not sure what event the Recognition Ceremony will be held at. She mentioned updating the video that was done for the 30th anniversary, and asked members to look for photos, stories or people to interview. They are looking to partner with one of the communities' television stations to do that work; she believes Rochester Hills did the last video.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Ms. Gamage asked the members to think about who should be considered for recognition this year. Mr. Elwert indicated they are looking at trail counters on the Clinton River Trail and may want to ask us for approval for one at Tienken. Ms. Ford said this would be nice for grant applications and suggested a formal user survey be conducted in the next few years. Mr. Ross commented that the temporary permit request indicated it will be held rain or shine, and has concerns about the trail conditions if they run in the rain – perhaps something could be in the permit that if they do hold the event in the rain and it causes any damage, the trail has to be restored. Mr. Sage talked about the lengthy Planning Commission meeting regarding Solaronics and said he believes the developer came away with an understanding or appreciation that the Commission, the City and the residents have concerns regarding the project, and thinks they may have to make a decision as to resubmit something that is more palatable or just abandon the project – March 6th is the next meeting and he will let us know if this is on the agenda. Mr. Sage also has concerns about the number of people anticipated for the run for the temporary permit request – unless they will sign a blanket assurance for liability for everything that could happen, he wouldn't want that on the trail.

ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION by Gamage, seconded by Elwert, *Moved*, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 9:22 p.m.
Ayes: All Nays: None **MOTION CARRIED.**

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: March 21, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. – Paint Creek Cider Mill

Respectfully submitted,

MELISSA FORD, Trail Manager

DAVID BECKER, Secretary

Draft