Scio Township Land Preservation Commission
Regular Meeting No. 252, August 13, 2026, 4:00 PM

Agenda

The Land Preservation Commission will meet in the Meeting Hall at Township Hall at 827 N. Zeeb Road. Members of the public may join either in person or view the livestream of the meeting by clicking the hyperlink "View Event" next to where meeting is listed on website. Public comment cannot be made via viewing livestream. To provide public comment or participate in the meeting remotely, access the meeting using this Zoom link https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81388011332. Persons with disabilities requiring any accommodation for participation in this meeting should contact the Township Clerk at (734) 369-9400 or clerk@sciotownshipmi.gov.

I. Call to Order

II. Roll call

Daryl Burkhard	Tim Redmond
Jeannine LaPrad	Liz Wiseman
Marybeth Lynch	Barry Lonik (Consultant, non-voting)
Lisa Pappas	Chris Cheng (Project Manager, non-voting)
David Read	

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of Minutes: *Regular Meeting No. 251, held July 9, 2026*

V. Public Comments

VI. Reports of Other Commissions

A. Board of Trustees (Trustee David Read)

B. Planning Commission (Jan Culbertson)

C. Parks, Pathways and Preserves Committee (Liz Wiseman):

D. Environmental Sustainability Task Force (Jan Culbertson)

1. Scio Township Sustainability Fair will be held on October 4, 2026, 12 - 4 p.m.

VII. Old Business

A. LPC Financial Statements (Daryl Burkhard)

There are no financial statements to review in the absence of both Daryl and Chris Cheng this month.

B. LPC working session with Board of Trustees on Tuesday, August 18th, beginning at 6 pm. Location: Township Hall meeting room.

C. Attendance at next meeting (#253) September 10, 2026

VIII. New Business

A. Board of Trustees 7/21/26 action on Request for Proposals (RFP) for Land Preservation Commission consultant

B. Scherdt property conservation easement

C. Michigan Open Meetings Act limitations on email communications: legal opinion attached

D. NGA Mobility survey: possible vote to approve

IX. Open Session Consultant's Report/Project Update - Barry Lonik

X. Consultant's Summary of Closed Session Topics - Barry Lonik

XI. Public Comments

XII. Closed Session: Roll Call vote

Discussion of pending property evaluations pursuant to Section 15.268(d) of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, specifically, to consider the purchase or lease of real property up to the time an option to purchase or lease that real property is obtained.

XIII. Open Session.

A. Approval of Closed Session Minutes

B. Possible vote(s) on matters arising from closed session discussion

XIV. Adjournment.

Scio Township Land Preservation Commission

Regular Meeting No. 251, July 9, 2026, 4:00 PM

Meeting of Scio Township Land Preservation Commission
July 9, 2026, 4:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time
Scio Township Hall

Call to Order

Call to Order at 4:07 p.m.

Roll call

Present: Daryl Burkhard, Marybeth Lynch, David Read, Tim Redmond, and Liz Wiseman

Also present: Barry Lonik (Consultant, non-voting), Chris Cheng (Project Manager, non-voting)

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Read, seconded by Burkhard, to approve the agenda. Motion unanimously approved by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Wiseman, seconded by Read, to approve Minutes of Regular Meeting No. 250, held on June 11, 2026. Motion unanimously approved by voice vote.

Public Comments

Mark Altomare introduced himself as a Candidate for Scio Township Trustee, and asked whether Scio Township has a location for recycling materials other than composted food waste. . Redmond suggested Mr. Altomare direct the question to the Environmental Task Force, which meets the first Thursday of every month, from 6:00 pm – 7:30 pm.

In response to Mr. Altomare's question about the difference between a "committee" and a "commission," Wiseman said she was not sure.

Reports of Other Commissions

Board of Trustees: Reports attached to meeting agenda.

Planning Commission: Jan Culbertson submitted the Planning Commission's timeline for revising Township's master plan. Timeline attached to meeting agenda.

Parks, Pathways and Preserves Committee: Wiseman reported PPP did not meet in July.

Environmental Sustainability Task Force: Redmond reported that the food waste initiative has had a good turnout, with 200 households participating.

Scio Township will hold its fourth Sustainability Fair, organized by Jan Culbertson, on October 4. Among other attractions, Washtenaw County Community College will be showcasing EV vehicles, and Ann Arbor EV drivers are expected to support the Fair as in past years.

Old Business

A. LPC Financial Statements: Daryl Burkhard reported that the financial statements have not yet been updated.

B. Attendance at next meeting (252) August 13, 2026: Marybeth Lynch and Daryl Burkhard are unable to attend.

New Business

- No new business.

Open Session Consultant's Report/Project Update

General Updates – Barry Lonik shared the following updates:

- RCPP – waiting to hear on appeal verdict and new application, RFP was posted.
- Spring monitoring was completed.
- Property lands map property reference changed.
- Summary of closed sessions; brief updates on two applications.

Property Updates – Barry Lonik shared the following updates on active properties:

1. Peter Heydon (2025-6, second; E of 1, 4400 Stein Rd.). 70 acres of woods, ponds and farm fields on the east and north side of Stein Rd. and the west side of Maple Rd. Appraised value $595,000 ($8,500/acre). Greenbelt $205,000 (50%); Scio share $300,000 (50%). Survey and ESA are in process, baseline once the survey is finalized. The PSA was amended to extend the closing deadline to September 30. MISS DIG was contacted to request the gas pipeline crossing the property be flagged so it can be shown on the survey; that will happen within 21 days, survey after that, baseline after that and ESA.
2. Jacqueline Hicks Trust (2022-2, third; E of C, 5777 Joy Rd.). 100 acres of farm fields and woods at the SW corner of Zeeb Rd. and Joy Rd. Appraised value $633,000 ($6,300/acre). ACEP award $246,870 (39%); State award $200,000 (32%); Greenbelt $62,000 (10%); Washtenaw County $62,000 (10%); Scio share $62,130 (10%). NRCS review found that the Hicks trust applied for funds when mom Jacqueline was alive as the trustee and beneficiary. She subsequently passed away, making son John the trustee

and he and his two siblings beneficiaries. Trust is being reviewed and a fifth PSA amendment was signed extending the deadline to December 30.

3. NGA Mobility (2025-1, sixth; N of 10 and west of K, no address). 78 acres of farm field, wetlands and scrub woods on the east side of Parker Rd. south of Jackson Rd. Purchase price $1.3M ($16,667/acre). Mariah holds the documents pending confirmation of the PSA execution. We have 90 days to close. ESA proposal was forwarded to the supervisor. Mariah was satisfied with a survey completed some time ago. Arbor Land (surveyor) provided a proposal to stake the boundaries (see attached).
4. Linda Lewis. Seven acres of scrub woods on the north side of Marshall Rd. west of Marshall Park. Purchase price $235,000 ($33,570/acre). The purchase closed on June 15.
5. Sheldon Smith. The project closed on May 29.

Consultant's Summary of Closed Session Topics

Lonik stated that the following will be addressed in the Closed Session:

- New application for scoring.
- Update of recommendation to purchase land or conservation easements.
- Discussion on target properties.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Closed Session

Motion by Pappas, seconded by Redmond, to enter into closed session pursuant to Section 15.268(d) of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, to discuss pending property evaluations, specifically, to consider the purchase or lease of real property up to the time an option to purchase or lease that real property is obtained.

The motion was approved with roll call vote. All present approved: Daryl Burkhard, Marybeth Lynch, David Read, Tim Redmond, and Liz Wiseman.

Open Session

A motion was made by Redmond, seconded by Burkhard, to move back into open session. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Approval of Closed Session Minutes

Motion by Read, seconded by Burkhard, to approve Closed Session Minutes. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Possible vote(s) on matters arising from closed session discussion

No motions from closed session.

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn was made by Burkhard, seconded by Read. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Submitted by Marybeth Lynch, Acting Secretary

Scherdt CE issue

6 messages

David Read <davidread@bitsoflight.com> Sun, Jul 26, 2026 at 8:16 AM
To: Barry Lonik <blonik13@aol.com>
Cc: Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com>, Lisa Pappas <lapappas@umich.edu>, Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com>, Daryl Burkhard <burkhard3dr@gmail.com>, Marybeth Lynch <lynchverga@yahoo.com>, Tim Redmond <timredmond@comcast.net>, David Read <dread@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Christopher Cheng <ccheng@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Murphy Harrington <mharrington@sciotownshipmi.gov>

All,

Just getting back from vacation and trying to catch up on several hundred emails. Sorry for the late response on this.

It is troubling to note that on April 27 of this year Mr. Scherdt had no plans for a timer harvest (see answer for question #5 in the Monitoring Report). Yet 74 days later and without a Forest Management Plan he had a proposal from a timber company to remove 80 hardwoods from his property with a sawyer already at work. It is unfortunate that three (landmark?) hardwoods were already felled before Murphy was able to stop him.

It is troubling that the land owner either was not being honest about his plans or didn't think he had to notify someone (probably Barry) when his plans changed. The mere fact that, when monitoring, we ask specifically about plans for a timber harvest should have alerted him to the need to do so. It would seem that we need to add language to our CE's regarding timber harvesting and the need for an approved FMP. Perhaps a discussion of the proper method huglekultur as well?

Ignorance we can fix by being more explicit in our communications with our CE owners. However, dishonesty is more difficult to deal. I am hopeful that this event was a result of the former not the latter.

Thanks,
David

On Jul 15, 2026, at 6:19 PM, Barry Lonik <blonik13@aol.com> wrote:

The LPC files were very well organized (by me) and located in several filing cabinets upstairs for years. At some point all of those docs were boxed and moved to the basement (not by me) and contents altered. For a time easement monitoring was done by other staff, who didn't do it properly and resulted in the Botsford easement violation. I had to sort through those boxes to find what I need for easement monitoring and ended up re-creating a number of baseline folders so I could do that work properly. Recently I commandeered a filing cabinet top drawer to house all of the baseline folders so I wouldn't have to sort through the boxes and have at least that most important part of the files organized. I've had "Scio file organizing" on my workplan for months but it's been a lower priority.

As for Scherdt, when Neil took ownership some yaers ago I met with him and provided a copy of the baseline folder including the recorded CE and all the baseline docs (photos, aerials, maps, descriptions). I have done the monitoring visit annually since then with the usual process of sending a letter (attached), following up with a phone call and then doing the visit. Neil has never joined me. I did this year's visit on April 27, walked the entire property including the woods and found nothing of concern (report attached). I still have three visits to do with NRCS staff so haven't sent copies of the monitoring form to Neil where I ask for his signature with a

stamped, addressed return envelope but he never does it. David is correct that the recorded CE requires a FMP by a registered professional forester for commercial forestry, defined as "...any cutting of trees for sale or use off the Property..." The Scherdts are permitted to cut landmark trees on their property if a plan exists but what is described is not a plan, and it was not provided to me (or anyone, apparently). I still have the "working" copy of the baseline folder at my home office but return it once I send the letter with the annual form and send the form to our funding partners.

Very glad for the citizen call and the quick action by Murphey and Dave. (I saw Murphey called me a couple times Friday afternoon when I was on vaca but she didn't leave a message.) Obv I only go to the property once a year and am glad I didn't show up next Spring to find the tree cutting which would have likely resulted in another legal action. I endeavor to establish and maintain good relationships with easement property owners but they can still be knuckleheads.

1. There are empty filing cabinets in that space in which all the boxed material can go. I'm happy to meet with Dave to get the process started.
2. See attached.
3. All that info is on the easement monitoring forms.
4. I just learned that county parks now requires FMPs to be reviewed and approved by them (not just produced) as well as harvest plans, and got the language they use. I support adopting that for future CEs.

Neill needs to be informed by registered letter that he cannot pursue his harvest without the FMP. Typically that's something I would do; is there agreement on that or is someone else taking the lead?

Barry

On Wednesday, July 15, 2026 at 03:51:02 PM EDT, David Read <dread@sciotownshipmi.gov> wrote:

> All,
> Friday afternoon at approximately 3:30, Murphy rec'd a call from a concerned citizen regarding the sound of chainsaw activity emanating from one of our CEs on Marshall Road. She and Olivia (our newest NAT) hurried out there and, after crossing the length on DD Marshall (quite challenging terrain I'm told) came upon a sawyer busy on the Scherdt property killing a third(!) landmark hardwood tree (black walnut?). She asked him to stop work until we could determine if property owner had an approved Forestry Mgmt Plan. While they were out at the site I went to Township Hall to dig through the files to find the Scherdt's info.
>
> I have previously been to the storage area - the underground tornado shelter - but never had to quickly find something. The LPC files are stored in 7 (heavy) banker boxes stored 2-deep with couple of dozen file folders, three-ring binders, etc. stacked on a shelf above the boxes. Then there are two much larger boxes labelled "Bateson" which will probably have to go into the Liberty Pond file at some point in time (Bateson being the previous owner of that property).
>
> Found the Scherdt file and we determined that he is allowed to cut timber for personal use (home heating and the like) but anything more than that requires a Forestry Mgmt Plan. Pretty standard easement language. Scherdt's is an old easement and, as with many easements, the original owner (Paul Scherdt) has passed away and his son and daughter-in-law (Neal and Kim)

now live there. The only phone number we could find in the file has been disconnected, probably the original land line. Murphy and I went out to the Scherdt's but they were not home. We stopped at Nurture and Nature, assuming that neighboring farmers would know each other and possibly have contact info. Sure enough Erica was able to give us Neal's number.

Murphy called and left a message asking Neal to call on Monday to setup a meeting to discuss the situation and review his Mgmt Plan - which he did. His Mgmt Plan turned out to be a 1-page proposal from the sawyer to kill 80! Hardwood trees. Not a plan. Laura Kreps from CWA explained the process needed to get an approved plan which I think was quite daunting to Neal. This could have been another Botsford but Murphy was able to stop it, at least for now.

Thank you for reading this far. I think the above highlights some short comings in our process or perhaps in our internal communication.

1. The LPC files should be organized and stored in file cabinets for easy retrieval. I plan to order 2 or 3 3-drawer file cabinets and will spend the next few weeks (months?) putting the LPC files in order.
2. Barry, I believe you send out a letter each year informing the owner of your pending monitoring visit.an Would you please provide us a copy of that letter?
3. We need to review the process by which the records are updated when a property changes hands. Minimally, we need the new owner's name, phone number, and email address. Also, home address if not living on the property.
4. We need to include language in the easement template that requires any Forestry Mgmt Plan must be approved by the DNR and filed with the Township and placed in the appropriate LPC file. I was astonished this requirement is not in place.

My New project:
In order to file the LPC documents, I thought it best to sort the "Scioproperties" by Type so that I could confirm how many of each type (CE vs Fee) we had. In its current format, the data cannot be sorted (at least I don't know of an Excel command that can sort columns rather than rows). Regardless, I have "Transposed" the data and it now exists in 12 columns and 47 rows - sortable by owner, date, size, etc. It also is printable on one double-sided sheet of 8.5 by 11 paper! I will send a copy of the revised sheet under separate cover along with some observations that we should talk about.

Regards,
David

<mon visit.docx><Scherdt mon form 2026.pdf>

Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com> Sun, Jul 26, 2026 at 10:49 AM
To: David Read <davidread@bitsoflight.com>
Cc: Barry Lonik <blonik13@aol.com>, Lisa Pappas <lapappas@umich.edu>, Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com>, Daryl Burkhard <burkhard3dr@gmail.com>, Marybeth Lynch <lynchverga@yahoo.com>, Tim Redmond <timredmond@comcast.net>, David Read <dread@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Christopher Cheng <ccheng@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Murphy Harrington <mharrington@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Kristy Aiken <KAiken@sciotownshipmi.gov>

David,

Please see my email of last Thursday, July 23rd. The Land Preservation Commission will not be engaging in online discussions of any subject at all. Discussions such as the are appropriate for an open meeting in which residents and members of the public can participate.

If you would like me to add the Scherdt property as a new business item for our August meeting please let me. know and I will do that.

Thank you very much.

Liz
[Quoted text hidden]

Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com> Mon, Jul 27, 2026 at 1:55 PM
To: Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com>

Hi, Liz. I appreciate your leadership and service as LPC chair!

Best,
Jeannine
[Quoted text hidden]

David Read <DRead@sciotownshipmi.gov> Mon, Jul 27, 2026 at 2:20 PM
To: Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com>
Cc: Barry Lonik <blonik13@aol.com>, Lisa Pappas <lapappas@umich.edu>, Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com>, Daryl Burkhard <burkhard3dr@gmail.com>, Marybeth Lynch <lynchverga@yahoo.com>, Tim Redmond <timredmond@comcast.net>, David Read <DRead@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Christopher Cheng <CCheng@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Murphy Harrington <mharrington@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Nathaniel Clark <nclark@sciotownshipmi.gov>

Liz,
That's a good idea.
Please put this item on the agenda for our next LPC meeting and include the attached emails as backup material.

Also, in the future, if you want to include a staff member's manager in an email, please be sure to be accurate. In this case, Nathanial Clark would be the appropriate person.

Thanks,
David

From: Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 10:49
To: David Read (Home) <davidread@bitsoflight.com>
Cc: Barry Lonik <blonik13@aol.com>; Lisa Pappas <lapappas@umich.edu>; Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com>; Daryl Burkhard <burkhard3dr@gmail.com>; Marybeth Lynch <lynchverga@yahoo.com>; Tim Redmond <timredmond@comcast.net>; David Read <DRead@sciotownshipmi.gov>; Christopher Cheng <CCheng@sciotownshipmi.gov>; Murphy Harrington <mharrington@sciotownshipmi.gov>; Kristy Aiken <KAiken@ScioTownshipmi.gov>
Subject: Re: Scherdt CE issue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
[Quoted text hidden]

Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com> Mon, Jul 27, 2026 at 7:5[illegible]M
To: Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com>

Thank you Jeannine, I appreciate that very much.
[Quoted text hidden]

Liz Wiseman <edevinewiseman@gmail.com> Mon, Jul 27, 2026 at 8:21 PM
To: David Read <DRead@sciotownshipmi.gov>
Cc: Barry Lonik <blonik13@aol.com>, Lisa Pappas <lapappas@umich.edu>, Jeannine LaPrad <jmlaprad19@gmail.com>, Daryl Burkhard <burkhard3dr@gmail.com>, Marybeth Lynch <lynchverga@yahoo.com>, Tim Redmond <timredmond@comcast.net>, David Read <DRead@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Christopher Cheng <CCheng@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Murphy Harrington <mharrington@sciotownshipmi.gov>, Nathaniel Clark <nclark@sciotownshipmi.gov>

I'll add it to the agenda David, with emails attached. Liz
[Quoted text hidden]

Open Meetings Act—Email Quorum Violation

Introduction

The Michigan Court of Appeals has ruled that email deliberations among a quorum of public body members violates the Open Meetings Act (OMA). The November 1, 2016, unpublished opinion was issued by a three-judge panel in the case of *Markel v Mackley*, Case No. 327617.

Meeting requirements

Section 3 of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, PA 267 of 1976, as amended (OMA), requires that:

- "All meetings of a public body shall be open to the public and shall be held in a place available to the general public," and
- "All deliberations of a public body constituting a quorum of its members shall take place at a meeting open to the public."

Interpreting these provisions, the Court explained that "[u]nder the OMA, public bodies must conduct their meetings, make all of their decisions, and conduct their deliberations (when a quorum is present) at meetings open to the public," (quoting *Speicher v Columbia Twp Bd of Trustees*, 497 Mich 125, 134-135 (2014).

Deliberations

In *Markel*, four members of a seven-member elected public body engaged in numerous email exchanges regarding matters of public policy which would soon come before the public body for consideration. Three of the members on the group emails actively exchanged thoughts and plans to handle the matters. The fourth member on the group emails simply received the emails but did not actively engage in the exchange. At subsequent public meetings, the matters were handled just as had been planned in the email exchanges. The Court found that the group emails constituted a "meeting" under the OMA because there was a quorum present and deliberations occurred on a matter of public policy. Furthermore, the Court found that, "Because the meeting was held privately via email, the four defendants violated [Section 3(3) of the OMA] which required such deliberations to be open to the public."

The Court acknowledged that the mere receipt of an email by a public body quorum does not, itself, constitute "deliberation" and that there must be some level of discussion on the issue of public policy being presented. While the Court ultimately ruled that such a finding is often fact-specific, in reaching its decision it relied on the facts that:

1) The members who received the emails were not "mere observers," and that their tacit agreement to the substance of the email was later demonstrated at public meetings by, "acting consistently with decisions made in the emails;"

2) None of the members objected to their inclusion on the emails; and

3) The response by members to some of the emails, but not all, could indicate participation on behalf of a member.

While the Court's ruling did not specifically address group text messages, the rationale applied in this case would apply equally to group text messages and other forms of electronic communications. Thus, members of public bodies must act with great care to avoid group communications that may constitute an impermissible "meeting" under the OMA. See the following Fact Sheets: OMA—Definitions and Requirements, OMA—Posting Requirements, OMA—Calling Closed Meetings, and OMA—Closed Meeting Minutes.

This Fact Sheet was provided by the law firm of Miller Canfield.

PROPOSAL FOR LAND SURVEYING SERVICES

June 24, 2026

CLIENT:
Scio Township
c/o Barry Lonik
827 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
(734) 369-9400

BY:
Kevin Gingras, P.S.
Arbor Land Consultants, Inc.
6653 Schneider Rd
Manchester, MI 48158
(734) 320-4412

PROJECT INFORMATION:
Boundary Survey
NGA Mobility Parcels

SUBJECT PARCEL(S):
H -08-169-300-001, 400-023
See attached sketch

SERVICES PROPOSED BY ARBOR LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.:

ITEM #	DESCRIPTION
1	Locate sufficient survey control to accurately determine the parcel boundaries
2	Stake the boundaries of the parcels every ±250 feet with wood lath and ribbon.
3	Locate encroachments, if any
4	Prepare a sketch that shows the results of the survey on an aerial image

FEES:
The LUMP SUM FEE for this survey will be as follows:
Locate control and determine parcel boundaries: $925
Stake North Segments (shown in red) +$740
Stake East Segments (shown in yellow) +$555
Stake South Segments (shown in blue) +1110

NOTES:
This work can be completed within 5 weeks of acceptance of this proposal, weather permitting.

Thank you!

TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

Information Provided by Client: The Client shall provide information relating to the Project that is available, and Arbor Land Consultants Inc. (ALC) shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of such information. Accordingly, the Client agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to Indemnify and hold Arbor Land Consultants Inc. harmless from any claim, liability, or cost for injury or loss arising from errors, omissions or inaccuracies in documents or other information provided by the Client.
Fee Agreement and Payments: Client shall pay Arbor Land Consultants at its current Standard Rates for Time and Materials, unless another billing basis is indicated. Invoices of the Arbor Land Consultants Inc. services shall be submitted , at Arbor Land Consultant's option, either upon completion of such services or on a monthly basis and are payable within 30 days of the invoice date. If the invoice is not paid within 30 days, ALC may, without waiving any claim or right against the Client, and without liability whatsoever to the Client, terminate the performance of the service. If the Client objects to any portion of an invoice, the Client shall notify ALC, in writing, within fourteen (14) calendar days of invoice receipt, identify the cause of disagreement, and pay when due any portion of the invoice not in dispute. Failure to provide notification shall constitute acceptance of the invoice as submitted. Retainers shall be credited on the final invoice.
Late Payments: Accounts unpaid 60 days after invoice date will be subject to a monthly service charge of 1.5% on the then unpaid balance. In the event any portion or all of an account remains unpaid 90 days after billing, the Client shall pay all costs of collection, including reasonable attorney fees.
Indemnification: The Client shall indemnify and hold harmless ALC and all of its personnel from and against any and all claims, damages, losses, and expenses (including reasonable attorney fees) arising out of, or resulting from, the performance of the services, provided that any such claim, damages, loss, or expense is caused in whole or in part by the negligent act, omission, and/or strict liability of the Client, anyone directly or indirectly employed by the Client (except for ALC), or anyone for whose acts any of them be liable. ALC's total liability to the Client for any and all injuries, claims, losses, expenses, damages, or claim expenses arising out of this Agreement from any cause(s), shall not exceed ten times our fee or $50,000, whichever is less. Such causes include, but are not limited to, ALC's negligence, errors, omissions, strict liability, or breach of contract.

CLIENT ACCEPTANCE AND GUARANTEE:

I/We personally guarantee the obligations of the (Company) Client listed above.

Legal Name of Client:	
Guarantor Signature:	
Name of Guarantor (Printed):	Date:

Please sign and return this form via fax, mail or email if you would like ALC to perform this work.

Cordially,

Kevin Gingras, P.S.
President
Arbor Land Consultants, Inc.
kevin@arborlandinc.com

SKETCH OF PARCELS TO BE SURVEYED



Treemore Ecology and Land Services, Inc.
Barry Lonik
11300 Island Lake Rd.
Dexter MI 48130-8513
(734) 223-2321
BLonik13@aol.com

TO: Scio Township Land Preservation Commission

FROM: Barry Lonik

RE: Project Update

DATE: 6 August 2026

Other matters for public session:

- RCPP: the appeal was denied in April; Legacy filed a subsequent appeal and awaits word on that (unknown timing). Partners had a video call on the new RFP but no one had the bandwidth to lead it so we'll wait for the next round later this year.
- Spring monitoring: done, finally! Scherdt letter
- summary of closed session: score new application, recommend appraisal

The latest on public projects in Scio Township. Updates in **bold,** ~~cross-thru's~~ will be deleted.

1. Peter Heydon (2025-6, second; E of 1, 4400 Stein Rd.). 70 acres of woods, ponds and farm fields on the east and north side of Stein Rd. and the west side of Maple Rd. Appraised value $595,000 ($8,500/acre). Greenbelt $205,000 (50%); Scio share $300,000 (50%). ~~The PSA was amended to extend the closing deadline to September 30. I navigated MISS DIG to request the gas pipeline crossing the property be flagged so it can be shown on the survey; that will happen within 21 days, survey after that, baseline after that and ESA.~~ **The PSA extension was signed—finally. Survey and ESA are in process, baseline to follow. Greenbelt funds were approved.**
2. Jacqueline Hicks Trust (2022-2, third; E of C, 5777 Joy Rd.). 100 acres of farm fields and woods at the SW corner of Zeeb Rd. and Joy Rd. Appraised value $633,000 ($6,300/acre). ACEP award $246,870 (39%); State award $200,000 (32%); Greenbelt $62,000 (10%); Washtenaw County $62,000 (10%); Scio share $62,130 (10%). ~~NRCS review found that the Hicks trust applied for funds when mom Jacqueline was alive as the trustee and beneficiary. She subsequently passed away, making son John the trustee and he and his two siblings beneficiaries. As a result the three of them needed to submit the federal income forms which were sent by US mail to the IRS. Honestly. It was unknown how long it would take for the IRS to verify that each of them individually did not have more~~

~~than $2.7M of income over a three-year period so we signed a FIFTH PSA amendment extending the deadline to December 30.~~ **The beneficiaries' federal forms were filed. Just waiting for the federal program to give the go-ahead to close. Closing statements have been circulated.**

3. NGA Mobility (2025-1, sixth; N of 10 and west of K, no address). 78 acres of farm field, wetlands and scrub woods on the east side of Parker Rd. south of Jackson Rd. Purchase price $1.3M ($16,667/acre). ~~I'm told the PSA has been fully executed but I have not seen it as Mariah is now the one holding such docs. Regardless, we have 90 days to close. I forwarded the ESA proposal to the supervisor. Mariah was satisfied with a survey completed some time ago. Arbor Land (surveyor) provided a proposal to stake the boundaries (attached); recommend?~~ **The PSA was signed and the ESA is underway, expected soon. Assuming it's clean, we can set up closing; statements have been requested.**

Glossary of acronyms:

PSA—Purchase and Sale Agreement (with the property owners/sellers)
PA—Participation Agreement (with local funding partners)
BOT—Board of Trustees
CE—Conservation Easement
ACEP—Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (federal)
ESA—environmental site assessment (aka Phase I)
CWA—Carlisle Wortman Associates (township planning consultant)
NATAC—Natural Area Technical Advisory Committee of Washtenaw County Parks
NAPP—Natural Area Preservation Program of Washtenaw County Parks
RCPP—Resource Conservation Partnership Program (federal)
GAC—Greenbelt Advisory Committee
MDARD—Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
AFT—American Farmland Trust
BE—Building Envelope