

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 MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2016 AT 5:00 P.M. IN CONFERENCE ROOM A, HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of the [February 4, 2016](#) Minutes

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

Communications

A. [Tri-County Bicycle Association](#)

Discussion/Action Items:

1. Application and Review Process
 - a. [Mannik Smith Edits](#) to the Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report
2. [Bridges](#), New Construction and Matching Dollars
3. Special Projects and Blue Ways
4. New Position to Assist with Millage Implementation and Administration and Other Duties as Assigned
5. Trails & Parks Task Force Recommendation Resolution to the Board of County Commissioners

Announcements

Public Comment

Adjournment

TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE
February 4, 2016
Minutes - Draft

Members Present: Anthony, Banas, Case-Naeyaert, Koenig Maiville, Nolan, Tennis (Departed at 5:59 p.m. and Returned at 7:53 p.m.), and Tsernoglou (Departed at 7:50)

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Commissioner Hope, Tim Morgan, Jared Cypher, Brian Collins, Lucie Fortin, Nancy Krupiarz, Laura Tschirhart, LuAnn Maisner, Leonard Provencher, Michael Unsworthy, Matthew Bennett, Bob Lovell, Alice Florida, Matt Mikocajczyk, Mike Waltz, Elaine Ferris, Henry Rojas, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Banas at 5:07 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 and December 10, 2015 Meeting Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVLLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NOLAN, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 19, 2015 TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE MINUTES.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. BANAS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 10, 2015 TRAILS AND PARKS TASK FORCE MINUTES.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

Leonard Provencher, Meridian Township Residence, addressed the Task Force regarding connectivity in the trails.

Mike Untsworthy, Representative from the Tri-County Bicyclist Association, addressed the Task Force regarding the Association's objection to 22% of the millage money being used on parks.

Matt Bennett, Vice Chair of the Ingham County Parks Commission, presented a resolution asking the Task Force to reconsider several decisions made at the December 10, 2015 meeting.

Bob Lovell, a resident of Meridian Township, expressed concern regarding the use of millage dollars on parks.

Lou Ann Maisner, Meridian Township Parks and Recreation Director, addressed the Task Force regarding the proposed trail connection between Michigan State University and Lake Lansing South.

Ralph Monsma, Parks Commission member, addressed the Task Force regarding connectivity with Okemos and the lack of millage dollars being used on parks.

1. Park Commission Correspondence and discussion of set aside for deferred projects within Ingham County Parks

Tim Morgan, Ingham County Parks and Recreation Director, reviewed the composition of the set-aside.

Chairperson Banas asked what the 5% amounted to each year.

Mr. Morgan answered \$170,000 annually.

Commissioner Koenig stated that county parks were always a part of the millage.

Commissioner Anthony asked if the allocation percentage was passed to ensure that parks would receive some percentage.

Chairperson Banas answered that the Task Force moved to allocate 5% to make sure that there were dollars for county park improvements such as the interior park loop trail.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that the Parks Commission always intended for the millage to include the parks. She further stated that she felt 20% was a reasonable amount for county parks with 80% going towards the trails. She stated that parks had been carried through the entire process.

Commissioner Nolan stated that there was a motion made at the December 10, 2015 meeting to give the parks 5% of the annual millage. She further stated that while considering the letter, the Task Force already acted on what the letter was asking. She suggested moving forward and reconsidering it on an annual basis.

Commissioner Maiville stated that the 5% was based on numbers given for budget reduction and that it was to fund money that was cut. He expressed concern over which numbers were the correct numbers.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that the Task Force already had discussion on the allocation of the 5% and that she was still in favor of that allocation.

Chairperson Banas stated that the discussion was put onto the agenda because there were updated numbers.

Mr. Morgan stated that the documents which the movement was based off of included “to be determined” numbers and that the new document included actual estimates.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she thought it would be more than 5% because of the cuts to the parks budget. She further stated that the money allocated would be used to catch up on 8 years of deferred maintenance and that the allocation could be determined on a year by year basis.

Commissioner Nolan stated that several decisions had already been made by the Task Force, and that she would be happy to reevaluate the parks budget for the next year.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that a majority of county parks were eliminated from the Parks budget when it was reduced. She further stated that the Task Force would never move forward if decisions were consistently revisited.

Commissioner Anthony asked for clarification on whether the 5% was the minimum and whether further money could be allocated to it.

Jared Cypher, Chief Deputy Controller, recommended that the 5% be for 2016 and that the parks do a CIP list for future years so that the 5% could be folded into the budget.

Commissioner Anthony asked if it was the intention of the motion for the percentage to remain for the duration of the millage.

Chairperson Banas stated that the motion did not say.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that she felt the allocation was too low. She further stated that she would like to amend the percentage because parks were a part of the millage and the people were promised millage dollars. She stated that if she had been at the December 10, 2015 meeting, she would have advocated for a much larger percentage.

Chairperson Banas stated that since looking at the more completed list, she would be in favor of moving up the percentage to 10%. She further stated that since parks projects were more shovel ready than trails, communities could see millage dollars put to use sooner.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he did not give voters the impression that parks were getting too much money from a trails millage. He further stated that he would be for improving the parks through the general fund, but wanted to be careful about using millage dollars.

Chairperson Banas stated that per the previous discussion, county parks could apply for grant funding.

2. Reviewing survey responses from Task Force members

Mr. Morgan provided a summary on the survey responses of the Task Force.

Nancy Krupiarz, Mannik Smith Group, reviewed the survey responses from Task Force members.

Commissioner Koenig stated that what the public thought was the most important.

Commissioner Maiville stated that although what the public thought was important, the Commissioners were the ones that needed to make the decisions. He further stated that the Commissioners' top choices were not going to be too far off from the public's opinion.

There was a discussion regarding the survey responses from Task Force members and the survey responses of the general public.

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

Commissioner Tennis departed at 5:59 p.m.

Lucie Fortin, Mannik Smith, reviewed the comprehensive trails and parks report.

Chairperson Banas reviewed the Existing Trail Pavement Assessment for members of the general public.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that some parts of the trail could not go any wider based on where they were. She further stated that the dollar amount did not actually reflect the cost to extend it.

Commissioner Nolan stated that it was shocking to see 84 projects cost \$900,000 to meet the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards. She asked for clarification regarding what potential, additional costs there were.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert clarified that it would cost money to obtain the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) permits, to pay for remediation, and to put the trail in.

Commissioner Anthony stated that she wanted to hear from Mannik & Smith's engineer.

Matt Mikocajczyk, Civil and Structural Engineer for Mannik & Smith, stated that there was a column that included contingencies. He further stated that many costs were unforeseen and could not be accounted for during an inspection and that a scoping project could be done to get more definite costs.

Chairperson Banas announced that the report was available online.

Commissioner Koenig asked what the advantages of widening a trail were.

Ms. Fortin answered that the use of the trails should guide the width.

Ms. Krupiarz answered that leverage for federal funding could be an advantage.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that some communities maintain their own trails.

Chairperson Banas stated that the comprehensive report was a good starting point and asked staff how the information would be used.

Mr. Cypher stated that the charts would be used as a guide for the County to learn where the issues are. He further stated that communities would apply to have these projects fixed by submitting an application.

Chairperson Banas stated that the County's role was to encourage and engage communities to help improve their trails. She further stated that the County was not responsible for trails built by local communities and that the County would be working as partners with local communities.

Commissioner Tsernoglou suggested that the Task Force issue a statement that the repairs would be a funding priority if applied for.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that there needed some balancing because some trails had easements that could not change.

Commissioner Anthony asked if there were common themes in what people asked for versus what the Task Force said needed work.

Ms. Fortin stated that common themes were identified in the report.

Commissioner Anthony stated that part of the project was about setting a vision for what to fund. She asked if some projects could be given preference when reviewing the applications.

Chairperson Banas stated that the current discussion was regarding inventory and that the process for funding would be discussed later in the meeting.

Commissioner Nolan stated that the most exciting part of the report was that the total estimated cost to bring the trails up to AASHTO standards was \$900,000.

Ms. Fortin clarified that the areas on the graph were segments, and that each segment did not have to be one project

Commissioner Maiville stated that the list was a great inventory, but that he hoped the focus would be on the PASER rating.

Chairperson Banas stated that they could be prioritized.

Ms. Fortin provided an overview of the “Bridges” portion of the Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report.

Mr. Mikocajczyk reviewed his inspection report on the trail bridges.

Commissioner Nolan asked how many of the bridges qualified as Act 51 bridges.

Mr. Mikocajczyk answered none.

Ms. Fortin stated that it would not be a useful source of funding.

Mr. Mikocajczyk stated that most of the time the money was used for widening a roadway as opposed to a separate, non-motorized bridge.

Chairperson Banas asked what was found in regards to the condition of the bridges.

Mr. Mikocajczyk answered that very few were considered “new” or “very good,” but many were in “fair” condition.

Chairperson Banas asked where the rating was on the first inventory table.

Ms. Fortin answered that it was not included.

Mr. Mikocajczyk answered that it would be in the appendix of the final report.

Commissioner Koenig asked if any bridges had already been repaired. She stated that the Task Force received a list of bridges that needed urgent repair and was wondering if any could be removed from the list.

There was discussion regarding the timing of the inventory and the list of bridges needing urgent repair.

Ms. Fortin stated that the bridges were inventoried in August/September of 2015.

4. Presentation by Mannik Smith for “Millage Allocation and Criteria for Project Evaluation”

Chairperson Banas stated that the project had never been done in Michigan before and that there was no template to work from.

Ms. Fortin reviewed the “Millage Allocation and Criteria for Project Evaluation” section of the Trails and Parks Comprehensive report.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she was not as interested in new construction until things were repaired. She further stated that the priority at the beginning might need to be repairs, but might eventually change depending on what is needed.

Commissioner Nolan stated that since this was a 6 year millage, people would be looking for new trails. She further stated that the trails will take several years to build. She stated that she felt both should be pursued at the same time.

Commissioner Anthony stated that she would be in favor of decision one.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she was in favor of decision one. She further stated that the likelihood of new construction was not high because communities would need to submit their project plans and have them approved before April 1 to get matching dollars.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that the communities that wanted to build new trails may not have been through any sort of formal process.

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM.CASE-NAEYAERT, TO NOT ALLOCATE A SPECIFIC PERCENTAGE TO DISTRIBUTE THE MILLAGE FUNDS.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis.

Ms. Krupiarz addressed the Task Force regarding community involvement in the maintenance of the trails.

Commissioner Anthony stated that community involvement of maintenance being part of the discussion was smart. She further stated that the project evaluation criteria was a good summation of what the Task Force had been discussing and suggested that the Task Force make some action with it.

Chairperson Banas stated she wanted to move towards creating a resolution and that the resolution would include a plan that contained the project evaluation criteria. She further stated that the resolution would include previous movements made by the Task Force.

Mr. Cypher stated that the only way a motion would be in order would be to change or amend the document.

Commissioner Anthony asked if the document would be adopted if no changes were made on it.

Mr. Cypher answered that it would go to County Services and Finance where it would be adopted as is.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she would like to hire somebody for the Parks and Recreation Department to work with the millage. She further stated that they could help write the April 1st DNR grants, organize communities to improve their trails, and they could be an expert on matching dollars. She suggested using a portion of the millage to hire them.

Commissioner Hope asked if the average basic annual cost of maintaining a trail included all three types of maintenance.

Ms. Krupiarz answered that it might be routine and long-term, but not rehab. She further stated that it depended on the trail and where it was located and that it was difficult to get an exact number.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that a specialist writing grants might be able to help smaller communities.

Commissioner Koenig stated that there were two main grants types.

There was a discussion regarding the availability of grants.

Ms. Fortin stated that a list of available grants was in the report.

Chairperson Banas stated that sometimes professionals were needed to help people make requests. She asked Mr. Morgan what services an additional staff person could provide.

Mr. Morgan stated that since he started as Parks Director, the millage had taken up most of his time, so he did not have a comprehensive view of the Parks and Recreation Department without the millage. He further stated that writing grants took a lot of time and that he did not know how an extra staff person could be implemented.

Mr. Cypher suggested coming up with a job description.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that she supported the suggestion to come up with a job description.

Mr. Morgan stated that an assistant Parks and Recreation manager position was cut several years ago and that the position entailed writing for grants.

Commissioner Anthony stated that she supported the hiring of another staff person that could maintain a relationship with both the Parks and Recreation Department and local municipalities.

**MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. ANTHONY, TO RECOMMEND
HIRING A STAFF PERSON THAT WOULD BE SPECIFICALLY ASSIGNED TO THE
TRAILS AND PARKS MILLAGE.**

Commissioner Koenig expressed concern over the amount of money that would need to be spent on a full time position and stated that she would probably vote no.

Commissioner Maiville stated that the position might not need to be full time.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that individuals hired to write grants would get their position funded from the grants.

There was a discussion regarding the job description.

The motion was amended as follows:

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. ANTHONY, TO ASK STAFF TO DEVELOP A JOB DESCRIPTION FOR A PERSON WHO WOULD SPECIFICALLY WORK ON THE TRAILS AND PARKS MILLAGE AND OTHER DUTIES AS ASSIGNED.

This was considered a friendly amendment.

THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED. **Yeas:** Anthony, Banas, Case-Naeyaert, Maiville, Nolan, and Tsernoglou **Nays:** Koenig **Absent:** Tennis

Ms. Fortin reviewed the Trails and Parks Program Application.

Commissioner Hope asked if the application was designed to be geared towards new trails instead of rehab and reconstruction.

Ms. Fortin answered that the application could be used as a model to prioritize projects.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that she thought the application was good regarding new construction, but it needed some modifications to accommodate trail rehab.

Chairperson Banas stated that one application was fine as long as it was modified to sound inclusive.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she wanted the application to specifically state that the trails would be wheelchair accessible.

Ms. Fortin stated that the language was in the application under the “Design” portion, but that it could be changed.

There was a discussion regarding the language of the application.

Mr. Morgan suggested changing it to “Meets or exceeds ADA accessibility.” He asked the Task Force if they wanted the application to include the prerequisite that only governmental entities would be able to apply.

Mr. Cypher suggested making a motion to include all suggestions to the application.

Mr. Morgan suggested also adding that reimbursement would be provided upon completion of work.

There was a discussion regarding the suggestions.

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CASE-NAEYAERT, TO ADOPT THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: ONE, INSURING THE ACCESSIBILITY

COMMENTS THAT COMMISSIONER NOLAN STATED, TWO, THAT LANGUAGE BE ADDED UNDER THE APPLICATION PROCESS REGARDING GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES ARE ONLY ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THESE FUNDS, AND THREE REGARDING THE REIMBURSEMENT UPON COMPLETION OF WORK.

Commissioner Koenig asked if communities would be required to maintain the trails.

There was a discussion regarding maintenance of the trails.

Chairperson Banas stated that it would be part of the application process.

Commissioner Case-Naeyaert stated that if somebody had a project that related to long term maintenance, then it was something they could apply for.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis.

Commissioner Tsernoglou departed at 7:50.

Chairperson Banas stated that a number of motions were made, but no action was taken on the identified trail repairs.

There was discussion regarding the identified trail repair segments.

Commissioner Tennis returned at 7:53.

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. BANAS, FOR ALL 84 PROJECTS 1-7 TO BE AVAILABLE FOR GRANT APPLICATIONS IMMEDIATELY.

Commissioner Anthony asked if a project could be available for funding if it were not on the list.

There was a discussion regarding the status of the next meeting.

Commissioner Anthony asked if the motion disqualified projects not on the list from receiving funding during the current year.

Several Task Force members answered that it would not.

Commissioner Anthony asked that the minutes reflect that preference was given to the 84 projects with a PACER score of 1-7.

There was a discussion regarding the wording of the motion.

Commissioner Maiville stated that the list would not be moved as projects.

Chairperson Banas clarified that they were "segments."

Mr. Cypher asked if it was the intent of the Task Force to send the motion to the Board ahead of the approval of the report.

Chairperson Banas stated that it should arrive at the same time.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tsernoglou.

Public Comment

Mr. Provencher addressed the Task Force regarding the width of trails, and their safety and durability.

Ms. Maisner addressed the Task Force regarding the hiring of an individual to help with the millage.

Mr. Bennett expressed disappointed over the Task Force not revisiting the parks allocation. He asked if the motion to not assign a specific percentage allocation nullified the 5% the parks would be getting.

Commissioner Anthony answered that it did not.

Chairperson Banas stated that the 2015 millage dollars had been collected, and in 2016 the allocation of 5% would add up to \$170,000 a year.

Mayor Mike Waltz of Mason addressed the committee regarding Mason's need for trail connectivity.

Mr. Lovell, resident of Meridian Township, expressed concern over the amount of money not being spent on trail connectivity.

Elaine Ferris, City of Mason resident, addressed the committee regarding the cost of projects.

Announcements

Commissioner Nolan thanked Mannik & Smith for the comprehensive report. She stated that it felt like a conflict of interest when they held meetings outside the process.

Chairperson Banas announced that the next Task Force meeting would be March 7, 2016. She thanked everyone for their attendance, the Task Force members for their work, and Mannik & Smith for their report. She stated that new trails needed to be built in tandem with repairs to existing trails.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.



TRI-COUNTY BICYCLE ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 22146

Lansing, Michigan 48909-2146

February 2, 2016

Ms. Teri Banas, Chairperson
Ingham County Trails and Parks Task Force
5303 S. Cedar
Lansing, MI 48910

Dear Ms. Banas:

We recommend the Trails and Parks Task Force reject the Ingham County Parks & Recreation Commission's recommendation that 22% of the Countywide System of Trails and Parks Millage be used for capital improvements and operations of the current Ingham County parks. We recommend the current 5% use for administration of the millage be retained.

The millage language states, "For the purpose of creating and maintaining a countywide system of recreational trails and adjacent parks trail system..." Three of the four Ingham County parks neither have trails nor are "adjacent" to a trail. Consequently, do not currently appear to be eligible for funding under the millage.

Ingham County voters approved the millage with the expectation that it would be used for trails and trail connected parks. While the items requested for funding under the Commission's request may be needed, they are not for the most part, what voters envisioned when the millage issue was adopted.

We welcome the opportunity to continue this discussion with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick S. Kelley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "P" and "K".

Patrick S. Kelley
President

Cc Mike Unsworth



MEMO

To: Tim Morgan
Ingham County Parks

From: Lucie Fortin, AICP, LLA
The Mannik and Smith Group

CC: Jared Cypher, Township Supervisor

Date: February 29, 2016

Project #: I1140002

Re: **Ingham County Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report**

As you requested via email (dated 2-26-2016), we have made some revisions to the January 27th draft report. The following is a list of the changes we made:

1. The draft report date was updated to February 29, 2016.
2. The Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Tables and the Executive Summary were revised as needed to reflect the changes.
3. Table 6, Bridge Ratings was added (inserted before p. 55 of January 27, 2016 draft).
4. The decision to allocate 5% of the millage fund to Ingham County Parks for years 2015 and 2016 was added as well as the decision not to allocate a specific percentage of the millage fund to the other categories as follows: "The Task Force decided not to allocate a specific percent to distribute the millage funds at their February 4th, 2016 meeting." (p. 107 of January 27, 2016 draft).
5. The following language was added: "- projects must meet or exceed the minimum accessibility requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)" (p. 110 of January 27, 2016 draft).
6. A bullet point, "Must be a governmental entity," was added and language stating "and trail related non-profit organizations" was strikedthrough/removed (p. 111 of January 27, 2016 draft).
7. Language stating: "- reimbursement upon completion of work and only after successful review by Ingham County" was added to bullet 7, p. 111 of January 27, 2016 draft.
8. The sample Trails and Parks Program Application was revised to reflect the above changes and various other minor edits (underlined) to make it clear that the application is for repair, rehabilitation and long-term maintenance as well as for new trails. (pp.112 – 115 of January 27, 2016 draft).

Based on comments received at the February 4th Task Force meeting, we are in the process of reviewing the existing trail pavement repair costs (Table 3, pp. 45-48) to clarify any possible issues and will be sending added language and/or tables before the end of the week.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions,

Lucie Fortin

RECOMMENDATIONS

The development of criteria to identify and rank trail projects was, as asked for in the Request for Proposals, a key component of the current work. In addition, making recommendations for spending allocations as well as for an application process to rank and score projects were also an integral part of the scope of the current work effort.

Millage Allocation Categories

The Ingham County Trails and Parks Task Force has determined and defined broad project categories eligible for millage fund expenditures. They include and are defined as follows:

1. **New Construction** – This would involve the construction of new trails and trail gaps where none currently exist.
2. **Repairs, Rehabilitation, Long-Term Maintenance** – This would involve the repair, replacement or re-construction of an existing trail infrastructure to bring it up to acceptable safety or design standards. Long-term maintenance is also included in this category and defined as that which extends the life of a trail “preserving a trail to optimal standards while excluding activities such as snow and trash removal, and grass mowing.” (Task Force Meeting of December 10, 2015). Routine maintenance or the everyday upkeep of a trail which would include tasks such as mowing, trash pick-up, leaf/debris blowing, dead limb removal, herbicide spraying or restroom cleaning are activities that are intentionally excluded from millage expenditures.
3. **County Parks** – This would involve funding for Ingham County Parks facility repairs, upgrades and improvements that have been deferred due to previous years’ lack of funding.
4. **Special Projects** – This would involve awarding planning grants to rural and/or smaller municipalities or small contributions to help local units of government fund projects. It could also include supporting region-wide projects such as wayfinding, trail user studies, trail town initiatives, adopt-a-trail programs, etc.

It is recognized that trail and funding needs vary between local communities and will change over time. It is clear that, at this time, the older existing trails located in the cities of Lansing and East Lansing require repairs and rehabilitation while the adjacent suburban and rural communities are mostly in need of new trail development and connections. As new trails are built and older existing trails are brought to acceptable standards, the focus will shift to long-term maintenance of the regional trail system. For this reason and because the County cannot predict which projects will be submitted, setting allocation percentages between these categories or maximum funding requests may be arbitrary and unnecessary.

The Trails and Parks Task Force has, however, decided to set aside and reserve five percent of the millage funds to Ingham County Parks for years 2015 and 2016 to fund park facility repairs and upgrades that have been deferred. This was decided at the February 4, 2016 Task Force meeting. The Task Force also expressed the desire that priorities for millage expenditures go for repair, reconstruction and new construction, which will likely capture the most expensive projects. In conclusion, we offer the following two options for millage allocation with a strong preference for the first option:

1. Not allocating specific percentages to the allocation categories and use, instead, the criteria to evaluate and select projects and ensure a fair distribution of the millage funds; or
2. Allocating general range of percentages (which could vary from year to year) as follows: 30 to 45 percent for new construction; 30 to 45 percent for repairs, rehabilitation and long-term maintenance; five to 10 percent for County Parks; and 10 to 15 percent for special projects.

The Task Force decided not to allocate a specific percent to distribute the millage funds at their February 4th, 2016 meeting.

Trail Maintenance

Trail maintenance is a multi-faceted and costly responsibility. As such, the responsibilities for it can be tackled through a few different systems to ensure the ongoing optimal standards are met for safety, enjoyment, and preservation of the asset. Examples of maintenance options are provided in the Appendix to the report.

The County Task Force recommended that only long-term trail maintenance and trail rehabilitation would be eligible for millage funding. Further, it was decided that routine maintenance will be the responsibility of the trail owner. Therefore, evidence of handling routine maintenance should be a prerequisite to obtaining millage money to help with long-term maintenance so the trail meets optimal standards.

An intergovernmental trails council with representation from county and local government entities, can be organized according to the Urban Cooperation Act, Public Act 67 of 1967, to provide for an overall cooperative approach to trail maintenance. The council would first work together to establish a countywide set of standards for both routine and long-term trail maintenance. Partners could learn from each other in evaluating their maintenance budget needs and troubleshooting issues. They could take advantage of economy of scale pricing for contractual projects, and strategize to add new partnerships and fundraising mechanisms to the mix. A portion of the millage for long-term trail maintenance could be set-aside by the County and increased as fundraising strategies take effect. More on intergovernmental trails councils can be found in the Appendix to this report.

The regional trails and parks system needs intergovernmental cooperation, but the establishment of a robust nonprofit organization could also enhance trail maintenance, as well as raise the profile of the regional trails and parks system overall. As was revealed in the public input process, people are excited and willing to get engaged in the trail system, especially through hands-on trails maintenance. Adopt-a-trail programs can generate this type of public engagement and also attract the involvement of local businesses. The County millage, together with other grants and donations could help to seed funding for the establishment of a nonprofit organization that would organize and run an adopt-a-trail program for the regional system. Programs, such as the one established by the Traverse City's TART organization, can provide for maintenance in areas where there is insufficient budget or personnel to operate trails on a daily basis, but also match people to trails where they live or have a special desire to help. A description of TART's approach to trail maintenance is provided in the Appendix. As has been seen around the state, a nonprofit organization established for the regional trails and parks can lay the foundation for all sorts of ideas for events, programs and projects that engage the community, thereby improving the level of maintenance, awareness about and enjoyment of the system, and thus, generating the revenue that enhances the overall trails and parks network.

3. **Meets or Exceeds Design Standards and Is the Best Design Solution:** Projects should be able to meet minimum design standards and all other design alternatives should be considered. To determine whether a project meets minimum design standards and is the best option, a project should address the following:

- Is physically separated from streets and roadways where possible;
- Provides a variety of experiences that can be enjoyed by a diversity of users, including people of all ages and abilities – projects must meet or exceed the minimum accessibility requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA);
- Design alternatives to the project have been examined to minimize impact on the environment;
- Meets minimum standards for grade, width, vertical clearance, intersection and crossing design; and
- Considers low impact development techniques that protect and enhance significant natural features.

4. **Is Feasible and Ready for Development:** Projects that are feasible and ready to implement should receive high priority. To determine whether a project is ready and feasible, the project should address the following:

- Is under public ownership or is currently accessible for public use;
- Does not require complex or lengthy acquisition process;
- Does not require a complex or lengthy permitting process;
- Is within an existing corridor such as a transmission lines and railroad corridor where it may be feasible to negotiate public access without needing to acquire land;
- There is an imminent threat to lose the project opportunity;
- Demonstrates cost efficiency, is appropriate and in line with available funds; and
- Provides a realistic maintenance plan along with costs.

5. **Supports Equitable Opportunities:** Projects that improve equity should be given a high priority. A project that demonstrates equity should address the following:

- Increases access and provides low cost transportation and recreation options for low income populations;
- Is located in a high use area;
- Is located in an underserved area; and
- Contributes to an equitable geographical distribution of the millage funds.

6. **Has Potential Available Funds:** Projects that have the potential to be funded through state or federal grants, donations, partner contributions or other funding sources should receive higher priority than projects without other identified funding opportunities. To determine whether a project has leveraged potential available funds, a project should address the following:

- Has funding available through grants or partner contributions;
- Has funding available through donations or in-kind services; and
- Has funding available through local community match.

7. Maintenance Commitment

Describe the degree of commitment to continue operation and maintenance of the project. Include an operation and maintenance plan detailing the amount of money needed to operate and maintain the trail after it is completed and identify who will be responsible for the work. Describe in detail

how the trail will be managed. Include discussion on season length, hours of operation, limitation on use, enforcement provisions, and scheduling.

-Recipients must be willing to commit to continue the maintenance and operation of the project and provide a realistic operation and maintenance plan/budget (show letter or commitment for funding); and

-This criteria may be fulfilled in cases where applicants demonstrate innovative measures for trail maintenance, such as adopt-a-trail programs supported by volunteer organizations under a non-profit status.

- 7 8. **Other Considerations:** Other project information not mentioned above may be provided for consideration.

Application Process

We recommend an application process similar to the existing Ingham County Open Space Preservation Program application. ~~Any~~ Only Ingham County municipalities ~~and trail related non-profit organizations~~ would be eligible to apply for the Ingham County Trails and Parks program by a yearly deadline with the first year set for a 2016 date to be set as soon as possible. The trail development projects would have to demonstrate a direct benefit to Ingham County residents.

We suggest the following project requirements:

- Must be a governmental entity;
- Must demonstrate a direct benefit to Ingham County residents;
- Must be a project that is in line with the broad categories established by the Trails and Parks Task Force of (1) new construction; (2) repairs, rehabilitation and long-term maintenance; or is a (3) special project;
- Cannot be allocated for administrative, operational or other similar uses;
- Must include a plan for future and/or ongoing funding to maintain the project; and
- Once complete, must display a recognition plaque on site provided by the County.

Acting in an advisory capacity to the County Board of Commissioners under the guidance of County Parks staff, the County Parks and Recreation Commission, as was mentioned in the Request for Proposals, would review and evaluate the submitted applications and make a final recommendation to the County Board of Commissioners for millage fund appropriations within a prescribed timeframe. The evaluation process could include the following steps:

1. Application submittal including completed application packet and local municipality resolution approving the application and any local share;
2. County Parks and Recreation Commission meets and reviews each application using the recommended scoring criteria mentioned previously;
3. County Parks staff tallies and calculates the project final scores;
4. Parks and Recreation Commission meets and discuss final scores as well as budgetary considerations and makes final recommendations;
5. Recommendations are presented to County Board of Commissioners for review and final approval;
6. Recipients are announced and municipalities enter into a legal contract with Ingham County; and
7. Municipalities report physical and financial completion to County- reimbursement upon completion of work and only after successful review by Ingham County.

We suggest a simple and short application form, as provided on the next page, which would require applicants to provide:

-
- The applicant's information (name, contact, address, etc.),
 - A brief paragraph description of the project (location, ownership, proposed improvement, etc.),
 - An overview of the project addressing the criteria and other aspects of the project,
 - The detail physical scope of the project,
 - The design, engineering and construction information,
 - Itemization of the project costs and funding, including amounts requested,
 - Future requirements of the project such as maintenance, and
 - The applicant's signature.

In addition to the application form, the Ingham County Parks Millage Fund application packet must include a cover letter, a resolution from all parties involved in the application demonstrating any matching contributions, plans and drawings showing the design of the project, a project location map, and ~~the~~ property boundaries.



Ingham County
Parks and Recreation Commission
P.O. Box 178
121 E. Maple Street, Suite 102
Mason, MI 48854

Trails and Parks Program Application

In November 2014, Ingham County voters approved a 0.5 mill tax millage to support the development of a countywide regional trails and parks system through 2020. The overall goal of the Ingham County Regional Trails and Parks Millage Fund is to create and maintain a **sustainable** countywide system of recreation trails and adjacent parks within Ingham County.

These funds must be matched (**how much? first round different?**) by the local community with their own funds, or in-kind services, or funds obtained from other sources, i.e., state, federal or other allocations. Applications for the County Trails and Parks Program funding must include a **resolution (s) of support** for the project from the governing body (ies) of the community where the Trail Project **or Blueway Project** is proposed. Eligible projects must fit the following categories: **New Construction; Repair, Rehabilitation, or Long-Term Maintenance; and Special Projects.**

Project applications must be received by _____ of each year for funding consideration the following year. Projects deemed worthy of funding will be approved at the _____ Ingham County Board of Commissioner meeting. The following information will be used by Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission in determining and recommending which projects should **be to** funded to the Board of Commissioners.

APPLICANT		
Agency (ies) or Organization(s):		
Lead Contact Person:		
Address:		
City:	State:	ZIP Code:
Phone:	Fax:	Email:
PROJECT SUMMARY		
Project Title		
Project Description (50-words) <i>Provide a brief description of your proposed project. Include, as applicable, the type of project (new construction; repairs/rehabilitation/long-term maintenance; special projects), property ownership and if applicable, the rights in land to be purchased (fee simple, development rights only, etc.), the acreage to be acquired, the acreage/length of the existing project and the features of the site.</i>		

Project Region-Wide Significance and Benefit to County Residents (50 words)

Total Project Costs (Estimated or Projected)

Amount Requested

Other Project Partners and Funders with Amounts

PROJECT INFORMATION & DETAILED DESCRIPTION (as applicable)

1. Discuss how the project is improving regional connectivity.

Your discussion should address how the project provides, supports and relates to the Ingham County regional priority corridors as depicted on Figure 24 either as an existing trail repair/rehabilitation/long-term maintenance reconstruction, new regional trail gap construction or new local trail access to the regional network (including enabling water trail access); improves access to Ingham County Parks; improves access to major regional destinations such as commercial and employment centers as well as community facilities, schools, colleges and universities; expands transportation options as well as provide for recreation; and increases access to sites of natural, scenic or historic interest; and any other related information.

2. Describe how the project responds to public demand and has support. (Attach letters of support)

Your discussion should address how the project is based on public demand; has been prioritized in adopted plans; has volunteer and/or partner organization support; is a community interest project that support partnerships, shared resources or coincide with other planning and development activities; and has the support of multiple jurisdictions and/or stakeholders; and any other related information.

3. Explain how the project meets acceptable design standards and is it the best design solution.

Your description should address how the project is physically separated from streets and roadways where possible; provides a variety of experiences that can be enjoyed by a diversity of users, including people of all ages and abilities; meets or exceeds the minimum accessibility requirements of the ADA; design alternatives to the project have been examined to minimize impact on the environment; meets minimum standards for grade, width, vertical clearance, intersection and crossing design; and considers low impact development techniques that protect and enhance significant natural features; and any other related information.

4. Explain how the project is feasible and ready for development.

Your discussion should address whether your project is under public ownership or is currently accessible for public use; does not require complex or lengthy acquisition process; does not require a complex or lengthy permitting process; is within an existing corridor such as a transmission lines and railroad corridor where it may be feasible to negotiate public access without needing to acquire land; there is an imminent threat to lose the project opportunity; demonstrates cost efficiency, is appropriate and in line with available funds; and provides a realistic maintenance plan along with costs.

5. Discuss how the project supports equitable opportunities.

Your discussion should address how your project increases or improves access and provides low cost transportation and recreation options for low income populations; is located in a high use area; is located in an underserved area; and contributes to an equitable geographical distribution of the millage funds.

6. Describe any other available funders and partners.

Your discussion should address whether your project has funding available through grants or partner contributions; has funding available through donations or in-kind services; and has funding available through local community match.

7. **Maintenance Commitment**

Describe the degree of commitment to continue operation and maintenance of the project. Include an operation and maintenance plan detailing the amount of money needed to operate and maintain the trail after it is completed and identify who will be responsible for the work. Describe in detail how the trail will be managed. Include discussion on season length, hours of operation, limitation on use, enforcement provisions, and scheduling.

8. Other considerations.

Provide other information you feel may be important considerations.

DESIGN/SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

Provide a detailed description of the project you are proposing, with reference to specific scope items. Describe the features of the project and all factors that affected your development design or program. Describe how your design was chosen, and why it is appropriate for the proposed project site. Use this opportunity to explain why you chose the type and placement of particular scope and design elements. Explain how your project design meets or exceeds standards.

ESTIMATED COSTS/BUDGET

Provide each scope/budget item and how the budgeted amount was calculated. List amounts requested from local sources, state or federal grants as well as amounts from foundations, corporations, and other funding sources (in-kind support or other).

EXPENSES

Scope Item	Quantity	Amount
Other Fees (i.e., Permit, Engineering)		
Total Project Expenses		

REVENUES

Local Contribution	
Grant Contributions	
In-Kind Support	
Other	
AMOUNT REQUESTED	

If constructed, how will the project be maintained?

ATTACHMENTS

1. Project Location Map & Photos. *Attach a project location map and site photographs*
2. Site Development Plan. *The site plan must show the entire site to be improved/developed, and should delineate and label the location and type of all existing and proposed uses. Features such as wooded areas, wetlands, water bodies, overhead utility lines, and all existing uses, including buildings and other development, need to be identified. The placement of all scope items proposed in the application should be depicted on the site plan. Indicate on your site development plan the destinations to which the proposed trail project will connect. Provide a map of the trail network (existing or proposed) to which your project will link.*
3. Documentation of Other Funding Sources. *You must provide documentation for (all) some of the funding sources you indicated on your application form, as follows: If any portion of the match is to be made up of funds from other grant funding sources, include a copy of the scope of work and budget provided for in the other grant application. If any portion of the match is to be made up of cash, labor, or material donations; include a letter from each donor committing to their donation. If the donor is an adjacent community contributing to the match, include a resolution from their governing body that supports the application and commits to their portion of the match.*
4. Letters of Support
5. Certified Resolution. *The governing body of the local unit of government must pass a resolution. The resolution should list and commit to the amount of the local match in terms of dollar amount or percentage of total project cost, and all source(s) of match as specified in the application.*

CERTIFICATION

Signature of Applicant:

Date:

Table 6. Bridge Ratings

Structure Number	Decking	Joints	Railing / Curb	Superstructure (Beams)	Paint / Protection	Bearings	Abutment	Pier	Culvert	Channel	Approaches	Signage
CL-01-SCT-SC	8	N/A	8	8	8	8	8	8	N/A	7	8	8
CL-02-PK-SWL	8	N/A	8	8	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	5	8	N/A
CL-03-LTS-SC	6	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	N/A	6	6	N/A
CL-04-LTS-SC	7	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	N/A	7	6	N/A
CL-05-LTS-SC	6	N/A	4	6	5	6	7	N/A	N/A	6	6	5
CL-06-LTS-SC	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	N/A	6	7	N/A
CL-07-LTS-SC	6	7	7	8	8	6	8	N/A	N/A	8	8	N/A
CL-08-LTW-GR	6	4	8	7	7	8	8	7	7	7	6	N/A
CL-09-LTW-GR	4	5	4	5	6	7	4	6	N/A	6	2	N/A
CL-10-LTW-GR	5	5	5	6	6	7	7	7	5	6	6	6
CL-11-LTE-RC	6	7	8	6	5	7	7	N/A	N/A	7	6	N/A
CL-12-LTE-RC	6	N/A	6	7	N/A	N/A	6	4	N/A	5	3	6
CL-13-LTE-RC	5	N/A	4	6	N/A	N/A	7	5	N/A	5	8	N/A
CL-14-LTE-RC	6	5	5	5	4	6	6	5	N/A	6	6	5
CL-15-LTE-SP	6	3	5	5	2	6	7	7	N/A	N/A	5	7
CL-16-LTE-RC	4	6	5	4	5	4	5	5	N/A	6	5	6
CL-17-LTE-RC	6	N/A	6	7	N/A	N/A	5	N/A	N/A	5	4	N/A
CL-18-LTE-RC	5	1	6	3	5	6	8	6	N/A	6	6	5
CL-19-PK-WL	8	N/A	8	8	N/A	N/A	8	8	N/A	7	5	8
CL-20-LTE-RC	6	6	3	5	4	6	7	N/A	N/A	5	5	7
CL-21-LTE-RC	2	1	6	4	4	6	6	6	N/A	6	4	6
CL-22-ELT-RC	6	4	6	7	6	7	7	N/A	N/A	7	7	7
CL-23-LT-GR	7	6	7	6	6	7	7	7	N/A	6	7	N/A
CL-24-LT-GR	6	N/A	4	6	N/A	N/A	6	5	N/A	7	5	N/A
CL-25-LT-GR	6	N/A	4	7	N/A	N/A	7	5	N/A	6	6	N/A
CL-26-LT-GR	4	N/A	6	2	1	4	7	6	N/A	7	6	N/A
CL-27-LTW-GR	8	8	6	7	7	8	8	8	N/A	8	7	N/A
CL-28-LT-GR	6	N/A	6	7	4	6	4	4	N/A	8	7	N/A
CL-29-LT-GR	6	1	3	1	6	N/A	6	4	N/A	5	6	7
CL-30-SCT-GR	7	6	3	6	N/A	?	7	N/A	7	7	6	N/A
CL-31-LT-GR	6	5	5	5	5	6	7	7	N/A	6	6	N/A
CL-32-LT-GR	6	4	5	7	7	7	7	7	N/A	6	4	N/A
CM-01-HAY-SC	7	1	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	6	7	N/A
CM-02-HAY-SC	7	1	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	6	7	N/A
CM-03-HAY-SC	2	N/A	2	2	1	5	7	N/A	N/A	6	1	N/A

Structure Number	Decking	Joints	Railing / Curb	Superstructure (Beams)	Paint / Protection	Bearings	Abutment	Pier	Culvert	Channel	Approaches	Signage
CM-04-HAY-SC	7	8	8	7	8	8	8	N/A	8	6	4	N/A
CW-01-CW-WL	6	N/A	1	6	N/A	N/A	6	6	N/A	7	7	N/A
DT-01-SCT-SC	8	N/A	8	8	8	8	8	N/A	N/A	8	8	8
DT-02-SCT-196	8	N/A	8	8	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	8	8	8
DT-03-SCT-SC	8	N/A	8	8	8	8	8	8	N/A	7	8	8
EL-01-ELT-RC	6	1	5	4	4	5	5	N/A	N/A	7	5	N/A
EL-02-ELT-RC	8	7	6	7	6	6	7	N/A	N/A	7	6	N/A
EL-03-ELT-RC	7	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	N/A
EL-04-NTT-SWL	6	1	1	1	N/A	N/A	6	1	N/A	6	6	N/A
EL-05-NTT-SWL	6	N/A	4	7	7	7	7	N/A	N/A	5	6	N/A
EL-06-NTT-SWL	6	6	4	7	6	6	6	N/A	N/A	7	5	N/A
EL-07-NTT-SWL	6	N/A	6	5	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	7	6	N/A
MT-01-PK-SWL	5	1	1	5	N/A	N/A	7	7	N/A	8	3	N/A
MT-02-MP-DR	6	7	6	7	7	7	7	N/A	N/A	6	6	N/A
MT-03-PK-DR	6	1	3	5	5	7	7	N/A	N/A	6	6	N/A
MT-04-PK-DR	6	N/A	6	6	6	6	7	N/A	N/A	6	4	N/A
MT-05-PK-DR	5	N/A	3	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	5	7	N/A
MT-06-MIP-DR	8	N/A	8	8	7	8	8	N/A	N/A	7	8	N/A
MT-07-MIP-DR	6	N/A	3	3	N/A	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	6	6	N/A
WT-01-WT-RC	3	N/A	3	6	5	6	7	7	N/A	5	3	N/A

N/A: Not applicable