



**Appendix A
Meeting Notes**

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

Kick Off Meeting

January 18, 2006

Pathway Committee Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Sara Schillinger, LSL Planning
Scott Weeks, LSL Planning
Julie Hall, SELCRA
Kelly Mathews, Brighton Township
Planner
Bud Prine, Brighton Township
Supervisor

Steve Bower, MDOT
Lynne Kirby, MDOT
David Murphy, Brighton Township Manager
Rhett Gronevelt, OHM
Jill Scheuerle Thacher, Livingston County
Planning Department

1. **Introductions.** Contact sheet is attached.

2. **Scope of Project & Schedule**

- a. Review of LSL & OHM work plan, goal is to have plan adopted by Township Board by June/July.
- b. MDOT plans to reconstruct Kensington & Pleasant Valley overpasses over I-96 in 2009. Kensington will be completely redone, whereas Pleasant Valley will just have resurfacing.

3. **Master Plan Pathway Recommendations**

- a. Review of pathways to be studied, as depicted in Map 10 of the Master Plan.
- b. Agreement to add segment of Kensington Road south of I-96 to connect to planned Grand River paths. Make this a high priority to connect the parks to Grand River.
- c. Remove Grand River from the study, as a plan has already been prepared for this corridor from the Brighton city limits to Kensington Road.
- d. Other corridors that should be considered: Larkins, Culver, Van Amberg and Newman.
- e. MDOT will not accommodate requests for paths unless they are already there/connect to somewhere. If the township has plans for it and has an identified funding source, MDOT more likely to include in construction. MDOT TSC can match 15-20%.
- f. The cost of construction of an overlay pathway on an existing bridge is roughly \$150 per sq. ft.

4. **Focus Groups**

- a. To be held at Town Hall, aiming for the afternoon of Wednesday, Feb. 22.
- b. Focus group #1: Neighboring communities and Livingston County Planning Department, possibly School Districts
- c. Focus group #2: User groups, bicycle enthusiasts, SELCRA, Lakes Committee, Neighborhood associations. Jill has an email list of people who may be interested, including Huron Trails group.
- d. Focus group #3: Technical group (to be led & planned by OHM) including MDOT, Livingston County Road Commission, Township Building Inspector

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

5. Public Meeting

- a. To be held at Fire Hall early March.
- b. Casual layout with information stations with brief informational presentation(s).
- c. In addition to notice in paper, should provide flyers at select locations, such as bicycle shops.

6. Other Items

- a. Look into DNR grants, \$ is available, connect Island Lake high point just south of Grand River to local destinations.
- b. Consideration of different users of paths, including horse riding.
- c. In order to qualify for MDOT funding, need to provide maintenance of paths, not sure if this includes snow removal or just repair.

- 7. Next Meeting.** Aiming for the afternoon of Wednesday, Feb. 22, immediately following the focus groups.

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

February 22, 2006

Focus Group 1 & 2 Regional Paths & User Group Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Sara Schillinger, LSL Planning
Scott Weeks, LSL Planning
Julie Hall, SELCRA
Evelyn Gallegos, Lakes Committee
Lesa Brookings, Green Oak

Jim Fackert, Friends of Green Oak Trails
Kelly Mathews, Brighton Township Planner
Mike Donnelly, Island Lake State Park
Joanne Stritmatter, Island Lake State Park

- Livingston Co. prepared a County regional map with a wish list of pathways 2 years ago, need to get copy.
- Off-road corridors are just as difficult to develop as roadside paths, example of railroad corridor in Green Oak, individually owned. Important to establish cooperative agreement up front.
- Need to investigate natural gas easement across Township, some thought one existed.
- Feeling that equestrian demands are fairly limited.
- Preference is for wide multi-use paths, separated from the road, generally 8-10 ft. in width.
- Use shoulder only when a separate path is not an option.
- Need to recognize opportunities to put paths in when roads are being improved or paved.
- Grand River pathway is a major first step.
- Pathway locations should take advantage of proximity to regional parks, connect to schools and parks first. Recommended to extend path west on Buno between Pleasant Valley and Kensington to provide route to the new Township park, and to extend the pathway from near the intersection of Hyne and Old US 23 north on Taylor Street to provide a route to the public school.
- Separate money is available for pathways to schools through the “Safe Routes to School” program.
- Pay attention to population density in choosing priority locations.
- In terms of connections to the south, Green Oak has not made Whitmore Road a priority, concentration is on west boundary, connection to City of Brighton through Ricket Road trail.
- Hamburg uses community groups to fundraise & provide light path maintenance, such as clean ups, “Friends of Lakeland Trails.”
- Maintenance of paths will be crucial, SELCRA is concerned.
- Livingston County is just starting to develop parks.
- Need a regional authority to coordinate area-wide pathway planning efforts. SELCRA could possibly act as regional coordination body to apply for grants and administer funds.
- Livingston County Road Commission (LCRC) provides 3-4 feet paved shoulders on all new road reconstruction. Road Commission would not be agreeable to stripe on-street areas for bike lanes.
- Experience in Island Lake shows that on shoulder bike lanes are more hazardous than off-street paths.
- St. Clair County has guidelines, provide for both off-street paths and bike lanes.
- Ned to analyze the types of users & nodes of parks, major employers, etc.
- Livingston Co. is open to bike lanes, but have never done it before.
- AASHTO requires 10 ft. paths for funding.

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

February 22, 2006

Focus Group 3 Technical Group Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Rhett Gronevelt, OHM
Todd Scott, MMBA
Mike Goryl, LCRC
Nancy Krupiarz, MTOA

Lynne Kirby, MDOT
Jim Morse, Brighton Twp. Building Official
Kari Andrews, MDOT

- Most Pathways proposed in Livingston County Road Commission ROW (LCRC), might cross MDOT (Michigan Department of Transportation) ROW
- LCRC – no currently published design standards. AASHTO used as a guide.
- Most ROW along major roadways exists as 66'. Master Planned for 100 or 120. Should base pathway locations on Master Plan ROW. OHM has a copy of the ROW map.
- General Rule of thumb would be “The farther from the road, the better”. General Plan is to place 1 foot inside ROW.
- LCRC ok with 8' or 10' wide pathways. 10' becomes hard to squeeze in ROW.
- It was questioned what LCRC does with their “1% for non-motorized Act 51 money”. LCRC responded and confirmed it is spent on gravel roads.
- LCRC/MDOT confirmed no current plans for widening Pleasant Valley Road or I-96 Bridge.
- MDOT confirmed that the Kensington / I-96 Bridge is being reconstructed in 2009. If pathways exist at each end at the time of design (2007/2008), then MDOT will incorporate that into the design of the bridge. For this reason, this should be a priority area.
- No current MDOT plans for any bridgework over US-23
- Bike Lanes became a significant topic of discussion. LCRC confirmed that all new roadways are built with 3 – 4 foot paved shoulders. These often get used as bike-lanes. There was discussion regarding the use of the pathways for serious bikers, and the safety problems they present. Some discussion continued about the possibility of sidewalks and bike lanes as an option to a pathway.
- Discussed intentions to use 3” HMA (hot-mix asphalt) on 8” 21AA aggregate base for cross section on pathways, and 4” concrete on 6” Class II sand base for sidewalks.
- Pathways to be 8 or 10 feet in width, and preliminarily on one side of the road. Sidewalks to be 5 feet wide on both sides of the road.
- All ramps to be concrete with truncated domes.
- If wetlands or other natural features exist in ROW, LCRC will consider allowing use of Boardwalks.
- Maintenance was discussed. OHM to include recommendations for design life and capital maintenance estimates. Township must be responsible for maintenance for many funding opportunities. Consideration can be given to levy costs to frontage owners.
- Reference was made to St. Clair County’s Pathways plan, and considering it for design information. <http://www.greenwaycollab.com/StClairNoMo.htm>
- Significant Discussion regarding funding opportunities:
 - ✓ DNR Trust Fund
 - ✓ CDBG (Community Development Block Grant)
 - ✓ Cool Cities Grants
 - ✓ RIFF RTP (???)
 - ✓ CMAQ
 - ✓ Safe Routes to Schools Grant

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

February 22, 2006

Pathway Committee Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Sara Schillinger, LSL Planning
Scott Weeks, LSL Planning
Julie Hall, SELCRA
Kelly Mathews, Brighton Township
Planner

Lynne Kirby, MDOT
Kari Andrews, MDOT
David Murphy, Brighton Township Manager
Rhett Gronevelt, OHM

1. Focus Group Summary

- a. Due to the low turnout, the regional and user groups were combined into one focus group.
- b. At the end of the session the two focus groups combined to have a brief large group discussion, so clarifications and questions were answered at that time.
- c. Everyone present at the committee meeting was present at the focus group meetings.

2. Public Meeting

- a. Scheduled for March 15, 7-9pm at the Fire Hall.
- b. Casual layout with information stations with a brief informational presentation. Stations will include trail advocacy, types of paths, pathway location and prioritization.
- c. A notice in paper & flyer will be prepared, should locate at local bicycle shops.
- d. Need this meeting to educate as well as start forming “grass-roots” community support.
- e. A brief presentation will be prepared and should be shown to the Township Board prior to meeting to educate and build support.

3. Plan Contents and Format

- a. Distributed & reviewed the draft Table of Contents prepared by LSL
- b. Will be used as a base for the document
- c. OHM will provide costs associated with the pathways
- d. Funding options will be researched by LSL and provided in the document

4. Preliminary Goals

- a. Distributed & reviewed the draft goals and objectives prepared by LSL
- b. Will be used as a base for pathway recommendations
- c. Committee will review & get any comments to LSL

5. Next Meeting. Wednesday, April 26 at 3pm

6. Other Items. None

Brighton Township Pathways Plan
March 15, 2006
Survey Results

1. Do you agree that pathways will be beneficial to Brighton Township?
 - 16 Yes
 - 2 No, if no, why not?
 - Too expensive, actual participation does not justify cost
 - It doesn't improve the rural environment

2. What types of pathways would you most like to see in Brighton Township?
 - 8 All off road multi-modal paths
 - 8 Mixture of both off-road multi-modal paths and on-road lanes
 - 1 All on- road bike lanes

3. Which one of the three do you think is the most important?
 - 9 Provide Improvement Recreational and Transportation Opportunities within the Township through a Township-wide Pathways System
 - 5 Implement a Pathway Network
 - 2 Provide Connections to Enhance Regional Connectivity

4. Do you disagree with any of the goals, objectives, or strategies?
 - 10 No, they generally cover it
 - 5 Yes, I don't agree with:
 - Violation of private property rights, also would ruin the rural atmosphere of this township
 - The theory that everyone wants these pathways in their yard. They don't! 10' wide sidewalks are too wide. 3-5' would be sufficient
 - 10' path too wide, major roads yes for pathway
 - 10' is too wide for this community. Share a smaller path and keep it "rural"
 - Keep it limited
 - Dirt paths and more of them
 - Needs to be clearer
 - Need to have limited pathways

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

5. Are there any locations that you think should to be added or removed from the DRAFT Proposed Pathway System Map?

These corridors should be *added* to the Map

- Add in routes that have adequate shoulders for road biking- enhance plan (e.g. Buno west of Van Amberg)
- Consider Corlett as a connection for Hyne and Newman
- Take path up Hacker to township line
- Should be limited

These corridors should be *removed from* the Map

- Spencer due t traffic
- Smaller Roads
- Keep Grand River and Pleasant Valley. Drop the rest due to expense to develop and maintenance issues.
- Hyne-Kensington, Pleasant Valley-Larkins

6. Which pathway segments are the most important to complete? (pick up to 5)

- 12 Those that lead to schools (Hilton, Spencer, Hyne, Hacker & Taylor)
- 12 Those that lead to parks (Kensington, Spencer, Old U.S. 23)
- 11 Grand River (north of City o f Brighton)
- 8 Those that lead to activity nodes (Hilton, Spencer, Old U.S. 23 & Grand River)
- 8 Kensington
- 4 South U.S. 23 (South of Hilton)
- 4 Hyne (west of Old U.S. 23)
- 4 Pleasant Valley
- 3 Spencer
- 2 Middle U.S. 23 (Hilton to Hyne)
- 1 Hilton
- 1 Hyne (east of Old U.S 23)
- 1 Others: **Hacker**

7. Are you willing to support a slight increase in taxes or millage in order to support the development of pathways?

- 10 Yes
- 3 Undecided
- 2 No

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

In the space provided below please offer any additional comments you may have.

- If we are family oriented community as we claim, we need to address the need for non-automotive transportation within the area immediately. It will foster families getting outside and increase fitness. This issue is mandated by the citizen's survey completed within the last 5 years.
- Provide accurate honest study of how many people actually use a pathway in a 24 hour period.
- Most of the residents who live along these roads do not want the extra traffic in their yards. Adding bike lanes on the main roads (the less busy ones, at least) could be beneficial. Anything a car could mistake for a road is too wide.
- We should promote volunteer efforts to start pathway work that removes obstacles to non-motorized traffic along proposed pathways. This would increase use and promote interest in a pathway system.
- Identify and consider locations throughout the Township that offer "spurs" into natural feature areas. Either paved or unpaved (hiking/mountain biking) or both. These offer additional features to the path and alternatives to riding all the way to major parks like Island Lake.
- Develop a north/south and east/west and leave everything else. Brighton Township doesn't seem like the place to plant more "huge" sidewalks.

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

April 26, 2006

Pathway Committee Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Sara Schillinger, LSL Planning
Kelly Mathews, Brighton Township
Planner

David Murphy, Brighton Township Manager
Rhett Gronevelt, OHM
Dave Schroeder, OHM

1. Public Meeting Summary

- a. Summary of the exit survey responses-were a bit surprising to the group.
- b. Need for additional outreach due to low attendance.

2. DRAFT ONE Pathways Plan

- a. Reviewed DRAFT ONE of the Pathways Plan prepared by LSL
- b. OHM will provide costs associated with the pathways
- c. OHM will provide cross-sections of the different types of pathways and bike lanes proposed.
- d. LSL will make all necessary revisions and redistribute DRAFT TWO before the next meeting.
- e. Those who could not make today's meeting were asked to send comments in writing.

3. Public Hearing

- a. Due to the low turnout at the Public Meeting, the Public Hearing will be expanded to include a workshop beforehand.
- b. The Planning Commission will not be expected to act that night.
- c. Scheduled for the June 26 Planning Commission meeting.

4. Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 31 at 3pm

5. Other Items: None

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

May 31, 2006

Pathway Committee Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Sara Schillinger, LSL Planning
Kelly Mathews, Brighton Township
Planner
Jill Scheuerle Thacher, Livingston
County Planning Department

David Murphy, Brighton Township Manager
Rhett Gronevelt, OHM
Dave Schroeder, OHM

1. DRAFT TWO Pathways Plan

- a. Reviewed DRAFT TWO of the Pathways Plan prepared by LSL, with added cost estimates and cross-sections by OHM.
- b. Need to look at MDNR Plan requirements to make sure plan is eligible for funding, including adding a section on barrier free accessibility.
- c. Get rid of cost estimates in Section Five, too far out to accurately estimate, but keep in appendix for frame of reference.
- d. Prioritized segments within Priority One.
- e. Clarify timeframes in each priority to be estimates.
- f. LSL will make all necessary revisions and redistribute PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT.
- g. Those who could not make today's meeting were asked to send comments in writing.
- h. Township attorney should review prior to public hearing to give his opinions.

2. Public Hearing

- a. Noticing depends on how plan will be adopted-if this is Master Plan amendment or a MDNR Parks Plan. Will notice both ways.
- b. June 26 Planning Commission meeting, 7 pm.
- c. Due to the low turnout at the Public Meeting, the Public Hearing will be expanded to include a casual "drop-in" workshop from 6-7pm, where there will be display boards & the public will be able to review recommendations & ask questions.
- d. Public hearing will have a brief presentation.
- e. The Planning Commission will not be expected to act that night.

3. Next Steps

- a. Edits based on public hearing.
- b. Planning Commission endorsement on July 10.
- c. Township Board adoption July 17 or first August meeting.

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

June 26, 2006

Planning Commission Public Hearing Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Sara Schillinger, LSL Planning
Carmine Avantini, LSL Planning
Kelly Mathews, Brighton Twp. Planner
David Murphy, Brighton Twp. Manager
Steve Holden, Brighton Twp. Planning Commission
Gus Mitsopoulos, Brighton Twp. Planning Commission
Ron Doughty, Brighton Twp. Planning Commission
Frank Grapentien, Brighton Twp. Planning Commission
Gary Unruh, Brighton Twp. Planning Commission
Tim Winship, Brighton Twp. Planning Commission & Trustee
Cathy Doughty, Brighton Twp. Trustee
J. Michael Slaton, Brighton Twp. Trustee
Julie Hall, SELCRA
Susan Esser
John Esser
Jeff Wirth
Sharon Sutis
Terry Croft

Rita Croft
Sherman Snow
Cherrie Snow
John Malek
Juile Amman
Scott Amman
Mike Richards
Chuck Rhein
Richard Swan
Doug Taylor
Carl Slindee
Terry Pihalja
Brian Parsons

1. Pathways Plan Presentation: Brief presentation on Pathways Plan by LSL Planning

2. Public Hearing

- a. The Planning Commission members read into the record, letters from residents. They were from the Scott Amman family of 4132 Merna Lane who are anxious to get going and enthusiastic about the proposed pathways.
- b. In addition, a letter from Sue & John Esser of 3465 Moraine Drive was read in favor of the township park and connecting pathways to get there and support for paths on existing paved roads.
- c. Also read, was a letter from the Livingston County principal planner, Jill Thacher, commending the Township on the proposed pathways plan.
- d. Carl Slindee, 1716 Clark Lake Road - commends the township for initiating this proposal. He would like to see Hacker Road included in Priority I since it's very dangerous. He also suggested putting gravel down as a temporary means to get going faster.
- e. Richard Swan, 4193 Chapelview Circle – any thoughts on widening or adding two foot paved shoulders and striping to Pleasant Valley Road?
- f. Doug Taylor, 3319 Oak Knoll Drive – was overwhelmed with the long term nature of the pathways proposal and had many concerns which included, but were not limited to,

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

safety, policing of what can be used on them, upkeep, who's responsibility it is for accidents that occur on the pathway, what do the walkers and bikers of the township want, how scenic the paths would be and how many intersections were part of the pathway?

- g. Terry Pihalja, 5109 Braddock Court – avid biker, in favor of more paths and trails. Offered to help set-up a committee.
- h. Jeff Wirth, 9325 Lexford Way – is supportive of the plan, especially for his children, paved shoulders are not safe for bikers or walkers.
- i. Brian Parsons, 9142 Orion Drive – in favor of pathways and the escrow accounts are a good idea.
- j. Discussion was brought back to the table. Steve Holden commented that they will not be taking any action tonight, this meeting is for public comment.
- k. F. Grapentien had several comments regarding the data in the plan on pages 6, 17, 18, 41 and 42 and rethinking priority 4 vs 1-3 based on cost.
- l. T. Winship supported escrow accounts.
- m. G. Unruh questioned liability (ask township attorney) and discussed grants.
- n. G. Mitsopoulos – the Master Plan supported the pathways.
- o. S. Holden – make it happen as quick as possible.
- p. S. Holden, there will be no future public meetings planned on the project. The vision is right and the residents want the pathways, we want to move forward with it as quickly as possible.
- q. Doug Taylor – encourages the Commission's sensitivity as to who will be using this off-road pathway where vehicles will be passing along side at 45 m.p.h or more.
- r. Chuck Rhein, 4529 Falcon Court – is supportive. Get going now, just add gravel for the time being.
- s. Julie Hall of SELCRA - found that pathways were highly supported in her surveys and she supported this plan.



Appendix B Detailed Cost Estimates

Figure Eleven	
Brighton Township Cost per Linear Foot	
5 Foot Concrete Sidewalk	
Clearing/Grading	\$6.00
4" of Concrete (\$3/sft)	\$10.00
4" of Sand (\$9/ton)	\$3.20
Restoration	\$3.00
Price per foot	\$22.20
20% Contingency	\$4.44
Total	\$26.64
Engineering and Construction	\$7.99
Cost per Foot	\$35.00
10 Foot Asphalt Pathway	
Clearing/Grading	\$6.00
3" of Asphalt (\$60/ton)	\$11.00
8" 21AA (\$18/ton)	\$13.20
Restoration	\$3.00
Price per foot	\$33.20
20% Contingency	\$6.64
Total	\$39.84
Engineering and Construction	\$11.95
Cost per Foot	\$52.00

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

Figure Eleven
Brighton Township Cost per Linear Foot

Boardwalk	
Boardwalk/Bridge	\$350.00
Price per foot	\$350.00
Total	\$350.00
Engineering and Construction	\$105.00
Cost per Foot	\$455.00
Retaining Wall	
Retaining Wall	\$200.00
Price per foot	\$200.00
Total	\$200.00
Engineering and Construction	\$60.00
Cost per Foot	\$260.00

Source: OHM

Figure Twelve
Detailed Cost Estimates

Road	Segment	Concrete (linear ft.)	Asphalt (linear ft.)	Boardwalk (linear ft.)	Retaining Wall (linear ft.)	Cost
Priority One (9.85 Miles)						
1	Kensington	Larkins to Grand River	3,090			\$160,680
2	Kensington	Spencer to Larkins	5,600	40	330	\$395,200
3	Old US 23	Spencer to Grand River	5,950			\$309,400
4	Old US 23	Spencer (E) to Spencer (W)	1,080			\$56,160
5	Old US 23	Hilton to Spencer	5,750	200	140	\$426,400
6	Hilton	Hunter to Old U.S. 23	3,400	60		\$204,100
7	Hilton	Grand River to Hunter	6,070	560	700	\$752,440
8	Grand River	Hacker to Hilton	3,490			\$122,150
9	Hacker	Hyne to Grand River	4,620		200	\$292,240
10	Kensington	Buno to Spencer	2,810		250	\$211,120

Brighton Township Pathways Plan

Figure Twelve
Detailed Cost Estimates

Road		Segment	Concrete (linear ft.)	Asphalt (linear ft.)	Boardwalk (linear ft.)	Retaining Wall (linear ft.)	Cost
11	Kensington	Jacoby to Buno		3,340			\$173,680
12	Spencer	City of Brighton to Old U.S. 23	3,930				\$137,550
13	Pleasant Valley	Larkins to Grand River		2,000		480	\$228,800
Priority One Total			7,420	43,710	860	2,100	\$3,469,920
Priority Two (8.74 Miles)							
Buno	Kensington to Township Park			1,290			\$67,080
	Spencer to Township Hall			1,000			\$52,000
Old U.S. 23	Hartland Twp. to Hyne			7,980	170		\$492,310
	Hyne to Hilton			3,830		300	\$277,160
	Grand River to Green Oak Twp.		5,930				\$207,550
Pleasant Valley	Spencer to Larkins			6,130			\$318,760
Spencer	Old U.S. 23 to Buno		1,500				\$52,500
	Buno to Van Amberg			6,440		180	\$381,680
	Van Amberg to Pleasant Valley			3,860	60		\$228,020
	Pleasant Valley to Kensington			5,270	250		\$374,790
Taylor	Old U.S. 23 to School				2,710		\$179,920
Priority Two Total			7,430	35,800	3,190	480	\$2,631,770
Priority Three (7.28 Miles)							
Hyne	Hacker to Hunter			6,040	100		\$359,580
	Hunter to Old U.S. 23			6,460	820		\$709,020
	Old U.S. 23 to Pleasant Valley			13,790	390		\$894,530

**Figure Twelve
Detailed Cost Estimates**

Road	Segment	Concrete (linear ft.)	Asphalt (linear ft.)	Boardwalk (linear ft.)	Retaining Wall (linear ft.)	Cost
Kensington	Pleasant Valley to Jacoby		6,270			\$326,040
Pleasant Valley	Hyne to Kensington		4,560			\$237,120
Priority Three Total		0	37,120	1,310	0	\$2,526,290
Priority Four (15.6 Miles)						
Buno	Pleasant Valley to Township Park		4,210	150		\$287,170
Culver	Spencer to Pleasant Valley		12,620	430	450	\$968,890
Hunter	Hyne to Hilton		9,050			\$470,600
Larkins	Pleasant Valley to Kensington		8,430	60	360	\$559,260
Newman	Van Amberg to Pleasant Valley		7,040			\$366,080
Pleasant Valley	Commerce to Hyne		8,020			\$417,040
	Kensington to Newman		2,100			\$109,200
	Newman to Jacoby		6,080	190		\$402,610
	Jacoby to Buno		3,340		390	\$275,080
	Buno to Spencer		2,680			\$139,360
Spencer	Kensington to Kensington Metropark		7,340			\$381,680
Van Amberg	Newman to Buno		7,960			\$413,920
	Buno to Spencer		2,690			\$139,880
Priority Four Total		0	81,560	830	1,200	\$4,930,770

Source: OHM