SPECIAL TRAILS AND PARKS COMMITTEE
May 18, 2017
Minutes

Members Present: Sebolt, Maiville, Banas, Grebner, and Nolan (left at 7:12 p.m.)
Members Absent: Naeyaert and Koenig
Others Present: Jonathan Schelke, Sarah Nicholls, John Calvert, Roberta Hamlin, Debbie Groh, Rhiannon Schindewolf-DeShais, Allan Dolley, Molly Howlett, Tanya Moore, Jared Cypher, Liz Kane and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Banas at 6:01 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Chairperson Banas introduced the objective of the Special Trails & Parks Committee in its second year to make improvements on the application process and to better include everyone in the County, including smaller communities.

Approval of the May 8, 2017 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE MAY 8, 2017 SPECIAL TRAILS AND PARKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Naeyaert and Koenig

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

Jonathan Schelke, Parks Commission member, stated he was glad when he saw the trails and parks millage come to fruition, because it was a good opportunity to rebuild and expand the County’s trails system. He further stated that the Parks Commission had done a good job of following their recommendations and guidelines for the program, first fixing bridges, pavement, and fortifying the river trails, and then they added more connections to and expanded County trails.

Mr. Schelke stated now that they were about halfway through the trails and parks millage, the Parks Commission needed to stay their course and keep connecting and expanding the County trails as the competition for the funding increased between the parks and trails projects.
1. **Public Input from Representatives From Smaller Townships And Cities In Ingham County: How Can Ingham County Better Support and Engage Smaller Local Jurisdictions in Participation in the Parks and Trails Millage?**

Debbie Groh, Aurelius Township Treasurer, stated Aurelius Township was one of the few townships that received funding in the second round of applications, and that was only done because she had heard from Commissioner Maiville that their project was not going to be funded, and she fought for the project to be funded. She further stated she had recently attended a Capital Area Treasurers meeting where she encouraged other smaller communities apply for funding, but they were reluctant to participate.

Ms. Groh stated that many treasurers of smaller townships had said applying for the trails and parks millage was not worth it, because they thought their projects would not get chosen over more urban, developed areas’ projects. She further stated that the Parks Commission and the Board of Commissioners needed to compare the amount of money that had been paid by those rural townships, to the amount they had received in funding because 13 out of 16 townships in the County were rural, and they had contributed 20.8% to the millage money.

Ms. Groh stated that the revisions to the application were good ideas, and the smaller townships should fill out the same applications as the larger municipalities, but ways to make the selection more equitable should be taken into consideration when selecting projects. She further stated that she got the feeling at the meeting that the smaller townships felt like they had been forgotten in this process and they were paying for something they were never going to get any money back from.

Ms. Groh stated trails and parks in rural communities could be used by people who lived there for the same types of purposes that they were used for in urban areas, whether that was to connect up with another trail or enjoy a park in their own area. She further stated the Board of Commissioners might need to change the language in their resolution to better accommodate smaller communities.

Ms. Groh stated her suggestions to the Committee included allocating an equitable percentage annually to smaller, more rural townships, based on the amount they contributed to the trails and parks millage. She further suggested that they could allocate funds like the Road Department did, which involved rural townships getting an annual fixed dollar amount that required a 50/50 match in funding, and then the funds could be carried over for two to three years so they could build up their money to pay for projects using the 50/50 matched funds.

Ms. Groh stated they certainly did not want to keep taxpayers interested in participating in the trail and parks projects to be kept out of the loop. She further stated that Tim Morgan, Parks Director, was very helpful in the application process, and she suggested they promote that service better to garner more interest from the smaller communities.

Chairperson Banas stated the reason they invited the smaller communities to their meeting was to discuss how to better involve smaller communities. She further stated in the past, the Committee
had talked about having a directed amount set-aside for communities available, to make the
distribution of funding more equitable across the County.

Commissioner Grebner asked how many people Aurelius Township had on staff.

Ms. Groh stated Aurelius Township had a supervisor, a clerk, a treasurer, a deputy clerk and a
deputy treasurer.

Commissioner Grebner asked if the deputies were full time employees.

Ms. Groh stated they were both part-time employees.

Commissioner Grebner clarified that the township staff consisted of the elected officials and two
people who worked two days a week. He asked if there were any Parks employees employed by
Aurelius Township.

Ms. Groh stated one person maintained and inspected play equipment and restrooms, and one
person who took care of the grounds. She further stated they only had two parks in Aurelius
Township.

Commissioner Grebner stated he was trying to figure out the staffing situations in these smaller
communities, and from what he heard from Ms. Groh, he understood they did not have any
planning staff that was able to prepare projects and applications.

Alan Dolley, Williamston City Manager, stated he had attended meetings about the trails and
parks millage last year, and he suggested in order to get smaller communities involved, they
should have a simpler, smaller application for smaller projects. He further stated that
Williamston had three city parks that served the Northeast part of the County’s residents, and to
have some assistance from the trails and parks millage to maintain those parks would be
beneficial to the City.

Mr. Dolley stated that there was nothing that Williamston could receive funds for, without
undertaking a large project and writing large grants. He further stated another idea would be to
have the communities could supply their parks master plan as part of an application and provide
the cost of maintenance of the parks, and then be reimbursed by the millage money for those
maintenance costs.

Mr. Dolley stated that Williamston was working on a trail plan, and once they figured out more
of the details they would apply for the larger amount of funding. He further stated that in the
meantime, they did not have large projects going on and they did not have the staff to prepare a
large application for the millage money.

Mr. Dolley suggested that the Board of Commissioners could also set aside money for annual
reimbursement based on the percentage of funds they contributed to the millage.
Chairperson Banas asked if Mr. Dolley could envision a plan for a trail that would allow them to connect to other parts of the County, so they could apply for the trails and parks millage funding.

Mr. Dolley asked if this millage was a trails millage, or a trails and parks millage.

Commissioner Grebner stated the millage was for trails and adjacent parks in the County.

Mr. Dolley stated Williamston had walking paths within their parks, and asked if those counted as trails.

Chairperson Banas stated that the initial focus of the millage was to create trails that connected trails across the County. She further stated they were working to better involve smaller communities and it may mean finding ways to support trail developments within a community initially, which could later be connected to the greater trails system.

Commissioner Grebner asked where Williamston’s trail went, and if there was potential to connect with Meridian Township’s trails.

Mr. Dolley stated the trail ran along the Red Cedar River, through downtown Williamston.

Commissioner Grebner asked if it was plausible to extend the trail into Meridian Township.

Mr. Dolley stated Williamston was drawing a conceptual plan for trails that circled the City of Williamston, and that could potentially tie in with county roads to go through Williamstown Township. He further stated he was not a fan of running the trail along the Red Cedar River, and would rather run the trail along through fence lines in farm fields because it was better than getting approval from all of the property owners along the river, and trails would be more direct.

Mr. Dolley stated that it was his understanding that the trails and parks millage serviced trails and County parks, and Williamston serviced a lot of residents of the Northeast part of the County, even though if they did not have County parks. He further stated a lot of what he heard was it was basically impossible for the smaller communities to get any funding, because it would be all given to larger, more urban communities.

Commissioner Sebolt asked, instead of the County reimbursing the city for parks maintenance, if Williamston had ever thought about contracting with the County to have the Parks Department perform the maintenance on their parks. He further stated by having the County take over the service, they could probably pay the County less than what they were currently paying for maintenance, which was valuable when both the County and municipal budgets were struggling.

Chairperson Banas asked if the County would be willing to talk about sharing their services, and if the County had enough staff to take on more parks.

Jared Cypher, Deputy Controller, stated the County had enough staff to maintain their current parks, but Commissioner Sebolt’s idea was worth exploring and Mr. Dolley should speak to Mr. Morgan about that possibility.
Commissioner Nolan stated this may need to go through the Controller, rather than the Parks Director, because there were a lot of fringe benefits provided to County staff, which was not available at a local level. She further stated there needed to be a cost-benefit analysis done before they offered these services.

Mr. Cypher stated that analysis would be done on a staff level and then they would present that information to the Board of Commissioners.

John Calvert, Friends of the Lakelands Trail member, introduced Stockbridge Village Council member Molly Howlett and stated that they had been working to complete the Great Lake-to-Lake Trail initiative across the state. He further stated the trail went from South Haven, through Southeast Ingham County in Stockbridge Township and Stockbridge Village.

Mr. Calvert stated that there was a benefactor for the Great Lake-to-Lake Trail project who had committed $5 million to the statewide project, which would be a great addition to potential trails and parks millage money and then would create potential for more connection from Stockbridge up to the rest of the County trails. He further stated that a connection to the Lakelands Trail would help connect the County to the rest of the state, if the County could help connect the southbound trail from Stockbridge to Jackson.

Mr. Calvert stated the Village of Stockbridge and Stockbridge Township were key connections to the trail, and they would be submitting an application for the trails and parks millage. He further stated he thought Stockbridge Township had never received money from the trails and parks millage, and that part of the trail was still in pretty raw condition.

Commissioner Maiville stated that even though it was already a trail, the Lakeland trail was relatively undeveloped; it was just crushed stone or dirt. He asked how much of the trail went through Ingham County.

Mr. Calvert stated the Lakelands Trail went from Green Oak Township to Jackson.

Commissioner Maiville asked how much of the trail was actually in Ingham County.

Mr. Calvert stated that Stockbridge Township was six miles and Stockbridge Village was one mile, so it was about seven miles of trail in Ingham County.

Commissioner Maiville stated he was familiar with the trail, but he was trying to figure out how much of the trail the County could say they improved for the trails and parks millage. He further stated he had previously mentioned the possibility of connecting to other counties’ trails.

Mr. Calvert stated the Great Lake-to-Lake Trail also provided connection to the Iron Belle Trail. He asked if Lansing had any connections to the Iron Belle Trail already.

Chairperson Banas stated the only connection to the Iron Belle in Ingham County was the trail in Stockbridge. She asked Mr. Culvert if they would be applying for trails and parks millage funds.
Mr. Calvert stated Ms. Howlett was working on the application currently, and the Friends of the Lakelands Trail group had helped other communities with applications previously, so they would help her with the application. He further stated they also worked with the Michigan Trails and Greenways, who provided a lot of assistance for these types of projects.

Chairperson Banas asked if they were seeking other funds to help match the trails and parks millage, because it sounded like they were exploring TAP Grants and local benefactors.

Mr. Calvert stated the group was looking into matching funds, but the $5 million from the benefactor would not go very far when looking at a statewide project. He further stated the Friends of the Lakelands Trail group was trying to figure out where the money was best spent, and if there was money available at the County level, they would pursue that.

Chairperson Banas stated that was true, as one mile of trail was about $1 million.

Commissioner Maiville clarified that estimate was usually for when they had to completely build a trail and pay for the easements and creation of the route.

Discussion.

Tanya Moore, Spicer Group Landscape Architect, stated she would look into the rough cost of paving the trails, but much of it was dependent on drain or road crossings and if there were bridges involved.

Mr. Calvert stated the Stockbridge Village trail was pretty well maintained and there were no bridges in the area, but they were looking at improving the trailhead with the project.

Commissioner Nolan asked how many miles of the Great Lake-to-Lake Trail were in Ingham County.

Mr. Calvert stated there was no less than five miles, but no more than eight miles of the Lakelands Trail was in the County.

Commissioner Nolan stated that sounded like a great project to support, because she had heard good things about the Great Lake-to-Lake Trail, but she was unsure if Ingham County was involved in it.

Chairperson Banas asked Mr. Calvert if his group had looked into the Tri-County funding process, because they had about $2 million in additional federal CMAQ funding for the region after the Bus Rapid Transit project was shelved. She stated that Stockbridge Township and Village should have received a letter calling for projects to potentially be funded under the CMAQ grants.

Ms. Moore clarified that just paving and excavation would cost about $200,000 per mile of trail.
Mr. Calvert stated that in previous parts of the trail, they had gained the support of the equestrians in the community in order to get more funding for the projects, so they had not completely paved the trails yet.

Rhiannon Schindewolf-DeShais, Onondaga Township Treasurer and Park Board member, stated that Onondaga had acquired Baldwin Park from the County in the past few years. She further stated that Onondaga did not initially apply for the trails and parks millage the first time around, so she was a little unfamiliar about the process.

Ms. Schindewolf-DeShais stated Onondaga Township had applied for a Department of Natural Resources Grant, and after an initial denial, Senator Curtis Hertel told them the denial had been rescinded and DNR was reviewing their application again.

Chairperson Banas asked what their project included.

Ms. Schindewolf-DeShais stated they wanted to make their parks more ADA-compliant by updating the bathrooms, docks along the river, and a possible kayak launch, and other measures to allow those not currently able to service it, to do so. She further stated that they had a parks master plan, and Baldwin Park had been identified as a Class A Waterway with DNR for their current waterways project.

Ms. Schindewolf-DeShais stated Onondaga was working in tandem to see where the DNR grant ended up. She further stated that Onondaga would apply to the trails and parks this time around; they were just looking to see where they fell in the grand scheme of things and how they compared to other proposals.

Commissioner Grebner asked if there were any plans for their trails to go North or East to keep them more connected to the County.

Ms. Schindewolf-DeShais stated she was relatively new to the Park Board and did not know the plans, but she could talk with their park ranger to figure out what their vision was for the trails.

Commissioner Maiville stated the regional plan map showed a trail going from Eaton Rapids to Jackson, and another that would go from Holt down Onondaga Road to east of Leslie. He further stated Onondaga was looking at creating a trail within Baldwin Park.

Ms. Schindewolf-DeShais stated there was currently a trail in Baldwin Park, but it needed maintenance done on it. She further stated she did not think the County kept the Baldwin Park trail up well.

Commissioner Nolan asked about the blue ways part of the trails and parks millage, and stated that Baldwin Park would be a perfect candidate for that.

Chairperson Banas stated the trails and parks millage could be used as matching funds for the DNR grant, and she suggested Ms. Schindewolf-DeShais meet with Mr. Morgan to discuss ideas and see where they might fit.
Discussion.

Roberta Hamlin, Leroy Township Treasurer, stated Leroy Township was developing a park because land was given to them. She further stated they did their own survey of the area, had a one to five year plan and had formed a committee, and they had talked to the township planner, but they did not have the staff to dedicate to this process.

Ms. Hamlin stated that Leroy Township did have a seven mile walking trail, but surfacing the trail would cost a substantial amount of money, which they did not have in their budget, and the maintenance costs alone would be substantial. She further stated that just getting guidance to know what to do was helpful.

Ms. Hamlin stated one of the challenges they had was acquiring land to put a trail to connect to the rest of the County, as she did not believe farmers would willingly give up their land.

Commissioner Nolan stated one of her ideas early on was that she wanted even a part-time staff person, paid for by millage money, to help the smaller townships apply for the trails and parks millage. She asked what had happened to that idea.

Mr. Cypher stated he had just conferred with Ms. Moore and asked if the guidance for townships was in the scope of services of the Spicer Group project, or if it had been removed to cut costs, which was what they thought it had happened. He further stated he would look into that option, because the smaller townships needed support and he did not want them go by the wayside.

Commissioner Nolan stated she knew that there were people in rural areas who did not have the ability to do the research and prepare the application on top of their other duties. She further stated that whether it was someone from Spicer Group, or someone from the Parks Department staff, it would be good to provide that guidance.

Commissioner Maiville distributed and read a letter to the Committee from Wanda Bloomquist, Williamstown Township Supervisor, who could not make it to the meeting.

Chairperson Banas stated the County had workshops prior to the application deadlines, but another workshop with specifically smaller communities, and help from Ms. Moore and the Parks Department would be good to iron out other issues the smaller communities could be having.

2. **Commissioner Discussion: How Can We Engage Smaller Local Communities In Plans For A Connected, Countywide Trail System, Meeting Their Needs While Moving Forward With The Voters' Desire To Build A Connected, Well-Maintained, Countywide Trail System?**

Commissioner Nolan asked if the townships could show up as a group and have them all fill out their applications together to make sure they fill them out correctly.
Ms. Moore stated they had already done something similar, where it was worked out with the County or a group of townships to put these workshops on, they just needed one committee or municipality to spearhead the effort.

Chairperson Banas stated she thought Commissioner Nolan wanted her idea of a point person to help rural communities move forward on the issues. She further stated Spicer Group had a strong engineering background, but in terms of staffing, staff could look at how to help the smaller communities with their applications, so they had a chance to get some of the millage dollars and the knowledge to complete those.

Mr. Cypher stated that they wanted the process to be as simple as possible, and applicants could always contact staff if they needed help.

Chairperson Banas stated it was her dream to make the trails and parks millage a long-standing program for communities. She further stated that $3.4 million was not very much money each year to make a more complete trails system that then connected to other parts of the state, and it would take time to make the process be fairer and more equitable.

Commissioner Grebner stated they were making a mistake by having a screen that each municipality had to participate in the trails and parks millage. He further stated the County should be able to work with entities that were willing to work with them to complete the trails system.

Commissioner Grebner stated that there were not many of the townships that attended the meeting, so it may be hard to get them on board for any project.

Chairperson Banas stated she did not think anyone was trying to say they should not include anyone because they did not come to the meeting.

Commissioner Grebner stated they were not ever talking about contracting with an entity other than the entity with the municipality involved. He further stated they could talk about working with non-profits, the Parks Department, or even have municipalities work outside of their corporate boundaries to complete the projects, rather than trying to get all townships on board.

Commissioner Grebner stated the point he was making was they did not have large staffs to put these projects together. He further stated they were creating a barrier where they kept inviting the townships to meetings, but they did not show up, and unless they were willing to have the Parks Department, the Road Department or non-profits to do the work, the segments the Board of Commissioners identified as important trails would not get built.

Commissioner Grebner stated that Chairperson Banas had said they were not solely focused on municipalities, but every single approved application had been from municipalities.

Chairperson Banas stated she disagreed with Commissioner Grebner’s sentiment, municipalities were the ones applying to the trails and parks millage, because they owned the land to build the trails on.
Commissioner Maiville stated the Board of Commissioners had previously discussed the focus being on urban connections, and he had not spoken up before now about that. He further stated they were at the meeting to talk about how to include rural townships, and they did contribute to the trails and parks millage but they did not receive any of the benefits.

Discussion.

Commissioner Maiville stated they needed to keep in mind the bigger picture and more rural townships’ needs should be included in that.

Commissioner Nolan stated that since the beginning of the Committee, she had felt this had been an inclusive process for all of Ingham County. She further stated that they had to start with the repairs, and some outer-County projects they had not gotten around to yet, but there was still time.

Discussion.

Commissioner Sebolt asked if only municipal governments had applied for the trails and parks millage to date, and if there was anything preventing other entities from applying.

Mr. Cypher stated there was language in the application that may be deterrent for other entities.

Commissioner Maiville stated the attorney had weighed in and said other entities could apply.

Mr. Cypher stated that nothing was stopping other entities from applying and them getting approved on a case-by-case basis. He further stated that the language in the application asked if municipalities owned or maintained the trails.

Chairperson Banas stated one non-profit had an application approved, for maintenance of a municipal trail.

Commissioner Nolan left at 7:12 p.m.

Commissioner Sebolt clarified that entity had found a workaround to the application by working with the municipality to receive funding.

Mr. Cypher stated that was correct.

Chairperson Banas stated one concern of having a non-municipal entity responsible for a project was in considering the long-term maintenance of a trail. She further stated she would like to hear about non-profits working with municipalities to complete trails, but they needed to make sure the non-profits did not go away and leave a project without an entity responsible for it.

Commissioner Sebolt stated it was a good idea to have a municipality and another entity working together, because well-meaning citizen groups did sometimes disappear.
Commissioner Maiville stated that the trail from Delhi to Mason was the poster child for that idea, because Alaiedon Township would probably not want to take up the task of completing and maintaining the trail. He further stated that the Board of Commissioners and the Parks Commission needed to work together with Vevay Township, Delhi Township, the City of Mason, and others because Alaiedon Township was too small and rural to put the effort into submitting in an application.

Commissioner Grebner stated Commissioner Maiville illustrated the point he was trying to make. He further stated that unless the requirement to have the municipality take responsibility was not on the criteria, the trails system would not be completed.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the Board of Commissioners should drive the project to make sure it got completed, and if a municipality was willing to apply, that was great, but if not, they should look at other methods or entities to get the project done.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that the trails and parks millage did have limited funds, and there had to be some level of compromise in choosing the projects to be completed. He further stated that in the long term, some entity would have to take ownership of the trail, and if a non-profit that was responsible for a trail ceased to exist, the future of that trail might be in jeopardy.

Commissioner Grebner stated he was not proposing to pick up any flaky non-profits, but he just wanted to look at ways to make the trails system work. He further stated in the case of the Delhi-Mason trail, it may take contracting with Mason to work outside of their corporate boundaries to connect the trail, or the Parks Department could pick it up if Alaiedon Township did not want to participate.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that at some point, a government entity would have to be involved in the management of the trail. He further stated he did not think anything prevented a non-profit from partnering with a government entity to make the project happen, but if the government entity was involved from the beginning, that might not be a bad thing.

3. **Tentative Timeline for Trails and Parks Millage Applications (Fall 2017)**

Ms. Moore explained the proposed timeline for Trails and Parks Millage applications provided to the Committee.

4. **Park Commission Recommended Revisions To The Application Request Form For Parks And Trails Millage Grants. Along With Recommended Changes To The Ranking System. (Materials Will Be Received After Park Commission Meeting on Monday, May 15)**

Chairperson Banas introduced the Parks Commission’s recommended revisions to the application request form. She stated the biggest change was asking for briefer answers on the application to make the process more streamlined when reviewing applications.
Chairperson Banas introduced the criteria form and explained the scoring of projects.

Ms. Moore further explained the criteria on the form.

Chairperson Banas stated she thought Question 4 of the scoring criteria could be split up, to have a separate question on feasibility, and then have another question on the equitable opportunities, as there was room for expansion in both of those.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he thought rural townships might not have as much in local matched funds. He further stated he thought zero points for 0-9% matched was too punitive, and it could be only two or three points to give them a few points back on their score.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the Parks Commission ranked and considered projects, but the Board of Commissioners was not constrained by the points. He further stated that any points system was going to be illogical, and in this case, the number of people who would use a trail was not taken into consideration, and Question 4 was overshadowed by Question 3 that scored the matching funds, even though there was much more substance to Question 4.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the Board of Commissioners was not doing a good job of prioritizing projects they wanted to be completed with the trails and parks millage. He further stated that the Parks Commission scored and ranked, while the Board of Commissioners had a more political view.

Commissioner Grebner stated that in effect, he was happy with the points system as it was, as long as the Committee understood that the Parks Commission was going to be bound by them, not the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Sebolt asked who ultimately set the criteria for the Parks Commission to review.

Chairperson Banas stated that the Parks Commission had always been an advisory body, and they were charged with reviewing applications because it was a timely process. She further stated the Board of Commissioners set the criteria.

Commissioner Sebolt clarified that the Parks Commission was working off of the scorecard that the Board of Commissioners had created.

Chairperson Banas stated that was correct and it had been used previously. She further stated that they had tried to streamline the process and make it more beneficial and fair, which was why they were reviewing it currently.

Chairperson Banas stated that ultimately, the Board of Commissioners made the decision, but they needed to have some basis for awarding projects, because the Board of Commissioners was overpowered by Commissioners from the City of Lansing. She further stated the trails and parks millage needed to be important and valuable and appealing to the entire County and connect people.
Chairperson Banas stated she would like to make some changes to Question 4, because she thought it would be helpful to have more criteria for what was an equitable opportunity. She further stated it also made sense to change Question 4, because it would make the scoring process easier.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he agreed with Commissioner Grebner, in that if they split Question 4, they should make public demand or support a more weighted part.

Discussion.

Commissioner Sebolt stated with that split of Question 4, however, they needed to be more careful, because rural communities would not have the same amount of people supporting the project as urban communities would, so public demand should be based more on a percentage of the population in an area.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the points system did not address the underlying problem, because it did not take into account how much projects cost and that was the kind of weighing the Board of Commissioners ultimately needed to do. He further stated that urban projects would cost more money than rural ones, because of the infrastructure and land acquisitions needed around the trails.

Commissioner Grebner stated he expected the Board of Commissioners to have a much more robust discussion in this round of applications about which projects would get funded. He further stated that the Parks Commission should also be aware of the projects that fall just short of being approved, because they would likely come back in the next round of applications.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the points did not do a good job of doing a cost-benefit analysis. He further stated he was not worried about Lansing taking all of the projects, because the Board of Commissioners was balanced politically.

Chairperson Banas stated the next Special Trails and Parks Committee meeting would be on June 12, 2017 and it would focus on the possibility of rolling deadlines for project applications.

Announcements

Commissioner Sebolt stated that the Complete Streets Special Committee would meet on June 8, 2017 to discuss the future County Complete Streets policy.

Public Comment

None.
Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

BARB BYRUM, CLERK OF THE BOARD