

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City
MI 49686

www.peninsulatownship.com

Township Board Regular Meeting

May 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Township Hall

Minutes

1. **Call to Order** by Sanders at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Pledge**

3. **Roll Call**

Present: Sanders, Clark, Milliken, Alexander, Sanger, Chown

Excused absent: Wunsch

4. **Governmental Updates**

Christine Murphy, Peninsula Township Parks Committee: thank you for the opportunity to provide an update on my parks committee role representing the state park. Thank you to our partners at the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, the township board, and the parks committee. This has been a collaborative, cross-functional effort, and the progress we're making reflects the shared commitment to create a management plan for the state park. We were able to locate the [Michigan Natural Resources Commission's] dedication for the park that confirms the official name is Old Mission Point State Park, not Old Mission State Park. I have put this dedication in the township board packet for all to refer to. We recommend using this name going forward and in signage. We've also confirmed the park encompasses approximately 650 acres, giving us a clear understanding of the scope we're managing. This is a substantial amount of acreage and waterfront, just under three miles at the tip of the peninsula. We now have 28 pages drafted for the appendix of the management plan, in conjunction with the DNR's work, documenting the park's history and key facts. This work consolidates information the DNR had previously gathered from many scattered documents into one comprehensive resource. This is the first time to my knowledge that these documents are being looked at in totality. We will be working with the DNR on future signage to ensure consistency and clarity for all visitors. This summer, the conservancy and DNR plan to walk the property to identify primary trails and assess any informal or rouge trails that may pose erosion risk so we can address them appropriately as we create new signage for the park. We are reviewing the township parks ordinance to better align with the DNR rules as well as updating the lease agreement with the State of Michigan, which dates back to 1949. For example, we found that metal detecting is prohibited on the beach due to keeping Native American artifacts safe. We will bring these recommendations to the township board once proposals are drafted and ready for your review. The DNR has been an incredibly supportive partner, offering guidance and expertise while respecting the township's role in managing the park. This is a strong team effort, and we are making meaningful progress towards a formal management plan that preserves the wild beauty of Old Mission Point State Park for generations to come.

At Pelizzari, the boardwalk construction is underway on the hemlock wing. You will see some construction vehicles in the parking lot. Donation pipes are in the works at Pelizzari and at the Bowers Harbor pickleball courts to bring in additional funds. And signage work continues.

Andre France, Community Police Officer: we had three citations in April. One PIA, personal injury accident. One OWI [Operating While Intoxicated] arrest, four criminal arrests, around 37 traffic stops. A few fraud complaints, which are typical in the whole country.

Fred Gilstorff, Fire Department Chief: today we held the Touch a Truck event at the school and had great turnout from our partners. A lot of vehicles were brought over. The kids had a blast. The biggest blast was when the Aero Med helicopter came in, which you got some calls about. Sorry about that. Aero Med is hard to schedule. Didn't want to put it on the flyer and then they can't show up. We didn't know for sure they were coming till about 15 minutes beforehand. They had just come from taking a patient to the hospital. The kids were super excited; they got to go up close to the helicopter. It's a good event, and we appreciate everybody who helped out with it.

5. Conflict of Interest: none

6. Consent Agenda

1. Invoices
2. Reports
 1. Fire Department
 2. Treasurer's Office
 3. Grand Traverse Sheriff's Office Citation, Accident & Arrest Statistics
 4. FOIA Coordinator regarding Appeal Received for FOIA No. 26-22 (Marini)
3. Minutes from April 14, 2026, Township Board Special and Regular Meetings
4. Order and Opinion Denying Plaintiffs' (Bonobo and Bowers Harbor Vineyard)) Motion for a Preliminary Injunction
5. GFL (Formerly American Waste) Contract Extension
6. OMPHS Annual Log Cabin Day Celebration Request
7. Peter Dougherty Mission House 2026 Cleanup Day Announcement
8. Letter in Support of FY 2026 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Planning Grant
9. Request to Appoint Wesley Cowan As an Alternate Member of the Board of Review
10. Summer Beach Monitoring at Haserot Beach
11. Correspondence
 1. Tom Barnhart
 2. Dave Baumann
 3. Jed Hemming
 4. George Weber
 5. Marc Gall
 6. Dan Bock
 7. Cheri Wickman
 8. Kip Nickel
 9. Katharine Pike
 10. Howard Pike
 11. Debbie Rough

- 12. John Dolton
- 13. Sally Erickson
- 14. Katharine Pike

Sanger moved to approve the consent agenda as presented with a second by Chown.

Roll call vote: yes – Clark, Milliken, Alexander, Sanger, Chown, Sanders **Passed unan**

7. Approve Agenda

Sanders will present business item eight, requested budget amendments.

Alexander moved to approve the agenda as amended with a second by Milliken. Motion passed by consensus

8. Brief Citizen Comments (for agenda items only)

Louis Santucci, 12602 Center Road: this letter you got from Fahey Schultz Burzych Rhodes. Curious they didn't sign the letter. It's unusual for a law firm not to sign a letter, especially when they're recommending what they're recommending. How can you know how much this maybe AI-generated letter you're going to be charged for? Normally you have hourly recommendations from the law firm, how much they're charging per hour for each person. No way to tell what that is here. Thing about this letter that bothers me is this next to last sentence: "Township should consider proceeding with caution in these areas and consider holding off on the formal adoption of any proposed changes until current pending litigation concludes." I can't think of anything more that would basically be a signal to people that you don't want them to, I won't say waste their time, but you don't want them to spend their time like the Agricultural Committee spent hours, almost more than a year, on the sign ordinance, and this non-identified person is basically saying, "Don't do anything." You are already in some trouble for constitutional violations. I can't think of anything that is more a constitutional violation than recommending that citizens not exercise their right to petition the government, which is the First Amendment and the First Bill of Rights issue that could possibly be another constitutional violation if you follow this. I can't think of anything that would be more darkening, a shot across the bow, of all the people than their time to come up with ordinances and recommend them. It's my hope that you will take this for what it is, which is just somebody's opinion. We don't know who the somebody is. Let things go on as normal and deal with them as they rise, instead of saying, "Well, gee, we can't pass any ordinances because they might have some vague nexus to the lawsuits." That would be true for every ordinance that you're going to work on. Somebody can always find a nexus. I hope you file this away because I don't see any reason why this board should not be moving forward on ordinances out of the fear [three-minute timer] that something might be a nexus to the winery lawsuit. Thanks.

Curt Peterson, 1356 Buchan Drive: in relation to business item four, there seems to be a misalignment with the Peninsula Township Master Plan and the appointed agricultural advisory committee [AAC], along with the township board, the township attorneys, and citizens over the importance and priority of future agricultural zoning. This board should reaffirm, as you did in 2024, that the goal of the AAC is to, and here it is in quotes from two years ago, "The purpose of the committee is to provide input on issues facing production agriculture within Peninsula Township." In the past few months, the AAC has proposed and sent to the PC, just last week, its recommendations for improving the zoning ordinance to enhance farming concepts. These suggestions should be evaluated and scrutinized based on their own merit or lack thereof. That's the discussion we need in order to clear any misunderstandings about the master plan, which was referenced at your March 24

board meeting. On page 84 under conclusions of the master plan, I quote, "To pursue development of updated zoning to address wineries and add more flexibility to other agri-business." That is what the AAC is doing. They are fulfilling that goal. There's nothing in the master plan that says, "Make no changes to agricultural zoning." So where are we today? As we just mentioned, our township attorneys per their correspondence contained within tonight's meeting packet have made a statement regarding farming and agritourism and say, "The township should consider proceeding with caution in these areas and consider holding off on the formal adoption of any proposed changes until current pending litigation concludes." Those were the words of the unnamed person from Fahey, our township attorney. These words, "Holding off," are quite concerning. This board should not curtail the actions of the AAC and should move forward with factual analysis of their findings and data. Those should be vetted properly at the PC. Let's not stand still for the next five years while more five-acre McMansions continue to march and take over our Peninsula and destroy our rural character and our scenic viewshed. Thank you.

Kip Nickel, 1015 Quaker Valley: after reviewing the packet for tonight's board meeting, I noticed new comments suggesting that proposed shoreline regulations would increase boat densities in Grand Traverse Bay by Peninsula Township residents, particularly from shared waterfront neighborhoods. Having participated in the ongoing fact-finding discussion and analysis of these regulations over the last two-plus years, I can confirm that the shoreline regulation study group and the PC have conducted thorough research and developed recommendations based on comprehensive evaluation of public perspectives. The conclusion, supported by Trustee Sanger's prior survey indicating a current average of three boats per 50 feet of shoreline across numerous shared neighborhoods, is that the proposed changes are not expected to increase boat density among township residents. Assertions to the contrary made without factual basis at this stage undermine the process and considerable time invested by participants. As communicated through letters and public comment at several meetings, the number of docks in our shared waterfront neighborhood has remained unchanged for many years. The board is maintaining this count through established dock policy and waiting lists for new residents. Currently, five owners are on that list. This net no new boat situation applies broadly across various shared waterfront neighborhoods. Consequently, the proposed regulations, which should also maintain 15 versus 30-foot setbacks for shared waterfront, are not expected to increase boat density. While some individuals without boating interests may prefer a decrease in boat density, implementing such preferences could negatively affect residents who have enjoyed the water for many years. Recommendations to return this to the PC for reconsideration due to lack of alignment with specific interests is regrettable. I hope the board will proceed. Let's continue to collaborate respectfully, sharing both land and water, and remain committed to stewardship of this area we all value. Thank you.

Dennis Hoeg, 550 Hidden Ridge Drive: my comments are related to shoreline regulation also. I thank the shoreline regulations group and PC for the difficult work over the past couple of years. That is not an easy project, to look at the older regulations and bring them up to a new standard. I ask you to consider that we allow a credit for a fractional share for the 50-foot shorelines beyond the 100 feet. There are several properties that do not have convenient increments of 50 feet, and it'd be nice to be able to have in the regulations something that defines that. Today it's not clearly defined and leads to arguments and debates about what really belongs in the regulations.

Sanders: for clarification, you said fractional credit for property beyond 100 feet?

Hoeg: yes, for 50-foot shoreline widths in excess of 100 feet.

Michael Gano, 508 Hidden Ridge Drive: I support the shoreline ordinance proposed and the work done by both the shoreline committee and the PC to develop the proposed ordinance. I support the three boats per 50 feet framework and the 15-foot setbacks in the original revision. The topography of the shoreline in this township is diverse, and from a practical standpoint, overly restrictive language is only going to create problems for consistent regulation and enforcement. A one-size-fits-all approach doesn't work for a lot of the parcels we have here. As Dennis mentioned, I agree the ordinance should address those communities that have an uneven amount of frontage, so some portion of a 50-foot allocation and how that is going to be managed. I hope the board will remain mindful that we are dealing with the Great Lakes shoreline and not an inland lake. There are unique jurisdictional and regulatory considerations involved here. If the ordinance becomes too restrictive, it won't resolve some of these issues we've been having. The boats aren't going away. We are a boating community, and people are going to want to continue to enjoy that. It's going to lead to more boats and other issues that will take up more space and create other safety hazards. Thank you.

Jed Hemming, 2455 Nehtawanta Road: between shoreline and agriculture, you are busy. The attorney letter, my response has to do with perspective. An attorney's perspective is, we need to win this legal case. That's where his letter comes from. As a farmer, my perspective is, if the township wishes to put off addressing the stuff presented by the AAC, it could present a centerpiece for discussion between WOMP and the township. I'm sensing there's things in this language from the AAC that are also part of the legal discussion with WOMP. I'm wondering, if we don't move forward legislatively, if this is an opportunity for the township to have an open table discussion about where agriculture is going in the future because that is a big part of what I believe the WOMP lawsuit is about. Access to the community, direct marketing, agritourism, and I hope some of you are going to the convention this week. That's my perspective. If [you aren't moving] forward, it offers an opportunity for maybe compromise and communication. Thank you.

Sally Erickson, 2228 Kaukauna Court: I'm the builder, developer of Port of Old Mission and East Beach Association, located at the base of the Old Mission Peninsula adjacent to the Hidden Ridge development. We too are subject to potential increases of density with the increase of boats. This year, I invite you to come to our beach and look at the installation of our adjacent neighbor's dock. I have written a letter to Aaron [current president of the Hidden Ridge Homeowners' Association] asking him to talk with his group about moving their dock to a more amiable location. I would like to put it on record that that has been done, a letter has been written to him, indicating that our goal is safety for our non-motorized users. We think our users have the same rights as theirs. The suggestion was perhaps they would go off the island. Currently, the dock comes off the beach and angles to the south, and the boats enter and exit in the water through our riparian area, where it would be finally deep enough for somebody to swim. Safety is our primary concern, as well as attention to how we take care of nature and care for our shoreline.

I do think that increasing the density of the boats will increase the number of boats on the shoreline. I'm not against boaters, and I love families, and I am sorry for all that this has caused for other people, but please take a look and consider the impact that could happen should this happen to other properties besides ours. Thank you

Thomas Barnhart, 10895 Peninsula Drive: thank you for the work you are doing and for the information that was put in the packet. I won't repeat what I wrote in my letter, but I do have a couple comments on the information that was provided, which was largely two categories. The first was the survey that Mr. Sanger did, factual information that was useful for this process. The other items were mostly PC minutes over several years of meetings. The bulk of the information was commentary, people expressing opinions from other perspectives. I don't think there were any substantive facts in those. Important for this process, facts, and understanding. In the course of reading these it was clear that the PC was all over the place. In certain instances, they said they wanted to focus on the sole ownership shoreline first, in other instances addressing the shared shoreline first. I think, in all instances, they said the broader shoreline work, not related to the hoists, was going to happen later. That later was a short time period, at least as I read in the minutes. The PC minutes also mentioned a letter from the Watershed Center regarding shoreline preservation. The minutes acknowledged that those items were not fully addressed in the current code and that they are, in their words, "in a bucket of work to be addressed later." I don't believe that was in the process, and there's no indication as to when later is. For those reasons, as well as the reasons sent in my email, I request that the shoreline issues be given the same seriousness of treatment as agriculture and the non-motorized, both of which have good structure and are providing good information, and that this be sent back to the PC to start that process. Thank you.

Judy Spencer, 6450 Peregrine Court: thanks for your time tonight. I wish I could say I prepared something written, but I'm going off the [cuff]. I've been up here many times. I've taken a back seat because I think you have heard a lot of what I've had to say already, but I want to express to other people who may not know that there's been a fundamental disagreement relative to whether or not the township has jurisdiction over the Great Lakes. Michael [Gano] mentioned earlier, if you are going to move forward with an ordinance, encourage [you] to be mindful that there is a difference between the inland lakes, where the riparian rights go out in a pie shape towards the center – it protrudes out into the water – where with the Great Lakes, your riparian rights for your land usage end at the ordinary high-water mark. Some of the proposals in the language that is being proposed talk about this imaginary line that protrudes out into the water 15 feet from your neighbor. If you are courageous enough to move forward with an ordinance and look at the writing, just be cognizant that you don't want anything going beyond that ordinary high-water mark because it's not going to hold up in court. Be conscious of that, that the language we do put forward, make sure it does abide by where your jurisdiction ends.

Unfortunately, I did participate in the shoreline study group. I thought that was going to be a great way to talk to one another. I don't find this to be effective either. I say my statements, you sit in silence, and then we wait to the next time. I was hoping the shoreline study group was going to be more interactive. I wanted to try to find solutions to meeting in the middle. But at the time, we were asked to state our legal opinion once for two minutes and never mention it again. Instead of putting forward three different options and letting you vote, guess what option you're looking at right now? An ordinance to increase the [number] of boats is the only option you're considering. I wish the study group had come up with three different solutions and you had voted on that. In a time where you are up to your eyeballs with legal pressure and limited resources, the fact that we're going to extend ourselves, possibly beyond our jurisdictional boundary, number one, maybe even talk about additional permitting with [fewer] resources...I feel bad for you. It's going to cause more fights and

more potential lawsuits. Just be cognizant of that. The third thing in terms of safety and being neighborly. Yes, I am from the infamous Hidden Ridge. I also encourage you to come to our beach in the summer. We have upwards of 30 to 40 kids, and our primary concern is safety and enjoying the water. [Three-minute timer] Any neighbor who puts their dock purposely to upset anyone else, they have something else going on. I can guarantee you no one's putting in a dock to upset anyone, and that's being a good neighbor. Thank you.

Dirk Mammen, 10878 Wood View Terrace: 30-foot setback versus the 15-foot setback. I was in a lot of meetings and overheard a lot of the discussion on that. Comes down to the direction the boat is ingressing and egressing out of their space. In a T dock formation, your ingress and egress point is out to the bay, which is safer than sideways docks. The 30 foot was intended to be those docks with the boat sitting parallel to the shoreline versus perpendicular to the shoreline. No different than if you have a T dock with slips on the inside. That boat has to go all the way around. The discussion of setbacks is related to how the boats come in and out from the shoreline. Also, in defense, I was here when we discussed the beach erosion issues, the beach grass issues, and why that question from Mr. Barnhart a few moments ago was moved off of this issue. It wasn't related to the Watershed folks. Their issue was about how we handle our beach grasses, how we handle our erosion. They weren't here to determine where the dock would go, how deep the dock would go. It related to how we manage our equipment, steps, beach grass, trees, and where we store that type of stuff. Thank you.

9. Business

1. Public Hearing for Festival of Races (Sanders)

Representatives from the Festival of Races thanked the board for more than 50 years of hosting the event and confirmed no changes to the plan from previous years.

Public hearing opened at 7:35 p.m.

No public comment

Public hearing closed at 7:35 p.m.

Sanger moved to approve the Festival of Races Special Use Permit with a second by Milliken.

Roll call vote: yes – Clark, Milliken, Alexander, Sanger, Chown, Sanders **Passed unan**

2. Discussion on No Parking Signs in Front of Township Hall and Elsewhere on M-37/Center Road (Sanders)

Deputy France expressed concern over safety with cars parking on M-37 when attending meetings or voting at the township hall. Recommended no parking signs or better lighting. Board was interested but Chown expressed concern about people not being able to attend board meetings or vote given the parking limitations if they can't park on M-37 if and as needed. Board requested a plan of action.

3. Discussion on Lighthouse Manager Reporting and Decision Structure (Sanders)

Sanders requested a formal reporting structure for clear communication between the lighthouse management, state park, and township board. Offered to be the intermediary for reporting.

Chown requested direct communication with parks committee members who oversee the state park. Sanger explained the difference between policy and operations. Policy will stay with board.

Clark requested a clear paper trail of specific budget designations between lighthouse and park.

Sanger moved to establish the operational management direction of the lighthouse be assigned to the township supervisor while policy matters remain with the township board with a second by Milliken.

Roll call vote: yes – Milliken, Alexander, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark **Passed unan**

4. Discussion of Topics on Hold at the Planning Commission and Agricultural Advisory Committee until the Conclusion of the WOMP Lawsuit (Sanders)

Sanders reviewed the letter in the packet and explained that it was from township legal counsel Chris Patterson. She accidentally overlooked printing the signature page. Board discussed the need to balance necessary progress with liability during uncertain litigation. General consensus that the signage ordinance should be finished and small acreage farm processing move forward, excluding any reference to policies concerning MCLL.

Sanders moved to direct the planning commission to take up the agricultural advisory committee recommendations for agricultural recommendations for properties between 5 and 39.9 acres with the restriction that there be no recommendations concerning MLCC, alcohol processing, or sales with a second by Chown.

Clark expressed concerns about limiting recommendations when the board makes the ultimate decision and can choose to veto after hearing the full recommendation. Sanders countered that setting conditions preemptively helps limit legal costs and wasted time during the recommendation process.

Roll call vote: yes – Milliken, Alexander, Sanger, Chown, Sanders. No – Clark **Motion passed by majority**

Chown moved to direct the planning commission to move the signage recommendations forward with a second by Milliken.

Roll call vote: yes – Alexander, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark, Milliken **Passed unan**

5. Introduction of Special Use Permit #117, Amendment #2, for St. Joseph Catholic Church (Sanders)

Clark moved to schedule a public hearing for the June 9 regular meeting for St. Joseph Catholic Church Special Use Permit #117, Amendment #2 with a second by Chown. Motion passed by consensus

6. Resolution 2026-05-12 #1, Authorizing Participation in Joint Representation Agreement for Charter Communications Franchise Renewal Negotiation (Sanders)

Sanders recommended moving forward with joint negotiations as done in previous years to save time and cost.

Alexander moved to approve Resolution 2026-05-12, #1, Authorizing Participation in Joint Representation Agreement for Charter Communications Franchise Renewal Negotiation, with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark, Milliken, Alexander **Passed unan**

7. Resolution 2026-05-12 #2, Amended Michigan Mutual Aid Box Alarm System Association Agreement (Sanders)

Chief Gilstorff reviewed the state system with the established local division and said the resolution is procedural to keep up-to-date signed documentation.

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-05-12, #2, Amended Michigan Mutual Aid Box Alarm System Association Agreement, with a second by Alexander.

Roll call vote: yes – Chown, Sanders, Clark, Milliken, Alexander, Sanger **Passed unan**

8. Requested Budget Amendments Supporting Clerk Operations and Elections Administration (Clark)

Board reviewed request for \$8,000 from general fund to be moved into the clerk's budget for office space equipment to help reorganize for election operations improvements. A page was

missing from the packet detailing items. Board requested a full explanation of the requested equipment at next meeting.

9. Continued Discussion of Shoreline Amendment #206 with Action Possible (Sanders)

Sanger: reviewed the survey in the packet with breakdown of waterfront ownership statistics.

Milliken: expressed support for 15-foot setback and percentage round up for irregular shoreline measurements and emphasized the importance of having regulations.

Sanders: explained that permitting and regulation are different, and regulation sits with the local authority.

Chown: discussed revising the wording and timeline for docks to be regulated by applicable count/state/federal departments.

Board discussed the updated off-season storage requirement wording, the 15-foot shared waterfront setback, and the fractional hoist rule using the .5 cutoff. Also questioned a required surveying of property.

Sanders moved to table the item to the May 26 3:00 p.m. board meeting with a second by Alexander.

Motion approved by consensus

10. Citizen Comments:

Dave Murphy, 6943 East Shore: regarding parking, 20 years ago, there were a lot of complaints about the parking on the other side of the boat launch near East Shore Road. The Scenic Heritage Route committee took it to the town board. Ended up with about 25 fishermen at the meeting feeling targeted, and our only attempt was to point out the safety issue. There had been some serious near misses [during the] daytime, with parking on the other side of the road. As you consider this important request, people are going to want to be at these [township board] meetings. I don't have an answer. I got yelled at by the town board for even bringing the suggestion forward, after the town board asked me to bring it forward, because there were 25 people in the audience opposed to it. We've been down that path before with parking and public meetings and safety. I hate to see people not be able to get to these meetings.

With the lighthouse manager, thank you for taking that on. The parks commission, when it was an elected body, opened the lighthouse in 2008. They hired a lighthouse manager who reported to the parks commission. The parks commission was dissolved in 2018. At that point, the town board took responsibility for all parks matters, and they made the decision to appoint a parks committee. The parks committee never accepted responsibility for the lighthouse manager, so she's been operating on her own. She's asking questions of the parks committee, she's not able to attend our meetings, it's back and forth with individuals. There's a lot of discomfort. Thank you, Maura [Sanders], for taking that assignment. I want people to know why. She used to have a manager, and that was the parks committee. Maura, you remember how much time the lighthouse occupied at park commission meetings. Offloading the lighthouse has allowed us to tackle more projects in parks. Shoreline is a big issue. I appreciate the work [Sanger] did to point out the ownership rights. I hear a lot of comments about, "We're a boating community." I'm not denying that, but history is important. There's a walking route I take along East Shore Road. There were 25 lots when we bought property. In the 80s and into the 90s, I walked the beach. There were two docks on those 25 blocks, and both were short, for fishing boats. At this point, there are 18 docks. This has evolved with the origin of Hidden Ridge, not that Hidden Ridge had anything to do with it, but it's a timeframe in which there's been an explosion of boats and hoists and long docks. The long docks have emerged with the recent low water. We're running into this hassle not just because of a couple subdivisions but because we

have become a boating community. Before we were not. We walked our shorelines and we shared our waterfront. We can't do it now because of everything that's stored on the beaches. It has been an evolution of use in this township.

Back to enforcement. Maura brought up getting in touch with realtor associations, dock installation companies. One method to try to help. Again on East Shore Road, these docks are skewed. They're trying to keep views open for the owners, and they're skewed to the lot lines. Nobody wants to complain. They talk among neighbors that they don't like it, but they don't want to report it. I would hope, with this new ordinance going in, that it's an opportunity to look at all of these waterfront lots, in this new era of being a boating community. Help the neighbors not have to tattle. I don't know whether we need to do a targeted mailing saying what the rules are. But tackle the realtors and the boat dock installers to get them to put them in the right locations. Looking at that area on East Shore Road, there are violations all over the place. People are skewing their docks. They're not at the midpoint, and they have lift stations out. JP [Milliken], thanks for repeatedly making the point, if we have no regulations, and with the way the shorelines move, you can have docks moving out like this. Port of Old Mission could do that. If they wanted to send a dock out in the other direction, they could hit each other. We do need regulations. Thank you.

John Dolton, 10862 Eagles Landing: I commend the board for the hard work and discussion on the shoreline topic, for listening to the feedback with respect to the setback. It's the right decision at 15 feet, which was the recommendation of the shoreline working group. This is a difficult topic. Those who are unhappy with the new ordinance language should keep in mind that the existing ordinance language says one hoist for 50 feet. We are acknowledging that we are a boating community. Giving everyone the better part of the year to adjust to this new ordinance is going to be beneficial and the right move.

Brad Niergarth, 8718 Peninsula Drive: with the waterfront ordinance and the number of issues you have to deal with, it would be neat to have a five-person, appointed, neighborly committee to hear complaints and try to mediate them. Two years ago, when we started the planning, I asked how many complaints there were every year: it was 32 out of 2,200 properties with waterfront. Seems like a lot of that could be mediated and not have to get into potential litigation or ticketing. A suggestion is to see if you can get some volunteers who would serve on a committee like that. My other comments are on the budgeting. According to the township budget that was published, I see three or four violations in last years that you may want to address. You approved your budget this year for activity level, but you still have some activity levels that appear to be over what the amended budget was, which is a violation, and you should amend that. I would recommend talking to your auditors, see what they suggest. Your parks plan is a bigger problem; it looks like it's going to end with a deficit. You'll have to file an action plan to fix that with the state, once your auditors see it. The fix is obviously to transfer more money there. You've got the next year budgeted the same way. So, this year looks like it's a problem ending with a deficit, next year budgeted with the deficit. You can't approve funding that's going to be a deficit at the end of the year. I've always questioned why your cash report shows a negative cash balance for parks. That doesn't seem possible either. There must be some borrowing from another fund going on that you should have authorized if you are doing that. You've got the MTA suggestions, but Public Act Two is what I'm referencing that you should be following. And in there MTA has best practices, but the public act requires you to report your budget to comparison to actual, at least quarterly. You should have in your minutes the 12

months of last year reported compared to budget. Do that quarterly because I think that's following the law. I suggest you try to act on that, and I would do it before your auditors come in so that you can show that you addressed that. Thank you.

Kirstin Erickson, 6379 Mission Point: I am an East Beach member. I want to stress my concern and hope to get the center dock placement established. If I'm misunderstanding, please correct me. A 15-foot setback, was that the dock placement? Because I'm concerned that a property will go 15-feet off, put their dock in, and then the next property will go 15, and then we only have 30 between us, and then we don't have T's or L's. I would really like to stress an L or T formation with the center dock placement. We would have more room... The way people pull their boats in and out, it's [encroaching] on the other property to the south or the north. That concerns me for my kids doing their paddle boarding. I have concerns and would like to stress shared frontage [using] center dock placement. I'm listening to all your wonderful work and strategizing and all these ideas; I appreciate all of that. I hope we can come to this great solution for all of us neighbors in these tight spots. I am concerned that when we do have something that's not feeling safe and we record it, how are we going to have enforcement? Is there a possibility to get people down there to physically look at a situation that doesn't feel safe?

Please consider some sort of fine structure to bring people into compliance. Money out of the pocketbook gets people to take action, and it has to be substantial fines and motivation to correct a dock placement. I am uncomfortable with them swinging into our neighboring property area with their boats when we want to go out there around our moorings. Think and strategize on that safety point. I appreciate your hard work. Thank you.

Judy Spencer, 6450 Peregrine Court: [addressing audience] it's not that I disagree with your comments about –

Sanders: you have to address the board.

Spencer: see, again, I would rather have a conversation than address, but I'll stay formal. I'm not in disagreement that a certain formation might be safer than others, but I will say that our permit specifically states that our formation needs to be in a certain way, and we use coordinates to figure out where our dock needs to be. My concern would be, if our ordinance conflicts with the permitting that we get from a higher body, who's right? This is where it becomes challenging because it's not one size fits all. I'm not disagreeing that a T is probably safer. But we're in a tough spot where we're going to be doing whatever the water is, how deep it is. It's very dynamic. If there's an encroachment and not feeling safe, that should be going to the Army Corps of Engineers who gave us the permit. Even though certain people feel certain formations are better than others, and I would agree, I think we need to recognize who is the body that needs to dictate what the shape is out on the Great Lakes. That doesn't have to do with the safety of the usage of your land; that is the safety of the water and that is a different power of government. Thanks.

11. Board Comments:

Sanders: we are transitioning to the online permitting website EPIC-GT used by the county; it should be accessible soon. Shaina LaFond in the clerk's office requested an audit of streetlight charges from Consumers Energy and found an owed balance of \$7,793.83. Of that, \$1,915.75 goes to the fire department budget and \$5,878.08 back into the general fund. The Citizens Coalition of Old Mission Peninsula is hosting a farmer information meeting on Thursday, May 28, at 11 a.m. at Old Mission Receiving. The flier will be attached to the minutes.

Peninsula Township
Township Board Regular Meeting
Laura Martin, Recording Secretary

Clark: the reviewed settlement for winter taxes is ready on the township end. We are waiting for the county treasurer to finalize the payout, approximately \$25,000 to the general fund, \$52,000 to the fire department, \$80,000 to PDR. Will be starting on the summer tax role for bills starting June 1. The treasurer's office is ready and in early engagement with auditors.

12. Adjournment

Alexander moved to adjourn at 9:08 p.m. with a second by Clark. Motion passed by consensus.