

MEMORANDUM

To: Peninsula Township Planning Commission
From: Shaina LaFond, Recording Secretary
Date: December 1, 2025
Subject: 11/04/2025 Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Please see the attached **current revised draft minutes** for the December 1, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Peninsula Township Planning Commission. The first draft of the minutes was inadvertently included in the meeting packet rather than the second draft. Additional revisions have since been made to that second draft, and the attached version reflects all current updates.

Revisions appear in **redline**. I respectfully request that the Commission accept these updates and make any further edits necessary to ensure the minutes accurately and fully reflect the meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.



PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI
49686 www.peninsulatownship.com

Planning Commission November 4, 2025, 7:00 p.m. Township Hall Minutes

1. Call to Order by Beard at 7:00 p.m.
2. Pledge
2. Roll Call – Present: Alexander, Beard, Dloski, Hall, Hornberger, Shanafelt, Shipman; Excused/Absent: none
3. Approve Agenda

Motion by Dloski to approve the agenda as written, seconded by Alexander.

Motion Passes

Beard references an MSU Extension article on avoiding ex parte communications, reminding members that discussions with interested parties outside public meetings compromise fairness and must be disclosed so all members receive the same information. Also stresses maintaining professionalism, noting that cameras and microphones capture side conversations and expressions, and urges members to model decorum for the public.

4. Brief Citizen Comments:

Katharine Pike, 6095 Red Fox Run: says the recent survey gave the impression that the township is running out of money and may need to raise property taxes, though she clarifies that may not have been stated directly. Asks where tax revenue from peninsula businesses goes and whether any stays within the township.

Commission responds that most tax revenue is distributed among various jurisdictions, with only a small portion remaining in the township, and advises her to speak with the township treasurer/consult the tax breakdown chart in the biannual newsletter for details.

5. **Communications:** **Beard** notes receipt of roughly two dozen communications regarding shoreline standards, many based on a circulating form letter. **Shipman** comments that the letters contain misinformation, incorrectly suggesting that the township is reducing shoreline rights. Clarifies that the current ordinance allows one hoist per 50 feet, not three, and says many letter writers appear unaware of this. Expresses concern that spreading false information harms the community, misleads residents, and undermines the township's deliberate review process. Encourages citizens to verify facts directly with township staff or by consulting the ordinance.

6. Conflict of Interest: none

7. Approve Meeting Minutes

- a. October 7, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Motion by Hornberger to approve the minutes, seconded by Shipman.

Motion Passes

8. Planner Report

Loud: reports that a new full-time administrative assistant begins November 12 and that the township is posting for a full-time planning and zoning administrator to help reduce the six-week permit turnaround. The zoning rewrite continues to address signage, shoreline standards, short-term rentals, acreage minimums, and residential uses such as accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and backyard chickens. Attorney comments on signage and shoreline drafts are under review, with a shoreline public hearing expected in December/January. Attorney advises keeping the current short-term rental rules rather than adding advertising restrictions. Commissioners discuss improving efficiency in seeking legal review earlier in the process.

9. Business

a. Seven Hills Special Use Permit 35, Amendment #4 Continued Discussion (Need Motion)

Motion to remove from the table the amendment to the above Special Use Permit that was tabled at the October 7 regular meeting of the Planning Commission for further discussion and consideration made by Dloski, seconded by Shipman.

Motion Passes

Loud clarifies that the packet includes the original staff report, a highlighted version of the conditions of approval, and a redlined version showing proposed changes. Members discuss the proposed inclusion of self-contained mobile kitchens and bars, which are not permitted uses in the township.

Motion to recommend denial of Amendment #4 to SUP 35 as presented made by Shanafelt, seconded by Alexander.

Motion to amend the main motion by striking Condition 1, Subsections H and I, referencing the mobile kitchen and bar(s) from the language made by Beard, seconded by Shanafelt. Beard comments that these are not currently permitted uses anywhere in the township and as Commissioner Dloski pointed out at the last meeting to grant this would amount to a use variance which is not legal.

Roll Call Vote: Alexander: Yes; Beard: Yes; Dloski: Yes; Hall: Yes; Hornberger: Yes; Shanafelt: Yes; Shipman: Yes;

Motion Passes Unanimously

Commission discusses condition #4 regarding outdoor amplified sound ceasing at 10 p.m. Discussion centers on redundancy with the township's developing noise ordinance, consistency of enforcement, and whether the provision should remain. Consensus forms to retain condition 4 as written to provide a clear standard.

Discussion ends.

Roll Call Vote on the Main Motion as amended: Alexander: No; Beard: No; Dloski: No; Hall: No; Hornberger: No; Shanafelt: No; Shipman: No.

Motion Fails Unanimously

Motion to recommend approval of Amendment #4 to SUP 35 as amended to strike Condition 1, Subsections H and I, referencing the mobile kitchen and bar(s) from the language made by Dloski, seconded by Hall.

Roll Call Vote: Alexander: Yes; Beard: Yes; Dloski: Yes; Hall: Yes; Hornberger: Yes; Shanafelt: Yes; Shipman: Yes;

Motion Passes Unanimously

b. Peninsula Township Fire Station – Fire Station #1 Special Use Permit #144 Introduction

Loud frames the application as a public capital project under Section 61 of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, noting a 35-day window for Planning Commission action and recommending scheduling a public hearing at the next meeting. Applicant – Township Fire Chief Fred Gilstorff; Engineer – Mark Maguire from Gourdie-Fraser; presents a new fire station on the township offices site, describing apparatus bays, main-floor offices and living quarters, and a lower level with training and fitness rooms; separate septic is planned. Chief explains that alternate sites proved unavailable or too costly, the current Station 1 site is too small and unsafe to retrofit, and the proposed design meets long-term operational needs. Maguire describes significant fill to address the existing ravine, grading to direct drainage to a rear retention area, and added/shared parking behind Township Hall; detailed topography, grading, storm water, and utility plans are provided in the full plan set with additional details forthcoming. Commissioners ask about parking conflicts and emergency egress; Chief says routine training and events will not impede operations and flashing warning signs will be installed.

Motion to schedule a public hearing at the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on December 2, 2025, for Special Use Permit #144 made by Dloski, seconded by Hall.

Motion Passes

c. Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Discussion

i. 40 acre minimum for all processing facilities (AAC recommendation)

Commission opens ordinance rewrite discussion with a "temperature check" on standardizing farm processing facility acreage to a 40-acre minimum. Loud says there is no redline yet and seeks direction; members express support and request a draft redline for December, while asking for background on why the current 40/50/60-acre tiers were adopted. Beard notes that the AAC has formed a subcommittee to consider operations on 5–39 acres.

ii. Special Use Permit definitions and approval process

Commission reviews McKenna's draft on special use permit definitions and process. Members agree to drop the "substantial improvement to the community" test and to remove the criterion stating an SUP must not "materially diminish economic value," as too subjective. They discuss McKenna's "minor vs. major amendment" criteria, generally supporting them, but debate whether small accessory structures should ever be treated as minor; no change is made. Members ask to adjust language so protection applies to existing natural areas as well as landscaped plantings and flag multiple errors in the included use table (e.g., boat hoists/docks) and direct that the table be removed from this section until corrected and integrated later in the district-specific tables. Loud confirms an ADU draft will come Monday, after which ADU permissions and procedures can be slotted into the use tables and SUP framework.

Other Discussion: Hall raises a concern for inclusion in the zoning rewrite, noting that the ordinance should consistently reference "accessory uses" at the end of each list of permitted uses within zoning districts. Explains that a well-drafted permissive zoning ordinance typically includes this clause, defining accessory uses as those incidental to and customarily found in connection with a permitted use, which helps avoid confusion such as that seen during prior public debate. Loud agrees this is an important point to address in the rewrite, and members suggest it would also make a good topic for a township newsletter, with Beard and Hall volunteering to help draft it.

10. Reports and Updates – Verbal

a. **Agricultural Advisory Committee**

Beard states that the AAC did not meet in October and will meet next on November 18. One member, Erin Hafeli, has resigned, and a replacement will be appointed to maintain the committee's size.

b. **Non-Motorized Plan**

Shipman: reports that review of a draft document is underway, with no new actions since the last meeting other than preparation of a grant report due November 7.

c. **Township Board**

Alexander: reports that discussions continue regarding the township's noise ordinance. The Board has also received correspondence from winery representatives regarding settlement discussions; the township attorney has issued a response. The Board will meet in closed session to address these matters, followed by its regular meeting the following week.

11. Brief Citizen Comments (Please keep comments to 3 minutes per person)

Kip Nickely, 1015 Quaker Valley Drive: responds to earlier remarks about misinformation surrounding shoreline standards. Thanks residents who submitted letters and urges the commission to do the same. Says the letters came from six shared waterfront neighborhoods on West Bay that have long operated with three hoists per 50 feet without township objection. Asserts that their statements regarding potential loss of access, decreased property values, and longer waiting lists for dock use are factual for those neighborhoods, not misinformation. Adds that he and other shoreline representatives remain willing to collaborate with the township on the issue.

Sally Erickson, 2228 Kaukauna Court: wishes to clarify the intent of her association's earlier complaint referenced by the previous speaker. She says the letter was not meant to target other neighborhoods but to address a specific conflict between her association, East Beach Association East Bay Shores, and the neighboring Hidden Ridge development. Explains that both associations were subject to the township's one-hoist-per-50-feet standard in their special use permits but Hidden Ridge later amended its master deed to convert limited common elements to common elements, allowing all owners beach access, which greatly increased boat use in a cove area not

Peninsula Township
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Shaina LaFond, Recording Secretary

sued for heavy activity. Says her association only seeks enforcement of the township's existing ordinance and notes that property line setbacks for shoreline equipment continue to be violated by the neighboring development. Suggests the township prepare a summary clarifying which neighborhoods are governed by which shoreline approvals to reduce confusion and ensure compliance.

12. Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members

Commission members discuss the issue of ex parte communication after reviewing an MSU Extension article. They note that while the Michigan Open Meetings Act does not prohibit such contact, best practice is to avoid private discussions with interested parties on pending matters to maintain fairness and transparency. Members agree that general informational conversations with residents are acceptable, but opinions or lobbying related to active cases should be disclosed so all commissioners have equal access to information. Discussion concludes that the concern is primarily about ethics and public perception rather than legal restriction, and staff will seek clearer written guidance for future reference.

Shipman clarifies earlier remarks about shoreline and noise concerns, emphasizing appreciation for public input but correcting misunderstandings. Explains that the township is not reducing waterfront rights; the shoreline discussions involve potentially expanding allowances from one to three hoists per 50 feet, not restricting access. Notes confusion surrounding special use permits and compliance issues but stress that balancing all waterfront uses remains the goal. Addresses misinformation about the noise ordinance, explaining that the update simply refines enforcement and is not intended to regulate ordinary activities like children laughing or playing. The purpose is to manage excessive or unreasonable disturbances between neighboring properties. Alexander adds that some residents misunderstand the ordinance(s) as something new, when it already exists and is simply being clarified to function effectively.

13. Adjournment

Motion by Dloski to adjourn, seconded by Shipman.

Motion Passes

Meeting Adjourned at 9:30 p.m.



Water front usage - ordinance and enforcement - Planning Commission Peninsula Township

From sally sallyerickson.net <sally@sallyerickson.net>

Date Sun 11/30/2025 7:16 PM

To Kevin Beard <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Randy Hall (rand.plancom@gmail.com) <rand.plancom@gmail.com>; 'David Sanger' <enforcement.peninsulazoning@gmail.com>; Armen <armen.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com>; lwdloski@gmail.com <lwdloski@gmail.com>; Julia Alexander (jualexanptpc@gmail.com) <jualexanptpc@gmail.com>; shipman.parks@gmail.com <shipman.parks@gmail.com>; dsh_44@yahoo.com <dsh_44@yahoo.com>; Maura Sanders <maura.a.sanders@gmail.com>; Becky Chown <clerk@peninsulatownship.com>; Katie Clark <treasurer@peninsulatownship.com>; Planning & Zoning Administrator <zoning@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; Robin Noval <deputy.clerk@peninsulatownship.com>

Cc sally sallyerickson.net <sally@sallyerickson.net>

 2 attachments (456 KB)

Mooring Basemap RIA Draft_2025 Image (002).pdf; east beach manigold letter.docx;

To the Peninsula Township Planning Commission,

Thank you for the work you do for the township.

I am writing to you regarding the potential of changing the waterfront usage and ordinances. The problem has not been the ordinance - it has been the lack of enforcement of the ordinance. Please see attached map with *Riparian respect lines* as reviewed/accepted by EGLE and Corp of Engineers for East Beach Association limited common element of Port of Old Mission. (*Riparian Interest area*)

Our issue is with the Hidden Ridge Association (SUP) overuse and abuse of our rights to enjoyment of our beach area.

The image attached shows the UNSAFE & unneighborly conduct of the Hidden Ridge Association.

Hidden Ridge Association overuse and installation of docks and hoists directly in our Riparian interest area – using our area as the runway for their boats and watercraft.

This is a HUGE safety concern for our members for swimming, stand up paddle boarding, kayaks, and non-motorized activities.

We also have concerns about the pollutants from this overuse.

We, East Beach Association, are a shared beach that adheres to our Port of Old Mission Phase III SUP approval and the township ordinances and rules.

We did not ask the township to throw the entire zoning ordinance on to the Todo list for a complete rewrite.

We simply wanted the current ordinances to be enforced. Just like the Gardners and others from this area of the Peninsula.

This is why I submitted a written formal complaint; To then supervisor Rob Manigold. Please see attached letter outlining our issues and concerns – they have not changed.

At the very least - any dock from shared frontage should be from the center of the frontage. Not allowed to be pushed to the edge of their riparian area or into the riparian interest area of their neighbors.

The written complaint has never been resolved. 2025 is the first year that Hidden Ridge Association was handed violations and a Cease and Desist by the township. It was also acknowledged that they **do not** abide by the “permit” from the Corp of Engineers. This action by the township was met with frivolity by the Hidden Ridge group, as they did not cease and desist, and had minimal fines assessed to them.

If this is the enforcement method than that the violation should meet with real consequences. The current fines/penalties are too low to be effective.

Years of inappropriate use, and the addition of beach sand to their vegetation striped area, has also changed the cove. The area is so shallow I recommend a site visit to see how ridiculous it is to have a marina in this region of the bay. This beautiful asset, our waterfront, is constantly changing and a one size fits all rule may not be a solution.

If you increase density to the waterfront, you have opened a pandora’s box – how many single-family residents will see offering a mooring as a personal profit center... VRBO moorings.

We simply wanted the current ordinances to be enforced and if they change that the future ordinances are enforced.

Thank you,
Sally

Sally J. Erickson, President

POM Associates Inc.

Builder & Developer of Port of Old Mission Neighborhood

East Beach Association – manager

sally@sallyerickson.net

231-218-5125



Property Lines (typ)



Riparian Interest Area depicted is consistent with
2020 JPA submittal - No Scale

Riparian Interest Area Exhibit - 2025 Aerial Image

PARCEL NUMBER 11-623-900-00		EAST BEACH ASSOCIATION
		Shared Frontage Parcel
		DRAWN 11/17/25 Revised ____

November 18, 2022
Isaiah Wunsch
Peninsula Township Supervisor
Dave Sanger
Zoning/SUP Enforcement

Hello Gentlemen,

I want to touch base and see that this is addressed during the winter 22/23, and before the hint of docks in the water next spring 2023. I know Dave, you are keenly aware of this concern.

Thank you for your help with this safety issue.

Best regards,
Sally

October 21, 2021

Rob Manigold
Peninsula Township Supervisor
13235 Center Road
Traverse City, MI 49686

RE: Beach abuse and dock location Hidden Ridge PUD approved 2001 originally 120' of frontage = Now 237' frontage – allowing by ordinance 4 boats; One boat for 50' of frontage.

From the East Beach Association and Sally Erickson, Developer Port of Old Mission neighborhood/PUD

Hello Rob,

Our concern is for the safety of our members, their families, and their guests.

The current use by our neighbors of the Hidden Ridge PUD Subdivision is selfish on two levels – unneighborly and erosively destructive to the beach and surrounding beaches.

1. If Hidden Ridge is allowed a dock. The dock should be centered on their frontage per Peninsula Township ordinance. This year 2021 the group installed the dock system adjacent to the beach South Property line – thereby forcing all the boats on the dock to drive through our swim and human use area. **Totally selfish and unsafe for our families and friends.** I pointed this factor out to Mr. Tucker the Hidden Ridge Beach representative during the dock installation this past spring, and basically got an “Oh well” response, he would send out a safety memo.
2. We realize that this group (Hidden Ridge Homeowners Association) has gone around local rules, but **the permitting that they have does not allow for an installation of the nature that was put in place in 2021**, and a simple infraction/fine is not a deterrent to this group. We need better enforcement of rules our group, East Beach Association, both respects and enforces. This is a horrific precedent being set for our region by Peninsula Township and the Corp of Engineers and potentially the Great Lakes Basin. Mother Nature requires that we work as a team, and respect the plans and rules instituted by the local jurisdiction and voted upon by local community members.
The Corp of Engineers should not undermine these types of measures.

3. If this type of misuse is allowed – what’s to say someone else won’t do this with 150 families. Is it just a matter of “word smithing” your way around the rules rather than respecting them....?
4. The boats cause extensive wake and shoreline destruction. Hidden Ridge has clear cut their beach area and has had significant erosion, as a result of this stripping of vegetation, and the wake abuse of power boat traffic that 20+ boats inflict on the shoreline. They have consistently brought in semi loads/trains of beach sand to compensate for the destructive impact that their lack of beach stewardship has inflicted on the shoreline. It leaves one wondering if the roadbed for East Shore could be compromised.

Our 157’ of frontage allows for 21 families/3 boats to use our beach from the Port of Old Mission neighborhood; and we charge a membership fee to join our East Beach Association. We have 171+ condo/homes in our neighborhood; that is how we keep the membership limited to the rules of Peninsula Township. Rules, which were incorporated into our Phase III Port of Old Mission Master Deed when we acquired the beach frontage – NOW Port of Old Mission Phase III Consolidated Master Deed.

5. I mention the Master deed because all buyers in Hidden Ridge PUD were/or should have been presented with a Hidden Ridge Master Deed prior to purchase – It does not matter if this was a bank owned or distressed development. That is how the development was approved by the township, and all owners had to agree to this document to close on their lot/home. The limits to beach use, and number of boats is not new information, it is PUBLIC information and familiar to the anyone who resides on the miles of beach frontage in Peninsula Township.
6. Perhaps this would be not issue - however our neighbors have made it abundantly clear that rules and simple curtesy to neighboring properties is not of concern to them as a group.

For this reason, we are lodging a Formal Complaint, and request for plan of action to prevent this type of miss use from happening in 2022, and any years in the future. We will not accept the Hidden Ridge dock system and safety issues that occurred in 2021, as result of disregard for the rules and approvals, for our members. Please let us know how your will resolve this issue.

Please let me know if you need additional information or if I can help to resolve this situation in any way. Available to meet in person, also available by email or text & phone.

Respectfully,

Sally J. Erickson

POM Associates Inc

Port of Old Mission Neighborhood

Builder/Developer

East Beach Association developer & member

sally@sallyerickson.net

[231-218-5125](tel:231-218-5125)

POM Assoc. Inc. & East Beach Association

mailing address

6379 Mission Pointe

Traverse City, MI 49686

cc. Christina Deeren – Peninsula Township Zoning
Dave Sanger – Ordinance Enforcement Officer, PT Trustee
Jill Little, Manager POM Phase III Association
East Beach Association Membership

NEW – Isaiah Wunch 11/2022

**PUBLIC INPUT TO THE PENINSULA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION, PLANNER
ELISE LOUD AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES RE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AND
REWRITE OF SHORELINE REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO SHARED ACCESS PROPERTY
OWNERS' USE OF SEASONALLY INSTALLED DOCKS AND HOISTS**

11/17/2025

Peninsula Township has over 2,200 residences that have water access (direct, across the road, or shared access). That represents over 60% of the total residences in our Township.

A 50-year-old Township ordinance, which would arbitrarily limit the seasonal use of docks and boat hoists by shared frontage property owners to one hoist per fifty feet of frontage, has never been enforced or even widely acknowledged as existing since its adoption. For all intents and purposes, the ordinance hasn't existed. I and my family have been waterfront boating residents of the Township for many decades, as have others. Over those years, shared waterfront property Associations have responsibly managed the use of their docks and hoists with self-imposed guidelines and limitations, with few exceptions. Occasional conflicts among neighbors have been resolved, sometimes with the involvement of Township authorities....as a trade-off to attempting to legislate the exercise of common courtesy among neighbors.

A well-publicized conflict involving an East Bay shared frontage Association remains ongoing, largely because of site-specific conditions (including unique shoreline configuration and bottomland topography) which have complicated resolution of the conflict. **The rewrite of shoreline regulations should include provisions that enable the Township to resolve conflicts involving unusual site-specific circumstances on a case-by-case basis. A one-size-fits-all ordinance isn't a solution.** The actions or circumstances of one or a few property owners don't justify subjecting all other Township shared frontage property owners to the burden of overly restrictive ordinance provisions.

The Township's Shoreline Study Group (working with Planning Commission members) has proposed a regulatory framework for waterfront regulations, which includes a provision to permit the seasonal installation of up to 3 hoists per 50 feet of shared frontage (along with set-back and other provisions). That regulatory framework is the product of nearly 2 years of exhaustive fact-finding deliberations, analyses, and public and private sector collaboration. The process included consideration of current township demographics and housing development trends, infrastructure constraints, public safety, environmental and esthetic concerns, township shoreline and bottomland topography, and input from township officials and the public. **An estimated 80% to 90% of existing shared frontage boat owners are already in compliance with and will be subject to the Shoreline Study Group's proposed ordinance amendments. The proposed ordinance rewrite is not**

expected to result in any notable increase to the number of boats and hoists which are already being seasonably placed offshore by existing shared frontage owners. Moreover, the Township continues to have regulatory control over the creation of new shared frontage parcels by developers.

In response to a vocal group of non-boaters and new residents who oppose any change to the Township's 50-year-old ordinance (on the pretense that boat traffic density in area waters is already excessive), Township officials are debating a compromise that would arbitrarily reduce, by one third, the number of allowable hoists from the proposed 3 per 50 feet of frontage to 2 per 50 feet, without any supportable justification. Such a change would have no discernable impact on local boat traffic density due to the geography of our local navigable waterways and the high volume of boat traffic that originates from nearby heavily used launch sites, multiple large commercial marinas, and numerous adjoining waterfront boating communities.

Adopting ordinance provisions that are more restrictive than those proposed by the Shoreline Study Group would infringe upon the property rights of shared waterfront property owners, diminish their property values and place those of them who are boaters in an untenable position. Many resident boaters would be forced to launch and reload their boats with each use and to transport them to and from their driveways for parking when they're not in use. Alternatively, boaters could attempt to use offshore moorings. Neither of those are viable alternatives, when considering the current shortage of local public boat launch site and marina capacity, the existence of prohibitive public and residential parking restrictions, space limitations, traffic congestion, volatile weather conditions that cause mooring risks, and a **host of adverse public safety consequences of no longer allowing resident boaters to simply continue parking their boats on hoists offshore of their property.** Moreover, many boaters would be forced to involuntarily liquidate substantial investments in their docks, hoist equipment, and boats.

The Township Board is encouraged to now collaborate with the many residents and fellow township officials who have comprised and supported the Shoreline Study Group, and who have worked long and diligently to formulate and fully vet a well-balanced and supportable shoreline regulatory framework. The arbitrary adoption of more restrictive provisions than those proposed by the Shoreline Study Group would serve no purpose and would needlessly cause significant financial and personal hardship to Peninsula Township shared frontage property owners.

Thank you for considering these thoughts and observations.

George Weber, Peninsula Township resident

Safety of Shoreline, Mission Peninsula

I am a retired board certified orthopaedic surgeon and practiced for 30 years. During my career I encountered orthopedic injuries caused by boat propellers and have seen the devastating impact they have on the lives of patients and their families.

Propeller Injury

More people die from boat propeller injuries than shark attacks. Boat propeller injuries are devastating injuries.

Propeller strikes to flesh:

- range from 50-250 strikes per second.
- cause death from blunt trauma, hemorrhage/bleeding, and infection.
- cause traumatic immediate amputation and/or the need for surgical amputation due to unsalvageable injury to tissues and/or infection.
- frequently cause severe infection due to depth of the lacerations, severity of the trauma to the tissues, and contaminated water propelled deep into the body.
- frequently cause septic shock, sometimes leading to amputations of all four limbs (more on this below).

The severity of propeller strike infections frequently causes septic shock—a body's response to overwhelming infection that leads to a severe drop in blood pressure. Septic shock can cause death in itself. And the medical treatment for septic shock is to use drugs that cause severe restriction of blood flow to the limbs in order to keep blood flowing to the brain and vital organs. This restriction of blood flow to the limbs causes death of the tissue in the limbs, necessitating amputation of the limbs-- frequently being both hands and both feet, and often including both arms and both legs as well.

When a motorized boat runs its propeller and is in motion, it is a danger to swimmers, paddle boards and kayaks in shared water spaces. The focus here is the mixing of people in the water with motorized boats near the shoreline of Mission Peninsula. Increasing boat density on the Mission Peninsula shoreline increases risk of propeller strikes to people swimming and people on small, unmotorized craft such as paddle boards and kayaks.

Warning

When propeller strike injuries occur on the Mission Peninsula shoreline in the future, you might have said that the event was unforeseeable. I am telling you now that it is foreseeable, and I am giving you fair warning. Even one preventable injury or death from a propeller strike is one too many.

Boating and Alcohol

When was the last time you saw a person holding a beer while driving a car? When was the last time you saw someone holding a beer while driving a boat? Drinking while driving a boat is culturally acceptable. Yet, people operating boats are more susceptible to piloting while impaired than people in cars, not only due to prevalence of drinking, but due to "boater hypnosis," a syndrome caused by stressors unique to the water such as sun, wind, vibration, motion and dehydration. Increasing boat density on the Mission Peninsula shoreline increases risks generated by all of the above.

Solutions for Safety

Propeller injuries are more probable with increased density of boats and people sharing the same water space. For safety's sake, it is important to minimize the comingling of boats and people in the same water space.

Motorized boats and swimmers do not mix safely. It is not possible for the skipper of a boat to see what is in the water directly in front of the bow, especially when accelerating and the tip of the bow rises. It is also not easy for the skipper of a boat to see what is directly behind the boat when operating the boat in reverse.

To promote safety on the Mission Peninsula shoreline, attention has to be drawn to measures which will limit boat traffic in areas where there will be people swimming or operating small, unmotorized craft.

These issues are of particular importance on shared beach property where multiple boaters and multiple families want to use adjacent water areas.

Swimmers are especially vulnerable having to swim in water where boats are coming and going. The shoreline in many areas of Mission Peninsula and especially at our beach is very shallow, requiring swimmers to walk out to where the water is deep enough to swim. This is the same depth and location where boats are docked. Note, I am not referring to swimming in the middle of the bay. I am referring to swimming in water adjacent to the shoreline of Mission Peninsula.

As I see it, there are four issues which need immediate attention:

1. Number of motorized boats/craft
2. Location of boat docks/marinas relative to areas where swimming and paddling occurs
3. Orientation of docks and pathways of boats leaving and returning to berths
4. Effective enforcement

Number of motorized boats—Maintaining the existing regulation of 1 boat per 50' of frontage is safer. Allowing the number of boats to increase will increase danger.

Location of boat docks— The rules about dock location need to be based on measurable, immutable, defined and enforceable criteria such as land lot lines and using the extension of those lines. All docks and marina structures placed in the water should remain in front of the property owner's beach. "In Front of" should be defined as a linear extensions of the lot lines visually into the water. A dock should originate within the lot lines and remain, to the dock's full extent, within the visual extension of the lot lines. Said another way, docks should be placed within boundaries consistent with a natural extension of property lines into riparian space and centered within that space, and not cross over into the riparian space of its neighbors. *This is especially crucial for shared beach frontage.*

Orientation of boat docks-- It would be advisable for motorized boats from marinas and individual docks on the Mission Peninsula shoreline to come and go from their berth perpendicular to the shoreline and not take a path that is parallel or at an angle to the shore to prevent crossing through areas where people are swimming or operating small, unmotorized craft.

A motorized boat cutting across water that is shared with people swimming and on small, unmotorized craft is a hazard.

Enforcement—Enforcement of regulations must be swift, efficient, and effective. Cease and desist orders should be issued and fines should be levied. If cease and desist orders are issued, measures must be in place to ensure that activity has ceased and desisted as well as ensuring that corrective action takes place. If fines are issued, fines should accumulate daily until corrective action takes place.

Shared Beach Frontage vs. Regular Frontage

Since there are a variety of property types and uses of the shoreline, it is possible that special rules need to apply to shared beach frontage, as there are special circumstances with the docking of multiple motorized boats and the resulting risks to safety. Specifically, the marina at Hidden Ridge needs to be regulated as its dock placement in recent years has been hazardous to the safety and wellbeing of its neighbors directly south (the East Beach Association)

If there must be one and only one set of rules for the entire shoreline, regardless of the beach being owned by one or multiple families, and if the new rules create any hardship for a certain property, a solution could be to allow that property to apply for a variance to the new ordinance if it can be shown that their request accommodates the safety and wellbeing of its neighbors.

Please reference the attached Google screen shots with additional information pertinent to the topics discussed herein.

Sincerely,

Howard Pike, MD

Sources: US Coastguard, NHTSA

septic shock leading to 4 extre: x Which causes more deaths shu: x +

google.com/search?q=Which+causes+more+deaths+shark+attacks+or+boat+propeller+injuries&oiq=Which+causes+more+deaths+shark+attacks+or+boat+propeller+injuries...

Which causes more deaths shark attacks or boat propeller injuries

AI Overview

Boat propeller injuries cause significantly more deaths than shark attacks. While shark attacks receive substantial media attention, they are an extremely rare cause of death compared to boating accidents.

Annual death statistics

Category	Global	United States
Shark Attacks	In 2024, there were only four confirmed, unprovoked fatal shark attacks worldwide. The average annual number of unprovoked fatal attacks is about six globally.	The U.S. recorded just one fatal shark attack in 2024, in Hawaii.
Boat Propeller Injuries	While global numbers are not as consistently reported as shark attack data, dozens of deaths occur worldwide each year.	The U.S. Coast Guard reported 41 deaths from propeller strikes in 2022 and 30 deaths in 2024, though it notes that these injuries are likely underreported.

Additional context

- Boating is far more common** While both events are relatively rare, recreational boating is a much more common activity than encountering a shark in the water.
- Risk perception vs. reality** Shark attacks often generate more fear and publicity, which can distort the actual level of danger. Statistical data consistently shows that many ordinary human activities, including boating, pose a higher risk of injury or

Yearly Worldwide Shark Attack Summary
Feb 10, 2025 — ISAF will continue to investigate these cases as data become available. * 2024 ...
Florida Museum of Natural History

Boat Propeller Accidents Can Cause Horrific Injuries
Oct 17, 2023 — How common are boat propeller accidents? In 2022, the United States Coast...
McNicholas & McNicholas, LLP

Shark Attack Statistics & Trends in 2024: What the Latest Data ...
Jun 5, 2024 — Shark Attack Statistics & Trends in 2024: What the Latest Data Reveals?

Show all

Freeze watch Just issued

boat propeller injuries leading to septic shock

google.com/search?q=boat+propeller+injuries+leading+to+septic+shock&sca_esv=17b6ad23b7736742&sxsr=A-E3TRPPKMGHmdGjb-cnuqvAc3PCTf4g%3A1761153397417&ei...

boat propeller injuries leading to septic shock

AI Overview

Boat propeller injuries can easily lead to septic shock due to the severity of the trauma and high risk of infection from contaminated water. The combination of deep, mutilating lacerations from the propeller and exposure to waterborne bacteria creates a perfect storm for a systemic inflammatory response.

Factors leading to septic shock

- Contaminated aquatic environments:** Freshwater, saltwater, and brackish water all harbor different bacteria, and open wounds from propeller strikes are a direct route for these pathogens to enter the bloodstream. Common infectious agents include:
 - Vibrio vulnificus:** A bacterium found in warm seawater and brackish water that can cause rapid, life-threatening infections, especially in immunocompromised individuals.
 - Aeromonas species:** Gram-negative bacteria found in freshwater that can cause severe wound infections.
 - Polymicrobial infections:** Injuries from water exposure often involve multiple types of bacteria, which increases the complexity and severity of the infection.
- Severity of the trauma:** Propellers spin at high speeds, inflicting extensive soft-tissue injuries, deep lacerations, broken bones, and amputations. The sheer force of the injury alone can trigger a massive inflammatory response.
- Dysregulated immune response:** Trauma itself, particularly severe polytrauma,

Sepsis in Trauma: A Deadly Complication - ScienceDirect.com
Nov 14, 2021 — * Defining Sepsis and Polytrauma. For many years, sepsis has been...
ScienceDirect.com

Motorboat Propeller Injuries: A Case Series and Review of the ...
Dec 31, 2016 — Abstract. Introduction: Injuries inflicted by motorboat propellers are rare but often result in extensive so...
Trauma Monthly

Sepsis after trauma—evolving paradigms in stress biology and host ...
* Abstract. Severe trauma is often complicated by subsequent infection and organ dysfunction, with sepsis being a major...
National Institutes of Health (NIH)

Show all

Russell 2000 -1.85%

septic shock leading to 4 extre...

google.com/search?q=septic+shock+leading+to+4+extremity+amputation&scsa_esv=17b6ad23b7736742&ssxrf=AE3TiHkkgucVdhHrCXfHGfGLuMcOmA%3A1761153477311...

AI Overview

Septic shock can lead to four-limb amputation **when a severe infection causes a drastic drop in blood pressure, leading to a lack of blood flow to the extremities.** This can cause irreversible tissue damage and gangrene, most often due to blood clots, microvascular spasms, or damage from **vasopressor drugs** used to treat the shock. Early recognition and treatment of sepsis are critical to reduce the risk of this complication.

How septic shock causes amputation

- Low blood pressure:** Sepsis can cause septic shock, a life-threatening condition where the blood pressure drops so low that vital organs and tissues do not receive enough oxygen.
- Blood clots and microvascular damage:** The inflammatory response in sepsis can lead to blood clots or damage the small blood vessels (microvasculature) in the limbs.
- Lack of blood flow:** The combination of low blood pressure and damaged blood vessels cuts off the supply of oxygen and nutrients to the extremities.
- Peripheral gangrene:** When tissue dies from lack of blood flow, it results in peripheral gangrene, a condition that is often irreversible.
- Amputation:** In severe cases, amputation is necessary to remove the dead tissue and save the patient's life.

Losing Limbs to Sepsis: Limb Loss Awareness Month
Apr 1, 2019
Sepsis Alliance

Four limb amputations due to peripheral gangrene from ...
In conclusion, we report this rare case of 4 limb amputations due to intropoe use for septic...
ScienceDirect.com

Amputations - Sepsis Alliance
For people who have sepsis, blood clots are a frequent cause of amputations. Your blood has...
Sepsis Alliance

3:22 PM 10/22/2025

septic shock leading to 4 extre... Which causes more deaths sh... What is a higher percentage dri...

google.com/search?q=What+is+a+higher+percentage+driving+an+automobile+impaired+or+piloting+a+recreational+boat&sq=What+is+a+higher+percentage+driving+an+...

What is a higher percentage driving an automobile impaired or piloting a recreational boat

AI Overview

While the overall number of impaired driving incidents on the road is far higher, **the percentage of fatal accidents caused by impairment is higher for recreational boating.** Environmental factors on the water make impairment especially dangerous.

Comparing impaired driving vs. boating

Metric	Impaired driving (automobile)	Impaired boating (recreational)
Percentage of fatal accidents	According to Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) , alcohol-related crashes made up 32% of all traffic deaths in 2022.	The U.S. Coast Guard reports that alcohol was the leading known contributing factor in fatal boating accidents, accounting for 20% of fatalities in 2024. In accidents where the primary cause was known, this figure is higher.
Risk of impairment	Driving a car is a routine activity for many, and impairment is a well-known risk factor.	A boater is more susceptible to becoming impaired than a driver. The effects of alcohol are intensified by stressors unique to the water, such as sun, wind, vibration, and motion. This can lead to "boater's hypnosis," which slows reaction time even before alcohol is added.
Increased fatality risk	Fatality risk for a driver increases with higher blood alcohol concentration (BAC).	A boater with a BAC of just 0.05% is four times more likely to die in an accident than a sober operator. At 0.10% BAC, that risk increases tenfold.

Coast Guard Reports Fewest Boating Fatalities in More Than ...
Jul 7, 2025 — By Chad Tokowicz, MRAA Government Relations Manager. On Tuesday, ...
Marine Retailers Association

The Dangers Of Drinking And Boating - BoatUS
Oct 14, 2019 — Alcohol Dangers. ... But what you might not know is that a boater is even mo...
BoatUS

More than 13000 People Died in Alcohol-Related Crashes for ...
Apr 4, 2024 — More than 13,000 People Died in Alcohol-Related Crashes for Second Straight...
Mothers Against Drunk Driving

3:15 PM 10/22/2025

boat propeller injuries leading to death

AI Overview

Yes, boat propellers can and do cause fatal injuries. Accidents often happen when someone falls overboard and is hit by a propeller, with potential for catastrophic injuries like **severed limbs, head trauma, and severe bleeding**. The high speed of the propeller (up to 40 times per second) can make a fatality occur very quickly.

Common scenarios for fatal accidents

- Falling overboard and being struck:** This is a frequent cause, whether from falling from a moving boat or one that is stopped.
- Being sucked under by the propeller:** When a boat restarts, it can create a suction effect that pulls a person towards the propeller.
- Attempting to reboard or retrieve items:** Someone in the water may be struck when trying to get back on the boat or retrieve a dropped item.

Examples of fatal accidents

- Thai Actress Tangmo:** Fell from a boat and was struck by a propeller.
- Julia Budzinski:** Was tubing with friends in Virginia when she fell and was fatally hit by the propeller of the returning boat.
- Lana Batochir:** Was on a raft that was sucked into a boat's propeller in Chicago, resulting in the severing of both her legs.
- Natalia Andrea Larranaga Fajardo:** Was fatally struck by a tour boat's propeller in

Has a human ever been killed by boat propellers? - Quora

May 31, 2019 — Yes. It has happened many times and in many countries. I took a forensic death investigation course in law...

Quora

High Profile Propeller Accidents

* 2 February 2022 Tangmo, a beautiful young actress in Thailand fell from a boat during a restaurant trip and was killed...

Propeller Safety

Over 60 people were injured by boat propellers in 2022

Nov 14, 2023 — 135 pounds multipl...

AZ Family

Show all

NVDA -1.08%

Search

3:19 PM 10/22/2025