

**Packet Addition Two
for 09-14-21 Regular
Township Board Meeting**

Reports

Correspondence

I want to thank Mr. Manigold for his considered response to Mr. Santucci's recent opinion piece. It certainly clarified some points for me. I trust that, as an elected official, he is doing his best to meet the needs and desires of the majority of residents of Peninsula Township. And, knowing what a careful individual he is, I am sure he did not respond to Mr. Santucci's opinion without careful assessment of the truth of the legal matter before the Township.

When I read Mr. Santucci's latest opinion piece in the Gazette, I have to say, based on what I had previously understood, I was a little skeptical that not all the facts had been presented in an unbiased way. I applaud Mr. Santucci for voicing his opinions, it is his perfect right to do so, and I must conclude he believes he has the best interests of the citizens of Old Mission Peninsula at heart. But I have to say, as a long time summer resident and recently a new citizen of Peninsula Township who has discussed this lawsuit with a number of my acquaintances, I really am not convinced the majority of Old Mission Peninsula residents agree with him that further commercialization of the wineries is in the best interests of the citizens of this community.

Yesterday, I went on line and actually read the township ordinance regarding wineries. It is clear to me that the original intent of this ordinance was to encourage diversity of agricultural activity, not to spread commercial enterprises within this rural, residential setting. And, I have to believe that the wineries established under the ordinance, did so in accordance with this very intent. After all, they knew the rules, which were clearly stated, and to decide to invest in their winery enterprise, they had to be in agreement with them. And I think, at first the wineries must have found it to be a satisfying endeavor. Why the situation is no longer satisfactory to the wineries is a question that only they can answer. But it now appears that the wineries will only be satisfied by turning their enterprises into commercial, rather than agricultural, entities. As I mentioned above, I am not convinced that the majority of citizens are in favor of increased commercialization on the peninsula.

With regard to a previous letter written by Mr. Santucci on this manner, he lamented that the wineries were under attack by certain citizens of the community. This was, in my opinion, a rather odd characterization of the facts as I understand them. In effect, we have at least eleven wineries financing a lawsuit with perhaps less than legitimate claims that can only be established by a lengthy court battle. To put this into perspective, if the lawsuit costs 250,000 dollars in legal fees, each winery would only be obligated to spend less than 25,000 dollars to finance the suit. As these are business enterprises, these costs will be written off as costs of doing business. On the other hand, the Township will be on the hook to finance their whole share of the \$250,000 defense. This must be done using taxpayer money that otherwise would be used to provide services in benefit of the citizens of the Peninsula Township. So, in my opinion, it is not the citizens voicing opposition to the situation that are attacking the wineries, rather it is the wineries who are attacking the citizens of the peninsula. You could say, this is a case of economic coercion designed to leverage the wineries demands for commercialization by forcing a settlement on their behalf, without due process.

In summary, thank you again Mr. Manigold for clarifying the situation from the Township's standpoint. I find myself in total agreement with the Township's stance on the matter. On a personal note, I will continue to make it a point to not purchase any products produced by the eleven wineries bringing suit and to encourage my friends and acquaintances to do likewise.

Thank you Old Mission Gazette for allowing me to express my opinion.

W. William Rudolph

Rebecca Chown

From: Jim Hall <halljr@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 5:09 PM
To: Clerk@peninsulatownship.com
Subject: Winery Lawsuit
Attachments: Winery lawsuit talking points 9_10_21.docx

To Whom it May Concern,

My wife and I sincerely hope the township will continue to defend us against the winery lawsuit. We fully support the position taken by the Board of Directors of Protect the Peninsula and the attached Talking Points. The quiet and rural nature of Old Mission Peninsula is what drew us to purchase a home on the peninsula 15 years ago, and we are alarmed by the approach and legal action taken by the wineries today.

Jim and Judy Hall
12700 Peninsula Drive

Rebecca Chown

From: Susan Piehl <officemanager@peninsulatownship.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Becky; Brad; Dave; Isaiah; Marge; Marge A.; Rob; Warren
Cc: 'louis santucci'
Subject: FW: Please give a copy to board members

Good morning Louis,

I am forwarding your email to all of the township board members in this mail reply.

Regards,

Susan Piehl
Peninsula Township Office Manager
13235 Center Road
Traverse City MI 49686
phone - 231-223-7322 ext. 1
fax - 231-223-7117

officemanager@peninsulatownship.com

Office Hours: Mondays 7:30 am to 6:30 pm, Tuesdays – Thursdays 7:30 am to 5 pm and closed Friday – Sunday and Holidays.

-----Original Message-----

From: Louis Santucci <santucci.louis@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 11:06 AM
To: Susan Piehl <officemanager@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Please give a copy to board members

As a member of the protect the peninsula farmers I want to express my support for the wineries and all the many benefits they provide both agriculturally and economically to the peninsula and in particular to grape growers on the peninsula.

To that end I urge the township to reach an accommodation with the wineries rather than expend time money and energy on the current lawsuit.

Lou Santucci

Sent from my iPhone=

impacted my neighbors for a few hours one day. The amount of traffic and noise on OMP is already at a nuisance level; adding more hours of operation and uses will only make it worse, and will reduce home values and burden the peninsula's infrastructure. Please don't compromise on this: It's unrealistic to think the Township can monitor a certain number of large events per winery per year.

- This is Old Mission Peninsula not Napa or the Loire. Our grapes are our grapes. Just say no to buying grapes/produce outside the area.
- Outdoor amplified music -- please, no, don't do it. Sound travels so far and so fast based on our unique geography. Our eardrums are already assaulted by the cigarette boats that flood our area whose loud engines make it seem like we're adjacent to an airport runway and whose stereos blast music that is louder than what I play in my own home. I don't want to go to sleep listening to the Macarena or Twist & Shout. I can get that in Detroit or Chicago.
- We do not need Walmart, bodegas or bougie stores on winery property. We are an agricultural community and want to keep it that way. Just say no to unrestricted merchandise sales.

Lastly, more people means -- as I mentioned earlier -- more traffic, more noise, more users of our roads and services. As someone who already needs to ask trespassers (visitors/tourists) to vacate private property, I do not relish the idea of having to do it more often. I'd like to enjoy the peace and tranquility of this area where my family has owned property for four generations. I know others feel similarly.

Please, just say 'no' to WOMP's demands.

Best Regards,

Emily Gest
(231) 223-4860