



**ACME TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES
WATERFRONT RECREATION FACILITY TASK FORCE
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690
1:30 p.m. Wednesday, May 12, 2004**

Meeting called to Order at 1:38 p.m.

Members present: R. Reinhold (Chair), P. Brink, S. Feringa, V. Guntzviller, O. Sherberneau

Members excused: D. Amon, A. Brasie, J. Hagen, B. Jabour, J. Nelson

Staff present: S. Corpe, Recording Secretary
J. Wade, Gourdie Fraser

- 1. Comments by Paul Brink:** Brink stated that one reason he became interested in joining this group is because his home is directly next door to one of the proposed launch sites (Yuba Park Road). He has sometimes been concerned that he may have a conflict of interest because he is adamantly opposed to development at that site, but was nonetheless welcomed by Reinhold and Amon. Having worked with the group and found it to function excellently, and being more comfortable that the process is an open one due to increased awareness of meetings through the website and people keeping minutes, he no longer feels that he must or should be at meeting of the committee at this time. He feels welcomed to attend and listen as needed and desired, and would be glad to serve again if site selection narrows consideration down to a site not in Yuba. Brink tendered his resignation from the committee, which Reinhold accepted with regret and with gratitude for his contributions to date. Reinhold expressed hope that the group can still utilize Brink's legal expertise from time to time.
- 2. Presentation by Gourdie Fraser & Associates – proposed graphics and PowerPoint presentation for public information meeting:** Wade still has many questions for which he seeks answers prior to finalizing the presentation. He has prepared some updated color design concepts for the four launch sites under consideration, but the rest of the presentation is still in rough format. Reinhold stated that the group would like the presentation to very much convey the message that public input is central to any final decision that might be made, and that the proposed improvements could come in a range of sizes. It should be clear that the committee has not settled on an answer that they are trying to market, but that the feedback received about the full range of ideas discussed will carry significant weight in any final decision.

Sherberneau asked what the history of this project has been, feeling that it is important to begin the presentation by answering the question: "Why are we looking at this in the first place?" Corpe explained that the issue really started when the township, acting on requests received by some township residents,

moved some rocks at the Yuba Park Road site to facilitate launching. The work generated a significant amount of negative feedback from another group of residents and other bay access users, and Brian Springstead from Trout Unlimited ~~Trout Unlimited~~ **Grand Traverse Area Sport Fishing Association** mentioned that grant funds for launch creation or improvements might be fairly readily available. Water use was also an issue that was prominent in the creation of the parks and recreation plan update.

Reinhold stated that this naturally leads into agenda item 6, comments received from Bob Garvey. Mr. Garvey called the township office to learn more about the committee's work, and expressed concerns that the ideas being discussed are designed to serve a large number of people external to the Acme community, which may not suit our citizens. They may desire a facility just large enough to serve very local needs. Reinhold suggested contacting the Coast Guard to get information about current water and launch usage patterns, so that perhaps as a starting point we can determine to what extent we are serving both Acme residents and others outside our immediate community.

Wade suggested that taking written public input would also be important, and provided a sample response card from his office. It would be valuable to gather information about the people who are interested enough to attend, and to encourage feedback from individuals who might otherwise not wish to speak their piece in front of a crowd. Reinhold felt it would be a good idea, but would want the response card perhaps worded with specific questions relating to the presentation so that the resulting responses can be more intelligible. Wade will consult with Heather Brady in his office, provide a sample card for the committee to consider and discuss at their next meeting.

Wade showed the committee the five pages he has prepared for a PowerPoint presentation to date. Each contains bullet point lists covering topics ranging from the genesis of the project to a list of sites being considered and pros and cons for each. The committee then looked at the revised color concept plans. A concept for Bayside Park that essentially creates a harbor would require significant dredging to a depth of 10'; Sherberneau noted that the dock requested nearby for the GT Resort is currently proposed to extend 750' into the bay to reach a current water depth of perhaps 2'. Another option would be to create a 60' wide channel only. Reinhold asked how wide the openings in the breakwall/harbor concepts studied to date have been; Wade replied they have been about 100' wide. Reinhold has been informed that for two boats to pass might only require 30'; Wade pointed out that in heavy seas that are tossing boats around – especially if a large number of them are running for cover all at once – a 30' wide harbor mouth is not a large enough target.

Reinhold mentioned that the owners of the marina near Mtn. Jack's are selling the slips off in a condominium format. One question we might receive is whether the township should be looking at the possibility of acquiring and/or utilizing this

facility. He will make some inquiries to see what the status of that marina might be.

Wade stated that there haven't been any changes to the concept plan for a Bunker Hill Road site. Reinhold asked if it might be possible to place multiple views for each site on one handout page to help the public in making comparisons. He also asked Corpe about the township budget cycle and how costs to prepare perhaps 250 handout packets at a cost of \$2.00/each could be handled. Corpe replied that the current fiscal year ends on June 30. It is probable that funds needed to prepare for the meeting can be found in the publications budget, which has not been used up as projected by newsletters, or perhaps in the parks and recreation budget. The committee felt that the packets need not be in color, but could be done in grayscale to help manage costs. If multiple concepts are to be displayed together on a page, it might be worthwhile to consider a larger size page.

Wade feels that a rough cost estimate for the larger Bunker Hill proposals would be \$8 million. He estimated a cost of \$3 million for a Yuba Park Road site, the different being that the former would require much more sheet piling than the latter. Guntzviller noted that if any improvements were made to the Yuba site, people might desire something on a much smaller scale such as a skid ramp. Reinhold mentioned the additional possibility of making relatively minor improvements to several of the considered sites rather than creating one mega-site. Guntzviller cited some statistics he has obtained about the amount of parking available at various Traverse City-area launch sites, and what is common knowledge about the current amount not being enough. At the site on the Peninsula near Shore Road, people habitually park trucks and trailers along the shoulder of Center Road for a significant distance in each direction.

Reinhold asked if any information from the parks & recreation plan should be quoted in the presentation; most felt this would not be necessary at this time.

4. **Discuss Boat Launch concept compliance with Acme Twp Parks & Recreation Plan:** Reinhold distributed copies of pages from the plan at the last meeting, asking that committee members review them to confirm whether the direction taken to date seems to be true to the plan. Reinhold noted that page 32 of the plan does discuss a public desire for enhancement of existing facilities. Sketches on pages 34-35 show sketches of possible improvements to the Bunker Hill and Yuba launch sites. A paragraph at the bottom of page 36 sets forth a desire to implement the plan goals as much as possible. On page 37 there is discussion about partnering with other entities and a desire to acquire additional waterfront property for public use as possible. Brink also referred to supporting information on page 39 clearly mentioning dredging to improve launch sites.

While the plan mentions improvements to the existing three launches, including dredging (at costs which seemed large at the time but seem inadequate after further study) it may not contemplate plans on the order of some of the concepts

the committee has been looking at. Reinhold feels that it's important to point out this possible discrepancy in the directions of the plan and the committee to see what public reaction might be. Brink is not sure if this is a major concern or not. Sherberneau feels that the plan is a broad statement of goals that is subject to refinement over time.

On page 41 there is continued discussion of dredging and improving current launch sites that indicates the public finds improvements important not only for recreational boating but for safe emergency services access to East Bay. Feringa feels that in light of concerns over project scope, explaining the history of the project as an attempt to address a recognized public need is important.

5. **New information from MDOT per discussion with Rise Rasch:** Reinhold had a chance to talk to Rasch at an MDOT open house earlier this week. She was intrigued by the idea Reinhold put forth at the last meeting whereby MDOT might acquire the Cross Creek property, which is close to the current state park, from the GT Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians in exchange for Gilroy Park.
6. **Inquiry from Bob Garvey:** covered previously
7. **Other Business that may come before the Committee:** None
8. **Public Comment:** None

The next meeting was set for Wednesday, May 26 at 1:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.