



**ACME TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES
WATERFRONT RECREATION AREA TASK FORCE
Wednesday March 31, 2004
Acme Township Hall
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690**

Meeting called to Order at 1:37 p.m.

Present: Voss Guntzviller, Owen Sherberneau, John Nelson, Ron Reinhold (Chair), S. Ferringa

Excused: David Amon, Anne Brasie, Paul Brink, John Hagen, Brian Jabour

Also Present: Jamie Wade, Gourdie Fraser Associates
Sharon Corpe, Office & Planning Coordinator & Recording Secretary
Herb Smith, Planning Commission Chairman

- A. Introduction of New Committee Members:** Reinhold gave everyone a member contact list for the task force. Most of the phone numbers on the list are work numbers. If anyone would like additional information about themselves listed, this can be arranged.
- B. Distribution and review of materials updated since July 31, 2003:** Page 12 in the meeting packets contains an update as to what has occurred regarding this project since July 31, 2003. Over the winter there was a period of no activity while we awaited state funding and township matching funds. Once funds were received, Gourdie Fraser was able to work on the engineering studies, which were first reviewed in January. Findings from the study, with some concept facility drawings, were presented to the Township Board and Planning Commission earlier this year.

Guntzviller and Reinhold attended a DNR hearing held at Benzie Central High School regarding a permit they requested from the DEQ for a new boat launch facility on Crystal Lake. They felt that the same sorts of questions that would come up for that project would come up during any Acme Township application process. Some of the key items they noted are included in the meeting packet.

On March 17, Reinhold and Amon met with Jon Kubiak and Andrew Bateman, representing the Grand Traverse Band and the Grand Traverse Resort respectively. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce Resort and Tribal leadership to the progress made to date and to foster a strong working relationship. As a result, Steve Ferringa is joining the task force.

Between August 2003 and January 2004 the township, state and Gourdie Fraser formalized the grant and service contracts. Distribution of funds is still ongoing, and every effort is being made to ensure that a good paper trail documenting expenditures is in place.

Reinhold asked Nelson to comment on potential environmental concerns that may exist. Nelson is uncomfortable because he has not been involved in studies as to the various alternatives that may exist. He is also concerned because the permitting process involves input from the Watershed Center in general and himself specifically. He was concerned as to whether he should be a member of the committee if he is going to ultimately be reviewing the application, and was encouraged to participate because we would rather have his insight on how to do it right up front. Nelson asked Ferringa if he represents the Natural Resources component of the Tribe as well as a general point of view. Ferringa responded that he represents both Tribal Government and the EDC (gaming), and is an appropriate person to make contact with the Natural Resources department. Nelson would prefer any alternative

that does not require placing fill in the bay, which can impact vegetation/fish habitat. He cited recent developments in Northport and Suttons Bay (Frigid Foods redevelopment) about which he will be having input.

Reinhold noted that the work to date has not been presented at a public hearing yet, so we don't know how it will be received by the public. He noted that a zoning question has also recently come up, in that only some of the studied potential sites are zoned properly for the proposed use. Guntzviller recalled that in the recent process leading to a new Recreation Plan, open space and more bay access were two of the top priorities identified during a public visioning session. He feels that this project can perhaps provide a little of both.

Reinhold asked Wade to explain the "wind rose" data. This graph summarizes direction and speed of windflow at the Cherry Capital Airport over the past 30 years. The prevailing wind is south/southwest across the bay.

Reinhold drew specific attention to a concept drawing on page 6 of the packet of materials provided to the Board and Planning Commission, and the legend in the upper left-hand corner. He walked the task force through the elements contained on this particular drawing, which may currently be the most favored configuration. Nelson asked if the docks on the plan would be seasonal or permanent and was told that they could be either. The total estimated cost of the facility concept would be in the range of \$8 million.

Kohl's and the new Great Lakes Campus of NMC are using a "Vortex" system to manage stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces. The new Traverse City Marina may also be using the system, and GFA recently held an informational session about it. The system helps separate solids out of runoff, among other things. There are overflows and baffles for separating out contaminants. One key component of the system is conscientious maintenance – without this it doesn't do the job.

C. Review preliminary engineering drawings and findings from Gourdie Fraser Associates (GFA)

- 1. Identify needed/final graphics for public hearing:** A good viewable size for an audience would be at least 2' x 4', and could be on posterboard or PowerPoint. Color is a must to help people truly visualize the type of project proposed. Nelson asked when the public hearing is expected to be held; Reinhold stated that this will be at the discretion of the Township Board. Wade recommends including one key design from each of the four proposed locations, but not showing all of the 20 or so concepts developed, which would be overwhelming.

Costs are also an issue. A possibility exists that GFA has billed an amount for Study Phase I work to date in excess of that approved by the Township Board for expenditure. Cost issues relate not only to the work being done and preparation of materials for presentation, but to real estate acquisition as well. At this point in time, the township does not possess the land needed at any of the sites to fully accomplish a project that would handle expected usage for the next 30 years.

Nelson offered the thought that parking is going to be one of the biggest impacts on the shoreline, and asked if off-site parking had been contemplated. Guntzviller responded that Elk Rapids faced a similar problem, and tried having people park at the local high school during the summer and use a shuttle to get back and forth. In practice, they ended up with quite a traffic jam. Reinhold stated that Wade spoke with the DEQ a month or two ago, and they said there was no way we would be allowed to place fill in the Bay to facilitate parking – they will only consider fill for

water-related structures if there are alternative sites for parking. Nelson agrees completely and strongly with this concern. If off-site parking can be provided, we should demonstrate how. If not, we must demonstrate why not.

Reinhold recently visited a 10-lane boat launch in Ludington. The breakwalls are about a half-mile long. This creates a harbor area so large that waves can build up within it again, necessitating an inner breakwall. The project we are contemplating is significantly smaller in terms of needed shoreline fill. This leads him to question what the true differences between the situations are, and whether or not there is an arbitrary component to the decision. Nelson responded that depending on when the Ludington facility was built, permitting rules may have been more stringent. Their facility is on open Lake Michigan, whereas our project is in a bay which is already somewhat more protected. This may lead to a difference in the character of lands and fisheries to be protected as well. Nelson speculated that to build the same facility today would face significant hurdles. Reinhold still wonders if there's still room for negotiation.

Nelson stated that it's very important to talk to both boating-oriented and fishing-oriented officials, both at DEQ and at the Tribe. In his experience, the two points of view are usually significantly different. He reiterated that for the most part we should be able to work with all agencies successfully. The idea of parking on filled areas will be a significant hurdle. Also, no permitting agency will sign off before the DEQ gives a permit. They may give a strong indication, but not an actual permit. Ferringa stated that past Tribal experience indicates that compromise will occur during the permitting process, and we can expect the site layout to change throughout.

Reinhold stated that he has learned that you can't charge a fee for what happens in this type of facility on state land unless you are somehow partnered with MDOT.

2. Comments by Jamie Wade, PE, GFA re: DEQ permitting

3. Further discussion

D. Presentation of boating statistics and ideas for access for the disabled (Voss

Guntzviller): Guntzviller has been talking to people regarding best practices in terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). He is trying to ensure not only full access to the facilities, but to provide ways for handicapped individuals to easily get in and out of their boats, which is often a challenge for them at traditional facilities. He also has a study prepared by one of Senator Allen's committees regarding the demographics of the boating community. Considering the DNR boat launch on Center Road on the Peninsula, in the fall there are cars up and down Center Road for a quarter of a mile each side of the facility. It has become such a problem due to a lack of sufficient parking at the launch site that the Sheriff's Department is writing tickets. At most launches on the bay right now, it is difficult to launch a craft longer than 16 – 18'. He will provide hard copy to everyone for the next meeting. He truly feels that the Bunker Hill site proposal is the best, and could interface well with the TART Trail.

Nelson recommended looking at the cost of fill and sheet piling for parking versus costs to acquire existing land area for parking. Wade stated that another concern is pedestrian traffic crossing US 31.

E. Discussion to identify areas of weakness in committee efforts: Reinhold noted that the committee has tried hard to include as many diverse points of view as possible. Nelson feels

the project as a whole is very worthy. Guntzviller pointed out that it could provide year-round access to water sports, including ice fishing and iceboarding.

F. Public Comment

G. Task assignments for issue preparedness: Reinhold asked for suggestions as to what should be available at the Public Hearing. Ideas included:

- Agendas at the door
- Graphics from Gourdie Fraser
- A PR plan prior to the meeting to get people in the door (website, PSA announcements on the radio, an article in the newspaper)
- Hold meeting after the “snowbirds” return for the summer – perhaps late May?
- Narrative of history of the project so the audience has context
- How much about the budget should be discussed? At this time, financing seems to be the least of our worries, as we expect to receive 75% grant funding.
- Flip charts and people to write down public comments/concerns
- Depending on expected turnout, find a venue other than the township hall
- PowerPoint presentation

H. Scheduling and Zoning Ordinance: The next meeting date will be April 7 at 1:30 p.m. for one hour, with a goal of finalizing plans to be able to make a presentation at the May Board meeting and schedule a public information session prior to Memorial Day.

Reinhold stated that Noelle Knopf asked him about concerns relating to our Zoning Ordinance and setbacks from wetlands and bodies of water. He spoke with Corpe, who helped him with reviewing the Ordinance, and noted that boat launches are only authorized in one zoning district by our Ordinance at the current time – B1S. The only site reviewed that is currently appropriately zoned is the Bunker Hill Site.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.