



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Acme Township Hall**  
**6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg, Michigan**  
**6:00 p.m. Monday, December 17, 2012**

Meeting called to Order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 6:00 p.m.

**Members present:** V. Tegel (Chair), B. Carstens (Vice Chair), S. Feringa, B. Finch, T. Forgette, D. Rosa, M. Timmins, K. Wentzloff, D. White

**Members excused:** None

**Staff Present:** S. Vreeland, Township Manager/Recording Secretary  
N. Lennox, Zoning Administrator  
J. Jocks, Township Legal Counsel

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Motion by Wentzloff, support by Timmins to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** None noted.

**1. Continuing Education/Special Presentations:**

- a) **FOOD HUB-Food Systems:** A YouTube Video starring Acme farmer Ken Engle was displayed. Carstens attended an informational session about this topic recently. He and Lennox recommend that Acme Township consider ways to foster food hub initiatives.
  
- b) **Open Meetings Act & Freedom of Information Act** – **Jeff Jocks:** Jocks noted that Supervisor Zollinger asked for a presentation on this topic for the Board. The presentation occurred at the December 4 board meeting, and the same written materials were distributed. The materials include state statutes regarding the Open Meetings Act (“OMA”) and Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”). Lawyers begin with the statutes, and then turn to existing case law when it comes to question of interpretation. One challenge is that many questions can fall into grey areas, being neither clearly legal or illegal. The goal is for everyone to have a working knowledge of the requirements so that the township can effectively manage liability. If the township is successfully sued under these statutes, the township can be liable for the legal costs of the winning party along with political and procedural liability.

The OMA includes some routine administrative items such as setting the regular meeting schedule for the public body annually and providing appropriate notice of special meetings (notice must be posted at least 18 hours in advance). Staff normally takes care of these items. A violation of the OMA can occur if a “public meeting” is held without proper notice, and/or without the keeping of proper minutes, and/or without providing an opportunity for public comment as part of the agenda. A public meeting can occur any time elected or appointed officials are gathered and having a conversation that constitutes a “deliberation,” which includes discussing items that would be part of making a decision on a matter before the public body. If a subcommittee or group of the public body meets to discuss an item the whole body will ultimately deliberate, Jocks recommended that the meeting should be conducted as an open meeting under the OMA.

A chance gathering of officials is not a public meeting. Planning Commissioners can be at the same social or other events. However, if at those events the officials gather

in a corner and discuss issues that will be decided by the Commission, it could be a violation of the OMA. The public perception of potential violation of the law can be as problematic as actual violation. Jocks encouraged the Commissioners that if they have a “gut feeling” that there is a problem, there is probably a problem, and to err on the side of caution when in doubt. Anytime anyone has a question about a specific situation Jocks is happy to field inquiries either directly or through the Supervisor and assist with review.

Wentzloff asked how the use of technology, such as e-mail or telephone, is treated. Jocks indicated that when it come to phone use, if one commissioner calls a series of the others to poll them for where they stand on a certain issue and receives simple yes or no responses, that can be permissible. If the call involves mention of factors being weighed in a decision, or one commissioner shares a second commissioner’s thoughts with a third, that can be a violation. Discussion between Commissioners about whether an ordinance should be created or changed can constitute a deliberation that should properly occur in public meeting. Asking staff to look into something or asking a question can be appropriate, but Jocks recommended not copying all commissioners on the conversation.

Carstens asked how *ex parte* communications interface with OMA issues. There is not an *ex parte* communications statutes. It can be acceptable to discuss an application before the Commission with the public, but it may not be acceptable for a Commissioner to meet with an applicant and indicate if that if the applicant does certain things the Commissioner can vote in favor of the project. This is a separate topic for another meeting.

Tegel asked about examples of purposefully seeking to avoid compliance with the OMA. Jocks gave the example of a mayor meeting with two city commissioners one day, and two more the next. There is a case where a court has ruled that there was a violation of the OMA, using the mayor as a focal point for non-public deliberations.

FOIA provides the public the ability to obtain copies of public documents. “Public documents” is defined fairly broadly. Nearly every document used in the course of transacting township business, including e-mails, whether they exist on township computers or on elected or appointed officials’ personal computers, can be considered a public document that can be released to the public under FOIA. There are some items that are exempted from disclosure, including but not limited to attorney-client privilege, the private identifying information of citizens, some employment records, and documents relating to police investigations. If anyone has a question of a delicate nature, they may want to consider whether it would be more appropriate to use e-mail or a phone call to communicate. It is also important to note that if the township withholds documents from a FOIA request that it should have provided, again the township can be liable for the attorney’s fees of the party that sues. Jocks again recommended exercising caution and calling him or the Supervisor with any questions.

Along with the statutes Jocks provide some summaries for reference. However, he encouraged that the statutes are the documents to be relied upon, not the summaries which are someone’s interpretation of the law.

**2. Consent Calendar: Motion by White, support by Carstens to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including:**

- a) Receive and File:**
  - 1. Draft Unapproved Minutes of:**

1. **Board [11/13/12](#)**
  2. **[Planning, Zoning & Administrative Activity Report](#)**
- b) **Approval:**
1. **Planning Commission [11/19/12](#)**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**3. Limited Public Comment:**

Robert Evina, owner of the Woodland Creek business development and resident at 6075 Arabian Lane, stated that he had been asked to speak on behalf of the Acme Business Association regarding some [concerns about the proposed township survey](#) related to the Master Plan. They feel that it is rather lengthy, and that if it is kept to 1-2 pages the response level may be better. They also asked if it would be possible to add questions to the draft survey. The ABA was notably active in the most recent political cycle and spoke with many residents. They are concerned that there are no questions in the survey regarding the Shoreline Project, placemaking and economic development and the associated costs. Mr. Evina noted that how a question is worded has the potential to affect the response. He is concerned that some of the questions are too vague, or that the survey itself is dated.

Gordie LaPointe, 6375 Plum Drive, sent an e-mail with some questions about the survey. He is also concerned about the length of the survey. He assumes that the survey will be sent with a self-addressed stamped envelope to encourage people to respond. He is also concerned that by naming it a “residents” survey, a perception is created that the opinions of non-resident property owners/taxpayers and business owners is not wanted.

**4. Correspondence:**

- a) **[11/30/12 Food Hub Article](#):** The Food Hub referenced will be at the Commons, and received a \$200,000 grant from the Department of Agriculture. White is uncertain what a “food hub” is intended to be, indicating an understanding that it is primarily for food storage. He is concerned that the amount of the grant will not go very far towards cold storage needs. Lennox reported that a food hub has elements of a farmers’ market and a commercial kitchen that can be rented by multiple start-up businesses. There can be an additional retail space component for sales of products made on-site, along with fresh produce or fresh value-added items such as apple cider or jam. There might also be a café where items purchased can be consumed. The Eastern Market downstate is an example of a large food hub, and there is a similar operation in Lansing. Carstens indicated that local planner Sarah Lucas at the Council of Governments is working on a “toolkit” for creating an environment where local food production, sales and consumption is encouraged. She is working on condensing her 1.5 hour presentation.
- b) **[FEMA Draft Discovery Report \(locally relevant excerpts\)](#):** Lennox attended two recent local work sessions for creating flood plain mapping in previously unmapped areas such as ours. This issue could be particularly concerning relative to the township’s shoreline parklands. The report is in draft form at this time, and a locally-oriented excerpt was provided to the Commission for its information and to help with any needed changes for our area.

**5. Public Hearings: None**

**6. New Business:**

- a) **Elect Planning Commission Secretary due to mid-term vacancy:** The position would be filled until the next regular election of officers in July. The duties of the Secretary are outlined in section 1.5 of the Planning Commission Bylaws as adopted 12/22/2008; in practice most of the duties are currently performed by staff on a

regular basis. Jocks reviewed election procedure for the commission.

Carstens nominated Wentzloff. No other nominations were made. Wentzloff was elected by a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstaining (Wentzloff).

- b) **Consider amending the Planning Commission Bylaws Adopted 12/22/08:** Tegel and consulting planner Iacoangeli recently discussed a potential change to the regular Commission meeting schedule. Currently the regular meetings are on the last Monday of the month unless a holiday, election day or the proximity of a Board meeting. One idea was to move the regular meetings to the third Monday of the month to avoid the variability and create more time for staff processing between the Commission and Board meetings. Section 2.1 of the bylaws specifies that the meetings are currently on the last Monday of the month ordinarily, so in order to change to a different schedule the bylaws must be amended. If the bylaws are amended, it might be desirable to be less specific about the schedule to allow for greater flexibility in the future without having to also amend the bylaws. There has also been discussion about changing the regular meeting time to 6:00 p.m. On one hand it could provide more time for items to be discussed as needed. On the other hand, it might be more challenging for individuals who work a normal workday schedule to attend meetings at 6:00 p.m. on a regular basis instead of 7:00. White did not favor moving to a 6:00 p.m. start time permanently. Rosa agreed; he ends work at 5:00 on the other side of town and can't always leave on time. It can be too early for the general public to get home, grab a meal and come to a meeting as well. Wentzloff also concurred.

There was also discussion about whether meetings should stay on Mondays or move to a different day. Rosa suggested moving meetings to Tuesday to match the Board meetings to create greater awareness of regular meeting days.

**Motion by Wentzloff, support by Carstens to amend the first sentence of Section 2.1 of the Acme Township Planning Commission bylaws to read “Commission meetings will be held each month in the Township Hall at a regular day and time set by the Planning Commission by resolution, provided there is sufficient business to come before the Planning Commission at that time.” Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.**

- c) **2013 Planning Commission Meeting schedule** : The schedule must be adopted by resolution, which will be numbered PC-2012-01. It should include both a regular meeting day and time. Schedules for the last Monday of the month and the third Monday of the month have been provided. There was discussion about compromising on a 6:30 p.m. start time if 6:00 p.m. is too early for some. Rosa is still concerned that he might have to miss part of meetings if held at the earlier time.

**Motion by Wentzloff, support by Timmins to adopt Resolution PC-2012-01 setting regular Planning Commission meetings for the third Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. at the Acme Township Hall. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.**

## 7. Old Business:

### a) Master Plans/John I Update

1. **Draft survey**: This is the third month the Commission has been considering the draft survey. The last community survey was performed in 1996. The goal is to create one survey that can be used for both the Master Plan and 5-year Parks & Recreation Plan updates, obtaining a statistically valid response using neutral language in the questions, and broadly engaging the public in

the process. The Commission, staff, consulting planner and NMC Center for Business and Industry have been working on the draft. The final form would have “bubbles” to be filled in to facilitate electronic scoring. In answer to Mr. Evina’s earlier question, Vreeland stated that the survey format under review was started only three months ago. The original base document was generated from a community survey performed by Whitewater Township for their Master Plan update in 2009. Wentzloff asked what their response rate was. Vreeland noted that the entire survey and the results are on the Whitewater Township website. A 39.6% response rate was achieved there. Acme Township’s 1996 survey achieved a 43% response rate. Vreeland is working on a survey mailing list that will use all property and personal property taxpayer addresses in the Assessing database, crossed with current voter registration files.

Internet completion of surveys has been discussed, but there were concerns about universal access to the survey through this method. At this time only hard-copy distribution is planned. While one survey will go to each property owner, business owner and to the extent possible non-owner occupants as identified in the above-mentioned database, additional adults in each household will be able to request their own individual survey forms. Iacoangeli has indicated that self-addressed stamped envelopes will be included to facilitate return. Postcards will be mailed shortly after the first of the year to let people know to expect their surveys.

Concerns were raised earlier about the length of the proposed survey. Whitewater Township’s survey, which had higher than goal participation, contained 23 opinion questions and 9 demographic questions. The current survey draft has 5 demographic questions, but the perception of the number of opinion questions varied between Commissioners, with 21 being at the low end. Whitewater’s survey was 9 pages long. Debate followed about the extent to which the length of the survey would affect participation, and whether there would be a positive effect if the public is informed that a good survey informs a good master plan which is an essential tool for attracting grant funding to achieve the goals contained therein. Perhaps noting in an introduction to the survey that it is long, but is the first survey since 1996 and is an important and valuable tool for making their voices heard will induce participation.

One suggestion was removing some choices from the questions. For instance, can it be taken as given that low crime rates and families are important to people? Can we successfully ask if recreation is important without asking for separate opinions about recreation for adults and for children?

Tegel noted that the timeline for the survey process was originally constructed to allow the results to be used for the 5-Year Parks & Recreation Plan update as well as the Master Plan update. The parks plan has to be approved by the Board, and then approved by the state prior to an annual deadline for the township to remain eligible to apply to a variety of state grant funding programs. One must consider which is more important: to get the survey out quickly to continue trying to meet that deadline; or to lengthen the timeline to allow the survey to be more fully developed.

Carstens raised a concern about a question relating to planning the character of development along the M-72 corridor. He observed that the current Master Plan identifies areas where the township believes development should be

concentrated to avoid sprawling strip development along key highway corridors. The VGT development was approved in large part to provide a place for development concentration. He particularly noted the undeveloped, natural character of the M-72 Corridor in many sections, particularly between Lautner and Bates Roads, and that the current Master Plan calls for this segment to not be significantly developed. He therefore feels that the survey question as currently written does not respect the current Master Plan principles or those in the broader and more recent regional Grand Vision document. Vreeland observed that the point of the survey is to determine how citizens feel today about desirable development patterns, and it is possible that the answer could be opposite to what the Master Plan says today on this subject. Carstens feels the options listed under this question, which are currently almost universally oriented towards types of development, should include a non-development option. Vreeland asked if it might be helpful to change the names of the answer options from "...important" to "...desirable." Carstens did not feel this would solve the problem he perceived. He felt that one key attractor to this community is the lack of sprawl. He feels the way the question is written actively invites people to choose sprawl. After additional discussion it was understood that to address Carstens' concern he felt it would be effective for there to be two questions for the Lautner to Arnold Road segment of the M-72 corridor: one for the segment from Lautner to Bates and one for the segment from Bates to Arnold. Both questions would have identical tables of options, with an option added for the current character to be retained. Wentzloff felt that the one existing question was sufficient for the real intent of the question, which she views as trying to understand public desires for the M-72 corridor anywhere east of the VGT development.

The Commissioners were universally confused by the line item "should not be planned" and felt it should be removed. "Not planning" is not synonymous with "not developing," but rather implies that there would be no consideration given to the area at all and anything could happen.

It was generally felt that the survey should be retitled so that it does not imply that it pertains to residents only.

If the survey is to be sent in very early January as currently planned, the township was told that the questions had to be finalized by December 19, two days from now. Wentzloff suggested having a small committee use comments made this evening to finalize the survey expeditiously. Otherwise, revisions would need to be discussed in January by the full Commission and the current timeline would be considerably disrupted.

Looking at the visual preference graphics for the M-72 corridor, people had trouble distinguishing between pictures 2 and 3. Most could not tell that picture 3 contained a vegetated boulevard at first glance.

Tegel asked for volunteers to serve on a committee to work on survey revisions. Such committee meetings would have to comply with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. Jocks asked for clarification about whether the charge of the committee would include actually finalizing the survey. If so, it should be clearly stated in the motion to be voted that the committee is to "review and finalize," so it is clear that the finalization authority has been delegated. If it is not intended to give this power to the committee, the motion would only discuss review and the survey would

come back to the full Commission for authorization in January. Wentzloff volunteered.

White expressed that his understanding had been that this survey would only pertain to the Master Plan, and that it had never been mentioned prior to tonight that the survey would also be used for the parks & recreation plan update. A majority of the other Commissioners and staff in attendance indicated that it had been discussed before. White is concerned about delegating final approval authority over the survey to a subcommittee, and asked if it would really throw the timeline for the parks & recreation plan approval too far off if survey finalization came at the January Planning Commission meeting. Timmins explained that the parks & recreation plan has to be submitted to the state by March 1, and there has to be a Board public hearing first. Vreeland believes that at this point it is not possible to submit the parks & recreation plan to the state by the deadline to be eligible for state grants this year. When we started the process there was a perception that the parks & recreation plan could be submitted to the state for approval concurrently with the due date for many state grant applications of April 1. We have recently learned that the state is adhering more closely and firmly to written guidelines requiring that plans be submitted for consideration no later than March 1. This means that the Board would have to be prepared to hold a public hearing on the plan as required in February.

Rosa asked if there is really need to hurry, and which planning document and which deadlines should really be driving the survey process and timeline; the Master Plan or the Parks & Recreation Plan? Tegel invited Vreeland to respond, and she stated clearly that her response is her personal perception and opinion: that at this point there is no reason to hurry the process to try to meet a March 1 Parks & Recreation Plan submission deadline. Even if we could meet the deadline, it seems likely to her that the township would not apply for state recreation grants this year because it seems that the biggest questions on everyone's minds at this time are how to complete the deconstruction of the Phase II and perhaps Phase III shoreline acquisition properties and how to pay for that work. The township is also slated to complete acquisition of 1-2 more properties in 2013, and fundraising for required grant match is a concern. The Placemaking project is complete, but what she hears indicates that many people feel that a lot more work needs to be done to take the contents of the plan from a broad vision to a detailed construction plan. Further, it does not seem that there is currently clear consensus on what improvements to the parkland should be made first. Combined with the need to be able and willing to commit matching funds to grant applications, this leads her to perceive that the township is not prepared to apply for park development funds by April 1.

Wentzloff expressed a feeling that the Commission is spinning its wheels and retracing old steps month after month, and that meaningful progress will not be made unless some Commissioners commit to additional work to move the process forward.

**Motion by Wentzloff, support by Timmins to form a committee to review and approve the 2012 property owner survey for the master plan update and parks & recreation plan update.**

Several Commissioners expressed concern over the concept of delegating survey approval authority to the subcommittee. Feringa asked if the wording

should be changed to “finalize” from “approve,” but Jocks and Vreeland noted that the Commission is charged by state law with the master planning process and does have authority to approve the survey without final Board consideration and approval. It was further noted that under state planning enabling statutes, Planning Commissions have final approval authority over master plan documents unless the Boards of their communities adopt a resolution to remove that authority from the Planning Commission and vest it in themselves. To this point Acme Township’s Board of Trustees has never assumed this authority, so currently final adoption of the Master Plan rests with our Planning Commission.

**Motion to amend original motion by Wentzloff, support by Timmins to amend the motion to give the committee to authority to review and finalize the survey rather than review and approve.**

Carstens asked if “finalize” means that the survey would not come back to the full Commission before it goes out. Wentzloff confirmed this as the intent of her motion.

**Motion to amend original motion failed by a vote of 3 in favor (Tegel, Timmins, Wentzloff) and 6 opposed (Carstens, Feringa, Finch, Forgette, Rosa, White).**

Commissioners asked if the intent of the wording of the original motion was for the survey to come back to the full Commission for approval or for approval to be given by the committee. Wentzloff indicated an intent that the survey would be approved by the committee only.

**Original motion withdrawn.**

**Motion by Rosa, support by Forgette to establish a committee to meet and come back to the full Commission with recommendations for revisions to the survey. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.**

Feringa, Carstens, Timmins, Rosa and Wentzloff volunteered to serve on the committee. All interested members of the public are invited to attend the meeting and provide additional input. Vreeland suggested that if the results of the committees work are to be included in packets for the regular January meeting, they should be transmitted to staff by December 19.

**A recess was declared from 8:28 p.m. – 8:35 p.m.**

2. **Map-color coded regions:** The map presented is currently coded with letters rather than colors. Tegel stated that there are several ways to break survey responses out so that subsets defined by various factors can be considered. Iacoangeli was asked to divide the township into geographic districts that would provide for meaningful data analysis. One question was whether “C” was intended to represent the M-72 Corridor. Rosa felt that if this were the case, “C” was too wide an area on either side of the road. Feringa did not perceive “C” as specifically relating to the road corridor. Timmins asked how the proposed boundaries were determined, and if it was an intent to have each area contain similar numbers of residents. Vreeland stated that from past experience, about third of the total township population lives in the Holiday Hills area, about a third in the Bunker Hill/Resort area, and the remaining third the area designated “A.” Tegel suggested that it might be

useful to segregate Holiday Hills residents from all others to determine their specific needs. She also felt that the Cresthaven Road neighborhood and the neighborhood in the platted Village of Acme west of US 31 N. and south of Deepwater Point Road would identify more with the US 31 Corridor south of M-72 than with other areas. Carstens objected to the idea of creating the districts to divide the township, since the goal is to plan for the township as a cohesive whole. Tegel feels it will be valuable to understand the differences in the perceptions of community needs and desires by neighborhood. Rosa felt the agricultural area should be more clearly distinguished, while White felt that the current division scheme captured 90% of the agricultural area in district "A." White also feels that keeping things simple is best and that it would be simpler if the divisions more closely followed roadways. Carstens asked if evaluation of the survey for the original master plan employed a districts. Vreeland looked at the original survey and found that it used 3 key evaluation districts. Vreeland noted that few questions are asked about each of the districts. To her this type of exercise would be most interesting if questions were asked about each district and the differences between the responses from the occupants of the district and the responses from everyone else were evaluated. Wentzloff had given some thought to which areas are most closely aligned to the shoreline district, and asked how hard it will be to divide the mailing lists into districts corresponding with the maps. Vreeland noted that to date nobody has asked her to do this with the list. She can do it, and it would probably make more sense to have the list divided to match the map by the township than by NMC as we will be more familiar with the geography and the easiest way to segregate the list.

No action was taken on the map at this time, with the thought being to finalize it when the survey is finalized and after in-person discussion with Iacoangeli.

3. **Stakeholder analysis:** Iacoangeli summarized the stakeholder analysis feedback received from Planning Commissioners. Tegel asked if the Commission found it generally accurate. Several commissioners recommended that the Elk Rapids School system should be included as a stakeholder, as some properties and families are within and/or served by that district. Munson Healthcare was listed on Tegel's response, since the township population tends towards the older segments, but she does not see it reflected in the summary. She also listed but does not see Rotary Charities on the list. Tegel was struck by the decreases in township population in the younger/family-oriented segments in the 2010 census. She feels the VASA should be on the stakeholder list separate from the TART as the VASA trailhead is here. Hope Village Assisted Living is also a group Tegel identified as a stakeholder.
4. **Stakeholder meetings-Business & Agriculture by Jan. 18; agencies on Tue. Feb 5<sup>th</sup> and committee appointments:** General community agency stakeholders will be invited to a meeting at the Bayview Inn on February 5 and asked for their input into the process. Tegel also mentioned that is good to have the business community at the meeting providing input and there will be a response. There has been discussion about holding two additional focused stakeholder meetings: one with the business community and one with the agricultural community. Two different approaches have been discussed: having open meetings held according to legal requirements at which volunteer Commissioners would be present along with Iacoangeli, or having Iacoangeli alone conduct the events. In the latter case they would

not be open meetings. The question is which format would be better for obtaining open and candid input from the guests of honor.

Forgette supported having the events hosted by Iacoangeli, since he would be familiar with the process and might be more experienced at fostering open dialogue than Commissioners. Rosa also feels that people would feel more free to speak “off the record” rather than in a meeting where their comments are being attributed to them and they might offend neighbors or customers. Feringa concurred for stated reasons, along with feeling that the meetings would be more efficient. White suggested that the best attendance from the agricultural community would happen if they are individually called and asked to attend, and asked about workable dates. Tegel asked if it might be more effective if a certain individual calls: Iacoangeli, township staff, or perhaps White himself. Winter months will be better for encouraging attendance than spring or summer, and he feels that during the workweek would be fine. White believes there are about 8-10 individuals who would need to be contacted.

Reaching out to the business community will be moderately complex, as not all are members of and/or represented by the Acme Business Association. Lennox attended the most recent ABA meeting, and Jim Goss felt there was a fairly free flow of conversation. He recommended that the business community might be more open in their input with only Lennox present and not Iacoangeli. Vreeland observed that it is not a secret that Iacoangeli is not overly popular with the business community. Lennox is willing to serve in this capacity, and to help with the agricultural community meetings as desired.

**Motion by Timmins, support by Wentzloff that Iacoangeli and Lennox conduct the stakeholder meetings to gather information and report back to the township. Motion withdrawn.**

**Motion by Wentzloff, support by Timmins that Lennox will hold a business community stakeholder meeting and that Lennox and Iacoangeli will hold agricultural community and agency stakeholder meetings, to gather input to bring back to the Planning Commission. Motion carried unanimously.**

5. **New Economy checklist**: The checklist provided was completed by Vreeland in conjunction with MSU Extension “New Economy 401” training in September 2011. Tegel provided it to the Commission to demonstrate types of information that planners suggest be included in community master plans. Carstens suggested that this information be provided on the Acme Future website that will be created for the master plan process so that the entire community can access it.

b) **Deep Injection Well Ordinance – Groundwater Maps**: This is more of the information Iacoangeli agreed to provide as the Commission considers potential deep injection well zoning ordinance provisions. White noted that some of his wells are not noted on the map. One is very new and one is about 30 years old. Vreeland stated that her experience has been that the County Health Department’s records older than about 1977 are substantially incomplete. The well location map is based on County data, and their older well and septic records have appeared to be lacking.

**8. Items Removed from Consent Calendar: None**

9. **Reports:** None

10. **Planning Commission Items for Discussion** (*items must be submitted one week prior to the scheduled PC meeting. Discussion limited to 5 minutes for each item listed.*)

- a) **LID Design-** Lennox: Low Impact Development stormwater design is a much-discussed topic. The township's contract with the Drain Commissioner to administer our stormwater control ordinance is expiring on December 31 (the ordinance itself remains in force with the township fully responsible for administration), and there has been some discussion about whether to maintain the ordinance as is or whether to think about amending it to require LID design implementation. LID design can be environmentally beneficial and less expensive for developers.
- b) **Form Based Code-** Lennox: Carstens also attended the training. Demographic changes towards older populations were discussed as one reason why development density should be concentrated in walkable areas. The township is considering using a form-based code approach to new ordinances for the shoreline district only as a starting point.
- c) **Parks and Rec. webinar-** Vreeland, Lennox, Henkel: The biggest message from this seminar was that the DNR is seeking greater compliance with program rules and will be firmer in requiring that 5-Year Parks & Recreation Plans are submitted for approval by March 1 of a year in which a community wishes to apply for DNR grant funding.
- d) **Heartland Center - Clues to Rural Community Survival** –Tegel, Carstens
- e) **Restrictions on Zoning related to Mining** – Carstens, Lennox, Vreeland: Carstens provided an additional summary of the court case information on this topic. To him one of the biggest messages is that in today's legislative environment it is very difficult for townships to regulate mining operations strictly.
- f) **Growth & Investment Network: Great Lakes Water Levels** – Vreeland: The 1964 record for the lowest Lake Michigan water levels recorded was broken today; it was expected to be broken this month. Tegel noted that Torch Lake has a public boat launch with a voluntary donation pipe. She was wondering if it would be possible to find out how many boat launches in the region have honor system donation pipes and how much they collect towards maintenance. One thing Vreeland heard at the presentation is that only half of federal port taxes are allocated back to harbor maintenance nationally. Of the amounts that are returned to harbors, most go to large coastal shipping ports and almost none to small pleasure harbors. There is also a useful sheet explaining how water is contributed to and removed from the Great Lakes.

11. **Public Comment/Any other business that may come before the Commission:** None

**Meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.**

**Blank Education Report form** for Commissioner use as needed.