

**Chairperson**

Teri Banas

**Vice-Chairperson**

Penelope Tsernoglou

**Ingham County  
Trails And Parks Task Force****Members**

Sarah Anthony  
Robin Case Naeyaert  
Carol Koenig  
Randy Maiville  
Deb Nolan  
Todd Tennis

THE TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2016  
AT 5:00 P.M. IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES  
BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING

**Agenda**

Call to Order

Approval of the [November 19, 2015](#) Minutes

Approval of the [December 10, 2015](#) Minutes

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

**Communications**

1. [Park Commission Correspondence](#) and discussion of set aside for deferred projects within Ingham County Parks
2. Review [survey responses](#) from Task Force members
3. Overview of costs to build new trails, repair existing trails and fix bridges, based on findings in Mannik Smith's Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report
4. Presentation by Mannik Smith for "Millage Allocation and Criteria for Project Evaluation and Application"

Announcements

Public Comment

Adjournment

## TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE

November 19, 2015

Minutes - Draft

Members Present: Anthony, Banas, Maiville, Naeyaert, Nolan, Tennis (Arrived at 6:34 p.m.), and Tsernoglou

Members Absent: Koenig

Others Present: Tim Morgan, Brian Collins, Nicole Wallace, Henry Rojas, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Banas at 6:03 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

### Approval of the October 22, 2015 Meeting Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 22, 2015 MEETING.

The minutes were amended to replace Commissioner Naeyaert with Commissioner Case-Naeyaert.

THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

### Additions to the Agenda

None.

### Limited Public Comment

None.

Chairperson Banas reviewed the agenda for the task force meeting.

1. Development of mission statement for use of Trails & Parks Millage Funds.
  - a. Goals and Objectives

Commissioner Nolan suggested replacing “Plan” with “Task Force” in the mission statement.

Commissioner Anthony suggested replacing “Ingham County Regional Trails and Parks Plan” with “millage.”

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that if it was an overall goal for what the millage is to be used for, it should encompass the millage.

Commissioner Anthony stated that she was in agreement.

There was a discussion regarding the plan goals and objectives of the millage.

Tim Morgan, Parks Director, stated that the word “system” belonged in the objectives.

Chairperson Banas provided an alternate objectives statement.

Commissioner Anthony stated that components of the alternate objectives statement could be modified into a vision statement. She further stated the audience of the objectives statement was important in deciding the language of the statement.

Chairperson Banas reviewed Resolution 14-310.

Commissioner Anthony presented an alternative objectives statement.

There was a discussion about Commissioner Anthony’s alternative objectives statement.

Commissioner Tennis arrived at 6:34 p.m.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that “maintained,” within the context of the mission statement, needed to be defined by the Board. She further stated that public needed to have an input on the mission statement.

Chairperson Banas suggested labeling the mission statement as a draft.

Commissioner Nolan suggested the mission statement be the first two lines of the millage.

**MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NOLAN, TO ADOPT THE FOLLOWING MISSION STATEMENT:**

The overall goal of the Ingham County Regional Trails and Parks Millage Fund is to create and maintain a county wide system of recreation trails and adjacent parks within Ingham County.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.**

## **2. Discussion: Definition of funding categories**

Chairperson Banas reviewed the categories

Commissioner Nolan stated that she would like the categories refined.

Commissioner Nolan asked for clarification on the difference between “repair” and “reconstruction.”

Commissioner Tennis clarified the difference.

Commissioner Anthony asked if the categories were being asked to the public.

Chairperson Banas answered that the categories came out of the February 19, 2015 meeting.

Commissioner Anthony asked if the feedback the consultants had received from the public fit the topics.

Commissioner Maiville stated that he agreed with Commissioner Tennis' definition of "reconstruction". He further stated that routine maintenance was operational.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that "grants" should be a separate category.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated the categories might not be funding categories, but could be applied to the Board's categories. She further stated that they should be reviewed because the Task Force had more information.

Chairperson Banas asked the Task Force what they thought about the topics.

Commissioner Nolan suggested keeping "Repairs, replacement, and reconstruction" as one category.

Commissioner Anthony reaffirmed the need for reconstruction.

Commissioner Maiville stated that for older parts of the system, reconstruction was needed.

Commissioner Tennis asked what the goal of having categories was. He expressed concerns if the topics were over allocating funds.

Chairperson Banas answered that no discussion was had yet on how to distribute funds.

Chairperson Tennis stated the Task Force needed to recognize that funds were going to have to have some flexibility so that it did not look like one part of the county was favored over another.

Mr. Morgan stated that these concerns were going to be brought up at the December 10, 2015 meeting. He clarified the difference between "trail rehab" and "long-term maintenance."

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that she was in support of long-term maintenance. She further stated that she was vehemently against routine maintenance.

Commissioner Nolan stated that, based on the examples provided, she did not agree with long term maintenance.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that she would define long term maintenance as preserving the trail to optimal standards.

Commissioner Maiville stated that dead tree removal and invasive species should be struck from long term maintenance. He further stated that the attempt to acquire grant money should not be limited to special projects.

Chairperson Banas stated that she agreed with Commissioner Maiville.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that she preferred to stay away from routine maintenance. She further stated she would like enhancements through the county wide trail system and that they were different from maintenance. She stated that she wasn't sure how the final category was difference from the rest of the categories.

Commissioner Anthony expressed confusion over the discussion of maintenance because the millage term was not a long time relative to the amount of time "long term maintenance" could mean. She further stated that some form of maintenance was important, as it was part of the millage language, and that there was still some ambiguity over the definition of maintenance. She stated that special projects could be used as an incentive for grants.

Commissioner Nolan stated that maintenance could be defined as: repairs, rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he did not feel comfortable telling local parks directors what they need. He further stated that the Task Force should focus on a holistic use of the funds and that he liked the broad, general categories.

Commissioner Maiville stated that since the County residents were being taxed, priorities would be established to invest in more aspects with a greater impact.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert suggested creating a long term fund for the millage dollars. She stated that the funding should be done on a case by case basis.

Chairperson Banas provided an account of how Genesee County set up a 501 (c)3 to help maintain their trails.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that system wide enhancements might be a cheap and visible addition to the Trails and Parks System. She stated that broad categories were fine, but they should be changed.

Chairperson Banas suggested directing their consultants to focus on maintenance. She outlined 4 categories to focus on:

1. New construction.
2. Repairs, rehabilitation, maintenance.
3. Parks
4. Special projects (enhancements)

Commissioner Nolan stated that Parks were inherent as to what the categories would apply to.

There was a discussion regarding the topics of “Parks” and “Maintenance.”

Commissioner Banas suggested setting aside money for county parks.

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. TSERNOGLOU, TO AFFIRM NEW CATEGORIES:

1. New construction.
2. Repairs, rehabilitation, maintenance.
3. Parks
4. Special projects

Commissioner Nolan asked why “Parks” was a separate category.

The motion was amended as follows:

1. New construction.
2. Repairs, rehabilitation, maintenance.
3. **County** Parks
4. Special projects

This was considered a friendly amendment.

There was a discussion about the “County Parks” category.

Commissioner Maiville stated that he wanted to remove maintenance and include reconstruction.

Commissioner Nolan stated that the definition of maintenance needed to be resolved before voting on the categories.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that the definition of maintenance should be: the tasks necessary to preserve a trail according to optimal standards.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he liked “maintenance” more vaguely defined

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that her definition of maintenance was vague.

Commissioner Tennis stated that the needs of the trails were going to change over time. He further stated that he was opposed to defining maintenance in terms of what tasks should not be performed.

Commissioner Maiville stated that he agreed that the needs of the trails would change over time, but hoped that a priority of the millage dollars went towards repair, reconstruction, and new construction.

The motion was amended as follows:

1. New construction.
2. Repairs, rehabilitation, maintenance (as to be defined by the Board of Commissioners)
3. County Parks
4. Special projects

This was considered a friendly amendment.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Task Force should consider using the consultants to help make decisions.

There was a discussion regarding public opinion of the categories.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

The following items were not discussed:

3. Discussion: Funding Breakdown
  - a. Discussion: Allocation to County Parks
4. Information Handout: Brief report on results of exercise from October 22, 2015 Task Force Meeting.

#### Public Comment

Ralph Monsma addressed the Task Force regarding maintenance.

#### Announcements

Mr. Morgan announced that the next Task Force would meet on December 10, 2015 at 6:00 p.m.

There was a discussion regarding the weighing system of the exercise from the October 22, 2015 meeting.

#### Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

## TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE

December 10, 2015

Minutes - Draft

Members Present: Banas, Maiville, Case-Naeyaert, and Nolan

Members Absent: Anthony, Koenig, Tennis, and Tsernoglou

Others Present: Tim Morgan, Jared Cypher, Brian Collins, Lucie Fortin, Nancy Krupiarz, Kurt Smith, Henry Rojas, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Banas at 6:07 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room "D & E" of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

### Approval of the November 19, 2015 Meeting Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. CASE-NAEYAERT, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO TABLE THE NOVEMBER 19, 2015 TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE MINUTES.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Anthony, Koenig, Tennis, and Tsernoglou.

### Additions to the Agenda

None.

### Limited Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated she did not feel comfortable having the consultants responding to constituents on behalf of the Board of Commissioners or the Task Force.

Commissioner Maiville asked why the email headers were not from Mannik Smith Group.

Chairperson Banas clarified that Mannik Smith Group was subcontracted by Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance.

Chairperson Banas reviewed the agenda for the December 10, 2015 Trails and Parks Task Force meeting.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert

1. Overview of Project Scope of Services – Next Steps (Tim Morgan, Jared Cypher)

Jared Cypher, Deputy Clerk, addressed the Task Force regarding the project status.

Tim Morgan, Parks Director, addressed the Task Force regarding the next steps of the project.

Chairperson Banas asked why a criterion ranking system was not included.

Lucie Fortin, Mannik Smith Group, stated that the plan was to discuss projects first, and then form criteria to be discussed.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert asked how projects could be ranked before criteria ranking the projects was established.

There was a discussion regarding criteria.

Ms. Fortin stated that she wanted to suggest criteria based off of public input and the projects.

Commissioner Nolan suggested compiling projects based on precincts.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that she thought the consultants would provide suggested criteria that the Task Force would use to decide on projects.

Ms. Fortin stated that she wished to discuss the projects first because some projects might be more relevant than others.

Chairperson Banas stated the Task Force was not ready for recommendations as the projects needed to be discussed.

## 2. Deliberation of Maintenance within Funding Categories

### a. Set aside for County Parks

Chairperson Banas suggested labeling “maintenance” as “preventive maintenance.”

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert asked if the consultants had defined maintenance.

Chairperson Banas stated that consultants could provide an answer by the next month.

Commissioner Nolan stated that defining maintenance should be defined by excluding the performance of tasks such as leaf and snow removal, grass mowing and trash removal.

Commissioner Maiville stated that some tasks could border routine maintenance depending on the scale of the task.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she would be happy defining it as the exclusion of snow removal, grass mowing, and trash removal.

Chairperson Banas stated that the millage should not assume the operations of local departments.

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CASE-NAEYAERT, TO DEFINE LONG-TERM MAINTENANCE AS THE PRESERVATION OF THE TRAILS TO OPTIMAL STANDARDS WHILE EXCLUDING ACTIVITIES SUCH AS: SNOW AND TRASH REMOVAL AND GRASS MOWING.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert suggested amending it to include the word millage as a reminder that millage dollars would not do those things.

Chairperson Banas stated that it could be precisely stated in the introduction for the defined categories.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Anthony, Koenig, Tennis, and Tsernoglou.

Chairperson Banas addressed the Task Force regarding fund operating appropriation and capital improvement.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the different millage percent rates and fund operating appropriation.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert asked the time frame for equipment replacement.

Mr. Morgan answered that items on the first page were for asked for 2016, section C was for the next 5 years, and section D was beyond 5 years.

Commissioner Nolan asked if the numbers had been added up.

Mr. Morgan answered that some of the costs were to be determined and others were estimates.

Commissioner Nolan stated that at 5%, the county would receive \$1,220,000.00 over 6 years.

There was a discussion regarding capital improvements on county parks.

Mr. Morgan asked if county parks would get trail connections paid for out of the general fund or the capital improvement appropriation.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert answered that if it fit the criteria the Task Force decided, it would.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she saw the appropriation as a gift that the county could use to complete long put off capital improvements.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that these would be things that were needed with or without millage money. She further stated that they would be looked at for how they fit into the regional plan.

COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, MOVED TO SET ASIDE 5% OF THE AFTER-TIFF FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Anthony, Koenig, Tennis, and Tsernoglou.

b. Set aside for Blue Ways

Commissioner Maiville stated that he could support it overall, but coming up with a number now would be premature as the scope was unknown.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that including a regional water trail was an exorbitant inclusion.

Commissioner Nolan stated that including accessible entry places at the Red Cedar and Grand River might be a more acceptable suggestion. She further stated that more data was needed before making a decision.

Commissioner Maiville stated that more information was needed before a decision was made.

Chairperson Banas stated that relatively inexpensive improvements could create new recreational opportunities and allow areas of the county that did not have great trails systems to participate with millage dollars.

Mr. Morgan stated that water trails were a valuable asset to the Parks and Trails system. He further stated that, as to Commissioner Nolan's suggestion, it might be a low hanging fruit.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated more criteria and information was needed.

Commissioner Nolan asked for estimated costs of a barrier-free access point on the river where there was already parking.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert asked for the cost of clearing waterways with traditional equipment. She stated that it needed to be elaborated because tasks such as clearing a water trail could escalate into tasks such as drudging out Sycamore Creek.

Chairperson Banas stated an application process for special projects would handle requests for something like the clearing of a water trail with expensive equipment.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Mannik Smith Group would propose a Blue Ways plan.

Commissioner Nolan related a first person story of going to Drain Commissioner Pat Lindemann to address the flooding of homes.

Commissioner Maiville stated the Sycamore trail needed to have some work done on it, but was not sure as to how it was being payed for even though it was a special case.

3. Presentation by Consultant, Lucie Fortin of Mannik Smith Group and Nancy Krupiarz of Michigan Trails & Greenways Alliance
  - a. Public Input Results

Ms. Fortin and Nancy Krupiarz, Mannick Smith Group, addressed the Task Force regarding the results of the public input survey.

There was a discussion of the categorization of Delhi Township.

Commissioner Nolan asked if the survey was advertised to the Friends of the River Trail.

Mr. Morgan stated that it was done through tweets and Facebook.

There was a discussion regarding the online survey.

Chairperson Banas asked why twice as many urban participants completed the survey online versus the in-person public input.

Ms. Krupiarz answered that it was easier to complete a survey online than to attend a meeting.

There was a discussion regarding the online survey participants.

Chairperson Banas asked for the difference between long-term and routine maintenance.

Ms. Krupiarz answered that routine maintenance was everyday things such as: leaf and debris blowing, grass cutting, and grass removal. She further stated that long-term maintenance was about preserving the standards that the trails were built to and that trail rehab was the complete redoing of trails.

Chairperson Banas stated that most people did not care who did the maintenance, as long as it was getting done.

Commissioner Nolan stated that when a grant application process started, applicants would be notified that they would have to provide routine maintenance. She further stated that it would be included in the application language.

Chairperson Banas stated that the DNR application had a check box indicating that the trail would be maintained. She further stated that it would be the right and purview of the Task Force to include something like it on applications. She asked what the most important categories pertaining to safety were.

Ms. Krupiarz answered trail connections and crossings because that was where most incidents would happen.

There was a discussion regarding the top three public input answers.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert asked for clarification if fifty people cared about safety at the public forums.

Ms. Krupiarz answered yes. She stated that citizens patrol and trail ambassadors were options the County could pursue.

b. Overview of Stakeholders Meeting and Ingham County Regional Trails Plan Map

Ms. Fortin Ms. Krupiarz addressed the Task Force regarding the stakeholders meeting.

Chairperson Banas asked how Washtenaw handled requests to disperse the \$4 million for regional trails, based on staff recommendation and board approval.

Ms. Krupiarz answered that it started with staff which comprised multiple committees, then it went to the Parks Commission, and then another committee.

Commissioner Nolan asked for a one page summary of the criteria used by Washtenaw and Charlevoix County for their application process.

Chairperson Banas asked for a model of ranking and criterion system.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that citizens of the out-county never formed a plan because they did not know they would have the opportunity to apply for millage dollars.

Commissioner Nolan stated that they would like an application and criterion system, and then the Task Force would go from there.

Ms. Krupiarz stated that the listed criteria were grouped according to the categories obtained from the previous meeting.

Chairperson Banas asked for a recommended application process for the next meeting.

There was a discussion regarding the application process.

Chairperson Banas stated that she wanted to leverage county dollars through the application process. She stated that she wanted the applications to include promises to maintain the property.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated she wanted the criterion defined, and an application process suggested so that the Task Force could determine: appropriate projects, where they would rank based on criteria, and how it would involve the application process.

Mr. Cypher clarified that the Task Force wanted a list of projects that was not ranked.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that there were groups of people who had not submitted their project ideas because they did not know what would be required of them to ask for the money.

Mr. Cypher stated that, from the staff perspective, requests were either official or unofficial. He further stated that official requests came in written form to the office in some sort of official capacity.

Commissioner Maiville stated that projects requests would not only be coming through local units of government.

Mr. Cypher stated that official requests could come through the application process, and the list from the consultants could be used as a list of possibilities.

Commissioner Nolan stated that the Task Force should be mindful that it was a 6 year project and that people would apply throughout the 6 years.

Chairperson Banas stated that she would like information about the meetings at least a week before their date.

Commissioner Maiville asked if there was a limit as to how many surveys could be completed per each I.P. address.

Ms. Krupiarz answered that Survey Monkey allowed only one survey to be completed per device.

Commissioner Maiville expressed confusion over the distribution of online survey participants. He stated that the numbers did not look right.

Commissioner Nolan thanked everyone for their work.

#### Public Comment

Matt Bennet, Vice Chair of the County Parks Commission, addressed the Task Force regarding the data of the public input surveys. He stated that the data was skewed towards the Lansing Urban Trail users. He further stated that the takeaway of the results was that regional connections were the most requested.

#### Announcements

None.

#### Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

# INGHAM COUNTY PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

Meeting of January 25, 2016  
**Resolution #03-16**

## **RESOLUTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE**

WHEREAS, the Trails and Parks Task Force at their December 10, 2015 meeting determined that five percent of the Trails and Parks Millage funds should go to the Ingham County Parks Department, and that these funds should be spent on capital expenditures (CIP); and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission concurs with the Trails and Parks Task Force that the millage funds allotted to the Ingham County Parks Department should be used to enhance the facilities and services provided by the Ingham County Parks Department and are not meant to supplant the Parks Department appropriation annually, but to help restore park funding to pre-recession times; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission has attached an amended detailed list of items from its planning capital expenditures (CIP) budget document which includes all dollar amounts estimated and operating appropriation history; and

WHEREAS, the amount needed in operating and capital expenditures over the six year period of the Trails and Parks Millage is estimated to be \$740,842 annually (this represents the 22% as discussed below).

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission requests that the Trails and Parks Task Force reconsider the previously determined percentage of funding designated to the Ingham County Parks Department.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission requests that the Trails and Parks Task Force also reconsider the determination to designate the millage funds for capital expenditures (CIP) only. The Parks and Recreation Commission has concerns that limiting these funds to just capital improvements will limit the ability of the Ingham County Parks Department and the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission to provide all that is needed to accomplish the deferred facilities maintenance, capital improvements, as well as the delivery of the goals and objectives of the Parks Department within its operating budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission recommends that the Trails and Parks Task Force consider 22 percent of the Trails and Parks Millage funds be designated annually for the Ingham County Parks Department, for each year the millage is levied.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission respectfully requests that the Trails and Parks Task Force recommend to the Board of Commissioners that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission recommend to the Board of Commissioners the allocation of the millage funds that will be dedicated specifically to the Ingham County Parks Department, as per the normal budgeting process. The Trails and Parks Millage funds were not designated to supplant the Parks Department appropriation annually, but to help the Parks Department funding annually.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission respectfully requests that the Task Force recommend the Park Commission act in an advisory capacity to the County Board of Commissioners working in conjunction with County Parks staff. The County Parks and Recreation Commissions, would review and evaluate the submitted applications for County-wide trail projects and make a final recommendation to the County Board of Commissioners for millage fund appropriations within a prescribed timeframe utilizing the application process and criteria for project evaluation and application recommended by the Trails and Parks Task Force and approved by the Board of Commissioners.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission respectfully requests that the Task Force consider allowing the County Parks to apply for and receive funding outside of the designated percentage for trails within and connecting links outside of the existing County Parks. An example is MSU through Meridian to Lake Lansing County Parks and Holt to Burchfield County Park.

FINALLY BE IT RESOLVED, that the above requests be considered by the Board of Commissioners Trails and Parks Task Force at their February 2016 meeting.

**Moved by Mr. Czarnecki and Supported by Mr. Pratt that Resolution #03-16 be approved as written. Yes-6; No-0. MOTION CARRIED.**

## **Narrative**

### **Request for Funding to the Ingham County Trails and Parks Task Force from the Ingham County Parks Commission per Resolution #03-16**

The Ingham County Parks' aging facilities, shelters, roadways, trails and features are part of the backlog of deferred maintenance & facilities repairs and improvement projects that require funding. The County Parks have had to postpone a large amount of park upgrades that have been delayed over the years due to funding decreases for Capital Projects and they are spelled out in the Parks 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Planning Budget and total \$2,797,300 (this comes to \$466,216 per year over six years). In addition to this the County Parks operating fund has been reduced by 20% since 2009, \$394,086 less annually. The Park Commission would like to address both capital and operating funds with item #1 and #2 below:

#### **ITEM #1:**

##### **Parks 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Planning Budget: \$2,797,300**

***\$466,216 per year for six years***

#### **ITEM #2:**

##### **County Parks Operating Fund down 20% since 2009, \$394,086 less annually**

In 2009 there were cuts to full-time and seasonal part-time employees, maintenance, supplies, etc. \$169,460 of this cut was for the police operating cost.

***\$224,626 total per year*** difference without full police reinstatement.

***\$50,000 per year*** (\$30,000 Sheriff/\$20,000 Maintenance Supplies) already approved in the budget by the Board of Commissioners for 2015 and 2016.

#### **IN CONCLUSION**

***The Ingham County Parks Commission is requesting a total of \$740, 842 from the Trails and Parks Task force for 2016 and the same in future years. This amount is approximately 22% of the Trails and Parks Millage Fund annually.***

We estimated \$740,842 or 22% of the \$3.4 million in millage dollars by taking off TIF (tax increment financing).

## THESE ITEMS NOT FUNDED IN THE 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

PARK	ITEM	COST	NEW/Renew
BUR	Table Saw	\$2,500	Renew
BUR	Stone chip existing paved road	\$10,000	Renew
LL	Carousel Building Roof- LLS	\$25,000	Renew
HAWK	Construct Pump house building/snow hill	\$25,000	Renew
HAWK	Red Tail Roof - HI	\$20,000	Renew
HAWK	Parking Lot Repair - crack seal	\$50,000	Renew
HAWK	Boardwalk sealer	\$10,000	Renew
LL	Sand Hill Shelter Roof - LLN (use funds from 2015)	\$4,000	Renew
HAWK	Boardwalk repairs	\$10,000	Renew
HAWK	Bathroom refurbishments	\$15,000	Renew
BUR	Boardwalk sealer	\$3,000	Renew
BUR	Electrical hand dryers for beach	\$3,500	Renew
BUR	Accessible Canoe/Kayak Launch BUR/McNamara(added 1/4/16)	\$100,000	New
All Parks	Point of Sale System	\$150,000	New
Subtotal		<u>\$428,000</u>	

### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EQUIPMENT

BUR	John deer Gator	\$15,000	Renew
HAWK	Golf Cart	\$4,300	Renew
BUR	Canoe Van	\$30,000	Renew
Subtotal		<u>\$49,300</u>	

### Report Summary

2016 Project Requests Not Funded	\$428,000
2016 Equipment Requests Not Funded	\$49,300
2017-2021 Projects	\$1,421,500
2017-2021 Equipment	<u>\$898,500</u>
	\$2,797,300

## 2017-2021 PROJECT PLANNING BUDGET

### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

PARK	ITEM	COST	NEW/REPLACE
BUR	Accessible Loop Trail	\$150,000	New
LL	Accessible Loop Trail - LLN	\$150,000	New
All Parks	ADA Beach / Swim Chairs (3)	\$6,000	New
LL	Band Shell Roof - LLS	\$20,000	Replace
HAWK	Beach Irrigation	\$10,000	New
HAWK	Boardwalk Repair	\$5,000	Replace
HAWK	Boardwalk Replacement	\$5,000	Replace
BUR	Boat and equipment replacement	\$2,500	Replace
HAWK	Boat Rental - Hawk	\$5,000	Replace
LL	Boat Rental Roof - LLS	\$4,000	Replace
BUR	Construct ski rental building	\$26,000	New
LL	Chip & Seal Parking Lots	\$50,000	New
HAWK	Construct Cabanas (2)	\$30,000	New
BUR	Disc golf master map	\$1,500	New
HAWK	Dog Park Bridge	\$50,000	New
LL	Dog Park Fence - LLN	\$60,000	New
HAWK	Dog Park Sidewalk	\$15,000	New
HAWK	Drinking Fountains	\$15,000	Replace
LL	Drinking Fountains	\$15,000	Replace
BUR	Drinking Fountains	\$15,000	Replace
LL	Gate House Roof - LLS & LLN	\$2,000	Replace
HAWK	Gatehouse & Snow Lift Roof - Hawk	\$2,000	Replace
HAWK	Grills & Tables	\$6,000	Replace
LL	Grills & Tables	\$6,000	Replace
BUR	Grills & Tables	\$6,000	Replace
HAWK	Kayaks	\$4,000	Replace
BUR	Canoes & Kayaks	\$6,000	Replace
HAWK	Kestrel Roof	\$5,000	Replace
BUR	Kiosk Sign at Winter Sports Building	\$1,000	Replace
LL	Lakefront Boardwalk/Gazebo	\$75,000	New
LL	Lakeview Shelter Roof - LLS	\$5,000	Replace
LL	Land Acquisition Match - LLS	\$60,000	New
HAWK	Magic Carpet	\$150,000	New
LL	Maintenance Building Roof - LLS	\$15,000	Replace
BUR	MDOT road signage	\$2,000	New

2017-2021 PROJECT PLANNING BUDGET

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS			
PARK	ITEM	COST	NEW/REPLACE
LL	Oak Knoll Shelter Roof - LLN	\$5,000	Replace
HAWK	Path Sealcoat	\$8,500	Replace
HAWK	Path-Concessions to Trail	\$10,000	New
HAWK	Pathway Sealcoat	\$10,000	Replace
BUR	Pave/Chip Seal Parking/Roadway Burch	\$100,000	New
LL	(cost increased \$45K with kayak/canoe)	\$100,000	Replace / NEW
LL	Row Boats	\$3,000	Replace
HAWK	Row Boats	\$3,000	Replace
BUR	Pedal boats (4)	\$10,000	Replace
HAWK	Pedal Boats (4)	\$10,000	Replace
LL	Pedal Boats (4)	\$10,000	Replace
HAWK	Peregrine Roof	\$10,000	Replace
BUR	Pine Knoll Roof - Burch	\$5,000	Replace
HAWK	Restroom Stall Dividers	\$20,000	Replace
HAWK	River Overlook Dock	\$5,000	New
BUR	Road Gravel	\$10,000	Replace
LL	Road Gravel	\$10,000	Replace
LL	Snell Restroom Roof - LLN	\$6,000	Replace
HAWK	Snow Tubes	\$8,000	Replace
BUR	Snow Tubes - 25	\$3,000	Replace
BUR	South Ridge Shelter Roof - Burch	\$5,000	Replace
HAWK	Splash Pad - Pump & Features	\$5,000	Replace
HAWK	Splash Pad Filter & Pump	\$12,000	Replace
HAWK	Stamped Kiosk Concrete	\$3,000	Replace
LL	Trail Boardwalk - LLN	\$50,000	Replace
BUR	Winter Sport Building Roof - Burch	\$20,000	Replace
		\$1,421,500	

## 2017-2021 EQUIPMENT PLANNING BUDGET

### VEHICLES / EQUIPMENT

PARK	ITEM	COST	NEW/REPLACE
All Parks	Back Hoe	\$110,000	New
LL	Blower	\$7,500	New
LL	Dodge Pick Up #676	\$30,000	Replace
HAWK	Dump Truck - Replace w/pick up	\$45,000	Replace
HAWK	Exmark	\$16,000	Replace
HAWK	Exmark	\$16,000	Replace
LL	Exmark #595	\$16,000	Replace
BUR	Exmark #696	\$16,000	Replace
HAWK	Exmark 798	\$16,000	Replace
BUR	GMC Pick Up #670	\$30,000	Replace
HAWK	GMC Pick Up #776	\$30,000	Replace
LL	GMC Pick Up #571 (Dump)	\$45,000	Replace
LL	GMC Pick UP #572	\$30,000	Replace
BUR	GMC Pick UP Mechanic #673	\$30,000	Replace
BUR	Golf Cart	\$5,000	New
HAWK	Golf Cart (2)	\$10,000	Replace
BUR	JD 4310 #693	\$40,000	Replace
LL	JD 4720 #590	\$50,000	Replace
HAWK	JD 4720 w/ bucket	\$50,000	Replace
HAWK	JD3320 w/broom	\$40,000	Replace
LL	John Deer Gator #K2	\$18,000	Replace
HAWK	Mechanic Truck	\$35,000	Replace
HAWK	Pick up 773	\$24,000	Replace
HAWK	Portable Power Washer	\$6,200	Replace
BUR	Scag #799	\$15,000	Replace
HAWK	Sign machine	\$7,000	Replace
LL	Skag #598	\$16,000	Replace
All Parks	Skid Steer + attachments	\$85,000	New
HAWK	Snow Brush	\$4,000	Replace
HAWK	Snow Thrower	\$4,000	Replace
BUR	Snowmobile	\$10,000	Replace
All Parks	Wood Chipper	\$40,000	New
HAWK	York Rake	\$1,800	Replace
		<hr/>	
		\$898,500	

