

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 20, 2021**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2021 by remote means (due to the COVID-19 pandemic).

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair J. Cardillo, S. Mittlefehldt, W. Premeau, Vice-Chair M. Larson, E. Brooks, M. Dunn
Absent: A. Andres (excused)

AGENDA

It was moved by M. Dunn, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt, and carried 6-0 to approve the agenda.

MINUTES

The minutes of April 6th were approved by consensus.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No certain or potential conflicts were stated.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

01-SUP-04-21 – 2090 US HWY S 41 (PIN: 0516410)

Zoning Official A. Landers stated that that the Planning Commission has received agenda packets which included the staff report and analysis and showed that on the screen, and she also showed the applicant's Special Land Use Permit application with attachments including the area map with the parcel outlined in blue, the block map with parcel outlined in blue, and photos of the site. She stated that on screen, she has the memo for the staff report. She read into the record the memo for the staff report, which stated staff has reviewed the special land use permit for a hotel/motel use to bring the existing legal non-conforming hotel/motel into a conforming use and to also include the existing single-family residence to be a hotel/motel use, and a special land use permit for outdoor entertainment and community events as a principle use to be located at 2090 US Highway South 41. **She stated that** for the proposed outdoor entertainment and community events, they do not meet the required parking spaces for the size of the tent, and that staff conducted a site visit on April 6, 2021, and it was found that some of the areas called out on the site plan that stated existing parking are not legal non-conforming parking spaces, they were not gravel. She stated that she will show a view of this - they do not have those 20 parking spaces, and they are required to have 88 for the hotel/motel use and the event use for the size of that proposed tent; and they state they have 90 existing spaces, minus the 20 that they do not have equals 70 existing spaces - so they need to either reduce the size of the tent or add a legal off-street parking lot to the site for 18 more parking spaces.

She also stated that the Marquette County US-41/M-28 Corridor Advisory Group reviewed the plans at their meeting on April 13th, and MDOT recommended to close the center drive of the three existing curb cuts on the parcel. She stated that on screen, we are showing the staff report, their Special Land Use Permit Application, their Site Plan Review Application, email, and answers to the preliminary review, the Fire department had no comment and the same for Engineering, zoning comments and their responses, the area map, the parcels outlined in blue, the block map, the parcels outlined in blue, and the existing photos of the site, and photos of the access drives. She stated that on screen, you will see a snapshot of the site plan. She stated that in this circle, it states there is a parking here, but you'll see that this is not gravel area, so this area is not *legal non-conforming* parking, so that does not count. She stated that it is not a parking area, and up here it's grass and it is called out for parking, and again, this area cannot count for parking. She showed the site plan set, and the additional items - the US-41/M-28 Corridor Access Management Plan sheet for the area, and the sheet on spacing for commercial drives and streets from MDOT. She stated that there was no correspondence for the case and asked if there were any questions for staff. J. Cardillo asked if that covers her city staff presentation. A. Landers stated yes. She asked D. Stensaas if he had anything to add to that and if A. Landers covered it. City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated that they pretty much covered it. He stated that the comments in the staff report under these

standards are what really explains their recommendations and analysis, and again, the site access is according to the Corridor Management Plan, which does cover all of Marquette County. He stated that this specific area was an area of concern 10 years ago when the plan was put together, so the Corridor Advisory Group, which consists of people from throughout Marquette County that are on US-41/M-28, unanimously agreed with the recommendation from MDOT on that access drive situation, so that is the only other thing he would like to call out. J. Cardillo stated okay, thank you.

J. Cardillo stated that that they can hear from their applicant now if they have anybody in waiting. A. Landers stated that she is bringing them into the meeting now. J. Cardillo stated thank you. A. Landers stated that Mr. Parker is the applicant. J. Cardillo stated good evening to Mr. Parker and asked if he wants to speak on his behalf, he can do that at this time.

Mr. Derek Parker, the applicant, stated that he does want to speak on his behalf. He asked if this is the way they would like to start the meeting with comments from him. J. Cardillo stated that they just had a presentation from city staff presenting his application, and so now typically we would hear from the applicant if they have anything they want to add before we move on to correspondence and then board discussion, and asked, unknowing what those comments were prior, if she could just fill him in a little bit. J. Cardillo stated that staff just presented your application.

Mr. Parker stated okay, and that he knows that they have a few sticking points here, one being the parking, so the parking that he had proposed was for 90 existing spaces. He stated that they came back and said he only has 70 existing legally conforming spaces. He stated that computes to a capacity in event center of 105 people, down from what he wanted it to be at 150. He also stated that now he could work with that. He stated that in the meantime, if he can work with 105, he could reduce the capacity of his event center and work on a conforming parking lot. He stated that he already put a down payment down on having a paved parking lot, but it is going to take some plans and to run that by them once that preliminary drawing is made. He also stated that is what he would like to do to move forward here. He stated that although he does disagree with some of the non-conforming parking spots where they said there is not gravel, which there is clearly gravel, the grass is just starting to grow up through the gravel, but he will not dispute that at this time to not muddy the waters so he can please get going with this event center. He stated as we know with Gretchen Whitmer's recent announcement as of April 16th, indoor nonresidential gatherings are limited to 25 people where outdoor nonresidential gatherings are limited to 300 people. He also stated that the last wedding season was essentially terminated, and this is a really unique opportunity for his small business in this town. He stated that COVID absolutely destroyed the hotel business, and he owns the Birchmont Motel, and this year with incorporating this wedding venue. He also stated that they addressed the parking, and he could reduce the capacity. He stated that where it says specifically to reduce the size of the tent to accommodate these parking spots, he stated that he does not know if that means exactly what it says, or he could just reduce the capacity. He stated that the size of the tent was specifically designed so that people could social-distance if need be with the event size. He also stated that reducing the size of that does not benefit anyone nor does the City of Marquette want to go on record demanding that he reduce the size of the tent during COVID when we are trying really hard to give people an ample amount of space to be apart if they so choose. He stated that other than that, he does not understand from the US-41/M-28 Corridor Committee, closing the main entrance into this business that's been there for decades. He asked if they could please fill him in on that.

J. Cardillo stated that they have information within their application that the Corridor Advisory Group recommended the closing with the Center Drive, and it appears with some supporting documentation that we have that that is based on the speeds of the highway and then recommended distances between curb cuts. She asked A. Landers to correct her if she is not explaining this clearly. She stated that their recommendation, from what she is guessing, is a safety perspective for what the openings between the curb cuts should be, she believes it was for 55. She also stated that she will have to find that.

Mr. Parker stated that it is 155 feet, center to center access. J. Cardillo asked D. Stensaas if he wants to add something to that. D. Stensaas stated that he can elaborate a little bit. He also stated that Corridor Management Plan has been in place for about 12 years, and prior to that time, throughout the county, there really was not a plan for access management, and all the jurisdictions in the county agreed to this plan, by which whenever new projects are brought forward, whenever roads are reconstructed or resurfaced, that

those jurisdictions in coordination with MDOT, look at all of those projects and find excessive curb cuts that can be illuminated because they are hazardous. He stated that property has been there since the 19th century, that there have been people living there, and who knows how long that curb cut has been there, and this is just like anything else with zoning - when you develop something new, you have to meet the standards that are in place at the time, so the fact that it was nonconforming for 30 years is now a moot point because it has been looked at now for the new development, and that is the decision based on state guidance. He also stated that it is interesting because the site plan itself shows an existing driveway from the northernmost curb cut, so if there is truly an existing driveway there, this should not be an issue, and it should not be an issue anyway because that is the state guidance for highway safety.

Mr. Parker stated that that northernmost driveway has never been used, ever. He also stated that it is not paved. He stated that it will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to build a paved road from that spot. He also stated that he has a paved road going right to it that has been used forever. He stated that now they want to open up a curb cut that has never been used. He also stated that they could shut that thing down because it is not used anyway. He stated that it is not paved. He also stated that it is this existing curb cut that is worthless. He stated that now they are shutting down right smack dab the entrance into my motel, and the entrance into the proposed event center. He stated that he just cannot see how this is productive at all. He also stated that if that were to be the case, he does have to build a road from this other curb cut. He stated that that is going to take a year. He also stated that this wedding season is shot, and there is just no timely way to get this possibly done. D. Stensaas stated that the requirement is not to build a road, that it is to build a driveway. Mr. Parker asked if a gravel driveway is okay. A. Landers stated that it is going to have to be an asphalt driveway, but not to the road standards, and that it cannot be gravel. Mr. Parker stated that that there is no way he could possibly pull that off. D. Stensaas stated that they could probably make an exception for gravel until you can pave it for an intermediate time, but that is the standard for access management. He also stated that you are adding hundreds of visitors to the site on given days, and this is what is looked at there.

Mr. Parker asked he needs any special permission at all to put an event tent up and hold an event on this property. D. Stensaas stated yes. J. Cardillo stated yes. Mr. Parker asked how so because, first off, with this parking thing, he is positive that he is being spot enforced here because he went down to the Ramada Inn and counted all of their parking spots today, did the calculations for the numbers of rooms they have and their capacity of their event centers is 300; 320 at the Holiday Inn. He also stated that they do not even have close to the amount of parking that they are supposed to have. He stated that the Yacht Yard down here at the lakeshore, they can just willy-nilly throw up party tents and have weddings whenever they want. He stated that they do not have a single parking spot. He stated that he has 37 acres that is not enough parking for you people. He stated that it is unbelievable. He asked what consists of shutting down this middle driveway. He also asked if he should be in there with an excavator digging it up tomorrow morning. He asked if he needs to put a barricade out there. D. Stensaas stated that MDOT can give him the specs for how to do that. Mr. Parker asked, putting aside the fact that he has to close down the main access to his property here, what about the rest of the conformities. He asked about the 70 conforming parking spaces, can he get allowed to start off with events at 105-person capacity, which is what the 70 spaces calculates to.

A. Landers stated that to be clear, the proposal from his architect was off of 54 parking spaces, for a 200 person occupancy, so if he wanted to reduce it more they can talk about that. She stated that that was one of the conditions that they put down. She also stated that if he wants to reduce the occupancy per the parking he has, he would be able to do that. Mr. Parker stated that he does not want to by any means reduce the occupancy, but he is trying to figure out what he is allowed to do here. A. Landers stated that he applied for 200 to be the occupancy, and he does not have the parking for 200. She stated that that he would have to add 18 more parking spaces. Mr. Parker stated okay and asked with the parking that he does have, can we go on the record saying how many that he is available to have. He also asked what occupancy he is allowed to have. A. Landers stated that he will have to run a calculator and he will have to give her some time to calculate that, so if he wants to discuss something else when I'm doing that, if he had anything else to discuss.

J. Cardillo stated that just so the Commission is clear, it looks like one way or the other, they are going to need to add a condition, and the condition is either, and they are willing to work him, either the condition is

that he comes back with an amended plan showing 18 additional paved spots or he comes back with an amended plan showing reduced capacity. She asked if that is correct. She stated that it is one of those two options. Mr. Parker stated yes, one of those two options, he could do those. J. Cardillo stated that they have to choose one and she thinks if he gives them his preference, then that will certainly be taken into consideration in their deliberations. Mr. Parker stated that if he comes back with an amended plan that he is going to reduce the capacity for the already conforming spots, then that will give him time to actually get a civil engineer out there, design a parking lot, have it paved, so on and so forth. He asked if then he could come back and essentially apply again for a higher capacity. J. Cardillo stated that she believes so. She asked A. Landers. A. Landers stated that to do a higher capacity, he would have to come back to the Planning Commission. She also stated that there is a way he could do this without coming back to the Planning Commission. She stated that what staff has asked is them to administratively review so he not have to come back to the Planning Commission. She stated that he had a choice of revise his plan to show the 18 off-street parking spots, and then his site plan has to be completed within a year or he could reduce the occupancy for what he has and revise the plan to meet the 54 parking spaces, which is 162 occupants. Mr. Parker asked if the number that he has right now is 162. A. Landers stated that for the parking spaces he has, he could have 162 occupants. Mr. Parker stated okay. A. Landers stated that if he wants the 200, then he would have to add eighteen. Mr. Parker stated that he could live with 162. He stated that most weddings are 150. He stated that 162 will work for him.

J. Cardillo stated that she was going to ask A. Landers in any event, if he did want to do the paving option, how long would he have to amend his plans. A. Landers stated that if that was his plan, he would let us know, and she would hold on to it for him to amend it if they approved it to be administratively reviewed. She stated that in other words, the plan would not have to come back to them to review it. J. Cardillo stated right. She also stated that she just wants to make sure Mr. Parker understands what his options are. She stated that one option would be for him to go back to his designers or engineers, architect and say we need to revise these plans and resubmit them. She also stated that if the Planning Commission tonight were to approve it, saying amended to add 18 paved spaces, he could come back with his plans, at which point he would not have to come back before the Planning Commission to ask for the additional capacity, and she stated that he would have, she thinks A. Landers said he has a year to put that paved parking spots in. She stated that the alternative is they could approve it tonight based on an amended capacity, so they would say his capacity is less than he initially requested, so that would be an amendment to this application, and so at that point, if he did later on want to add those parking spots, just so that he clearly understands, he would have to then come back to the Planning Commission to ask again. She also stated that they would have to go through this process another time to ask for those additional spaces, so she just wants to make sure he is clear on what his options are. Mr. Parker stated okay and thank you to J. Cardillo. He also stated that he would like to try to get an approval tonight on the amended capacity. A. Landers stated okay. She asked if he is saying for the 162. Mr. Parker stated yes. A. Landers asked if he would ever want to do the 200. Mr. Parker stated that he would certainly like to, yes, but he thinks looking into the future for that would be a lot more advantageous than continuing with this, and that he has brides that want to get married here this year, and if he has to tell them no, it is just something that he does not want to have to do. He stated that he would take the 162 current capacity. J. Cardillo stated okay. She stated that she thinks they have covered speaking with their applicant. She asked Mr. Parker if there is anything else he wants to add before they move on to the next piece of this. Mr. Parker stated no. J. Cardillo stated thank you. Mr. Parker stated thank you.

J. Cardillo asked if there were any members of the public that wanted to comment on the project. J. Cardillo asked A. Landers if she said they do not have any correspondence for this. A. Landers stated no, but there was a person for public comment. J. Cardillo stated okay, so why do they not go ahead and bring that person in. A. Landers stated okay, she is bringing them in now. J. Cardillo stated to Ms. Lasich she can go ahead with her public comment, and they like to keep them at about three minutes, so she will let her know. Ms. Nicole Lasich, stated sure, she will make it quick. Ms. Lasich stated that she just wanted to say she is a local wedding planner. She also stated that she has had her business since 2012, and she just wanted to reach out and say she hopes Park Place gets to go through. She stated that she has definitely noticed a steady increase in her destination clients since she first opened, so she thinks it would be great to boost to tourism and the local economy, and also, it would be great for the community for future non-profit events. She stated that she knows she has a lot of clients right now who are nervous about the 25-person capacity for indoor banquet facilities, and they are looking for a place to move their weddings to, and with the limited

outdoor venue spaces, they had to move 2020 into 2021, and if she has to move 2020 and 2021 into 2022, she might just cry. She stated that Park Place would be and a wonderful lifesaver to her local clients as well as her out-of-town destination brides. She stated that is all and thank you for your time. J. Cardillo stated thank you and that she can listen in on YouTube if she would like to continue listening.

J. Cardillo stated that they finished up with testimony. She asked if anybody wants to suspend the rules for discussion. She stated to Mr. Parker at this time if he just wants to just put himself on mute, typically now would be when the Commission discuss his application, and if they have any questions, they will let him know.

It was moved by S. Mittlefehldt, seconded by M. Dunn, and carried 6-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she maybe wanted to clear up a misconception or a different perception of what our Planning Commission does for Mr. Parker, because they by no means are trying to limit development or shut businesses down. She stated that it is the opposite and that they want to see small businesses like his flourish, but they also want to make sure that those 162 new guests when they come out of the wedding venue that they are safe, and that they can design traffic appropriately, so she just wanted to say that, that nobody is against this by any stretch of the imagination. She stated that she felt like there was a little bit of anger or hostility towards what they are trying to do here, but she thinks they are kind of on the same team. She also stated that they want to see economic development in their community and businesses like his flourish, and she thinks he is right that outdoor venues for weddings is a great idea for this season. She stated that she did not have any major concerns with the plan except for the parking and the traffic concerns that the highway committee had presented. She stated that those seem like important and legitimate public safety concerns, but if that can be addressed by some of the changes and the willingness to reduce capacity to 162, she thinks they can move this forward.

M. Dunn stated that he is trying to wrap his head around what a condition would look like for this. He asked if they were to say that the applicant needs to come back with an amended plan if that is something that just gets handled through staff. He stated that he does not want to have to make the applicant come back again and do the whole thing all over again if it is a simple matter of amending the plan. J. Cardillo stated that she thinks the way it would work, and that is what they were trying to suss out in terms of his options, is that they would tonight basically put conditions [on approval] -- it sounds like there are one or two conditions, one being to reduce the capacity and two being to potentially close that center curb cut -- and that could be done, he could make those amendments, and then that would be dealt with through staff, so he would not have to come before them again as long as staff deems that he fulfills those amendments. She asked A. Landers if that is correct. A. Landers stated that is correct. J. Cardillo stated okay.

M. Dunn stated that then he guesses the other comment that he would have is that as far as this curb cut situation, he wants it to be clear that that is not something that the City or staff or anybody else on their team made up. He stated that is something from MDOT and coming from the Corridor Advisory Group, so that was not them that came up with that, but it is their job to make sure that that gets followed still. He stated that he thinks that is all he had. J. Cardillo stated thank you.

W. Premeau stated that he is totally confused. He stated that first off, it sounds like the applicant does not realize that it would be a lot easier for him just to allow his plan to be amended instead of starting all over. He stated that he could just let A. Landers do that administratively. He also stated that it does not have to be done tomorrow morning, so he could get his 200 or whatever capacity he is looking for by adding the parking spaces. He stated that all he has to do is say he is going to do it. He stated that he does not have to have that plan totally drawn up, he does not think. He stated that when he gets it drawn up, he can take it to her, and she will say yes. He stated that she has to. He also stated that the other thing he does not understand is that on the highway Advisory Committee, if it is advisory or if they are the law. He stated that he will have to ask Dave. He stated that he means are they are the law, and they can come along and say this is what you are going to do, hell or high water, or are they simply an advisory committee saying this would be nice, because the other problem you are going to run into with MDOT - which is very costly when they get into this - is "Oh, you need to do a deceleration lane." He stated that you need all kinds of crap to meet their specifications. He stated that he does not know. He stated that he cannot see a board who is

supposed to be advisory being able to make the law and say, "No, this is the way it is going to be." He stated unless that is the way it is. He stated that he does not know. He stated that Dave could answer that.

D. Stensaas stated okay, so for the Corridor Group, the jurisdictions all agreed that they would weigh in on these issues and follow the guidance that MDOT provides. He also stated that MDOT gets their guidance from the Federal Highway Administration. He stated that this kind of guidance is pretty standard across the country. He stated if we do not follow it in this case, what the purpose is of having a corridor advisory group. He asked what the purpose is of having the rules, the guidance at all if local municipalities are not going to follow it. He also stated that it is designed based on traffic safety data. He stated that it is designed based on crashes, real life stuff, and that he means they are evaluating crashes and what is going to make roads safer. He stated that he worked in that field for a while, and they are talking about people getting killed and injured in accidents on highways. He stated that it is going to be costly to build a driveway there, but it is going to be a lot more costly if you have a family get creamed pulling out on the highway there, and you have somebody killed. He also stated that is not going to be a good thing for anybody's business or for the local municipality or for families or anybody, so this is not just academic stuff. He stated that this is all based on highway data. He also stated that this is the guidance that keeps people safe, so they have an obligation to follow that and put it into their requirements.

W. Premeau stated okay, he will go along with that, except when you are coming from the south, you have got to cross two lanes of traffic coming at you from Marquette, no matter which driveway you are going into. He also stated that whether you go to better one, the end one or where, you are still crossing those two lanes. D. Stensaas stated that you have conflict points for every access point on the highway. He stated that you have got several different conflict points when a car pulls out into the road. He also stated that it can cross the highway. He stated that it can stay on the same side, but multiple curb cuts right next to each other is multiplying the conflict points, and it is making it harder for people to see in front if there are cars pulling out. He also stated that if there are cars coming down the highway at full speed, they are not necessarily going to see a car that is in front of another one pulling out, and that it creates just more hazards, and so this isn't something that the City is going to ignore.

J. Cardillo stated that maybe an analogy is such that they, the Planning Commission, are an advisory committee to the City Commission in so much as they have an in-depth knowledge of the land development code, and they have charged them with their understanding of that land development code to make recommendations to them on the premise that they know and have studied this document.

W. Premeau asked where in the Land Development Code is that stated. D. Stensaas stated that it is not stated in the Land Development Code, but that the Community Master Plan that they adopted has more than a full page on corridor access management, but there is nothing specific in the LDC about corridor management. He stated that the City signed a memorandum understanding with MDOT that they were going to participate in that Corridor Advisory Group. He asked if they just start saying these rules do not apply to us, what good that does them. W. Premeau stated that, again, D. Stensaas is saying it's an advisory group, but they are not an advisory group at that point and they would be just like the a pseudo judicial group who just says this is what we are doing.

J. Cardillo stated that they are going to sit here and vote and decide whether they want to take that advice into account as they make this decision. W. Premeau stated to go ahead. He also stated that he does not care. He stated that he is just bringing up a question, and he knows what happens with MDOT, and he knows the costs that these things can rack up because he has to do it all, and he knows how crazy it gets. He stated that they can say anything they want and that if you had 150 cars coming to get in at the same time, there is going to be 150 cars from the south, 150 cars in that center lane all the way back through Harvey, through Marquette Township there, waiting to get across, especially at the right times of day when you have got 200 or 300 people leaving the medical center, the college or whatever heading home. He stated that you cannot even cross the highway. He also stated that he does not care, because there are a lot of things that come into play after the fact, which he does not think any of them are privy to. J. Cardillo stated thank you. She stated that they would take that into account. W. Premeau stated that he does not think so.

M. Larson stated that his question, as far as the corridor and just trying to get it, is if Mr. Parker have any recourse to suggest alternatives if they wanted to keep that center open but to close the other two driveways if the center is his main line. He asked if he can recommend that, if there's an issue with distance. He stated that he knows Mr. Parker has not suggested this and that he is just asking the question, can he come back with an alternative and say, "You know what? The main entrance really is the important one, and those two side entrances are not as important to my business, and I would rather keep that and have a road that goes up to the house and so on from there." He asked if he can come back and ask or come back to that Advisory Board, to avoid potentially some of the issues with paving a new road.

D. Stensaas stated that the issue is you have two curb cuts that are less than 300 feet apart, so that is about 2/3 of the recommended distance for two curb cuts to be apart. He also stated that if you want to eliminate the southernmost curb cut and have one entrance to the property, that does eliminate that issue and does not require any other action, but you would have to close that cut just like they are saying, and you need to close this middle one if you're going to have access to this site from another curb cut that is already there, as there are three curb cuts. M. Larson asked to follow up on that, and stated he could close the other one and still potentially have the middle curb cut remaining. J. Cardillo stated that they would have to close the two outer ones. D. Stensaas stated yes. He stated that you have to leave the other one as is with no access road/driveway and close the southernmost access point. M. Larson stated just the southernmost access. D. Stensaas stated that that would meet the guidance. He stated that the guidance says you cannot have two that are less than 455 feet apart serving the same property on a road that is more than 50 miles an hour. He also stated that you eliminate the one, if that is what he would like to do, that they have never discussed that and that that was never presented to them, and as he said before, the site plan actually shows an existing driveway from that northernmost curb cut, but as we found out, it is not there.

M. Larson stated that he only brings it up because it sounded like it was a little bit of a surprise to Mr. Parker that they came back saying that he would need to close the curb cut that is used as his main access to his business, and so if there is an opportunity for an alternative there, he does not know if that is something Mr. Parker has considered or if that is something they can ask Mr. Parker if he has considered an alternative to closing those curb cuts to potentially avoid a more prohibitive situation to yourself, whereas building a road or paving a road and so on and so forth. He stated that that raises a question he does not know if they can ask him. J. Cardillo stated that it is a question they can ask Mr. Parker. She also stated that she thinks there are a couple of ways we could deal with it. She stated that they could also word their amendment such to just say what the applicant must amend so that they do not have any entrances within 455 feet of each other, which would leave him open to come up with any variety of creative solutions . D. Stensaas stated that they need to have a site plan that is approved, that they cannot leave this meeting with an unanswered access issue. J. Cardillo stated okay. She stated that she guesses she is skeptical because she knows the southern one goes directly into the Birchmont Motel, so she is doubtful he would want to lose that one, but let us ask Mr. Parker. She asked Mr. Parker if what Commissioner Larson is saying appealing to him in any way. Mr. Parker stated that there is no way he could remove the one that goes essentially right into the motel. He also stated that he thinks they could all agree on that that. He stated that that needs to be there. He also stated that the second one has to be there and that that is where the paved road is. He stated that it is grandfathered in. He also stated that the MDOT cut that was made, it goes to the motel, so there is a circle driveway. He stated that otherwise, he cannot accommodate any 18-wheelers or anything because that is the only way that they could go through is to pull through on that circle drive, so now we are seriously limiting who he can accommodate in his motel. He also stated that they are immediately ripping out his middle driveway because of some advisory committee and that he never was even informed that this advisory committee was meeting on his topic. He stated that he feels like if they are going to make about a half a million dollar change to somebody's property, you should at least be advised to that to be able to represent yourself in some way, so whether he could take legal action against this whole thing, he just thinks it is absolutely insane. He also stated that he will not close that middle curb cut. He stated that there is just absolutely no way. He stated that he would rather bulldoze that house into the ground and be done with this, and he feels like we completely skipped over the main reason of this whole application was made - so he could use that house as short-term rental, as the 30th room, essentially a suite, on his motel. He also stated that that is all he really wanted to do with all this, and it is gone in such a direction, it is insane. He asked if they know what MDOT is going to charge him for the curb cut to redo that curb cut, probably put a deceleration lane in, build that road. He stated hundreds of thousands of dollars,

probably the net worth of the whole facility. J. Cardillo stated to Mr. Parker that she understands, but that they need to keep this moving along. She stated that he has already expressed this earlier, so they just wanted to ask a question to Mr. Larson's proposal. She stated thank you.

D. Stensaas stated that a deceleration lane is not required. He stated that was discussed. W. Premeau asked why it was not in the report? D. Stensaas stated that he does not have a report. He stated that he is telling him he was at the meeting and it was discussed, and MDOT will make some kind of a formal submission to their main office on that, but the minutes of the meeting will be available shortly, and I did inform the applicants, architect and surveyor and himself, I believe, that this meeting took place - before it took place last week. He also stated that he did provide that information. W. Premeau stated okay.

Mr. Parker asked if he was copied on that. He asked if he can you prove that because he never received that. D. Stensaas stated that they will look at it. He stated to Mr. Parker that he has had a variety of people contacting them about this project, supposedly representing him. Mr. Parker stated that he did have to hire an architect because you certainly would not -- no common man could possibly get anything passed through this planning deal, so yes, he did have to hire an architect. He stated that he thinks he hired the worst one on the planet, to be honest with them. Mr. Parker stated that going back to what W. Premeau said, he would like to just approve an amended capacity so he could keep the 200. He also stated that he could make a parking lot. He stated that that is not a problem. He asked if why they do not revisit that. J. Cardillo stated okay, so to be clear, he is going to submit an amended plan, which will be approved administratively to provide an additional paved 18 spaces. Mr. Parker stated that is correct. J. Cardillo asked A. Landers if that makes sense to her. A. Landers stated yes.

M. Larson stated that by doing so, though, that that brings them into conformity, which then that is why they are discussing the curb cuts. J. Cardillo stated that she thinks the curb cuts are totally separate. W. Premeau stated she is right. J. Cardillo stated that the curb cuts are based on the traffic on Highway 41, and they are irrelevant of the parking spaces.

M. Dunn stated that he is looking at the suggested condition in the staff report, and it looks it looks just fine to him the way it is. He also stated that he does not think that it is missing anything, so he is ready to make a motion if they have looked at that. He stated that he guesses the only thing that it does not take into consideration is the option of doing the single middle driveway. J. Cardillo stated that it does not sound like the applicant is interested in that option, so she does not think that is an issue. M. Dunn stated okay. W. Premeau stated that it could become an issue because that is what he is thinking right now in the heat of the battle.

A. Landers asked J. Cardillo if she wanted her to put the recommended staff condition on the screen so everyone can see it. J. Cardillo stated that would be helpful, thanks. She stated that she is looking at it. She asked if it is page 3. A. Landers stated yes. She asked if she can you see it now. J. Cardillo stated yes.

M. Dunn stated that he is ready to make a motion. J. Cardillo stated okay, go ahead, and then they will see if they have a second.

It was moved by M. Dunn, that after review of the site plan dated March 22nd, 2021, and the Staff Report for 01-SUP-04-21, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code, Sections 54-1403, 54-635, and 54-1402 and hereby approves 01-SUP-04-21 with the following conditions, that 1) an amended plan is submitted to meet the parking requirements, so that would be an additional 18 parking spaces; and 2) implementation of the site access recommendations of the Marquette County US-41/M-28 Corridor Advisory Group – to close the middle access drive on the parcel and create a driveway from the northernmost access drive, and that this amended plan may be administratively reviewed by staff.

J. Cardillo stated that they got a motion by Commissioner Dunn, second by Commissioner Mittlefehldt. She asked W. Premeau if he had something to add. W. Premeau stated that he thinks he should have the option. He stated that he has got to be X amount of feet apart with his curb cuts. He stated that he should be able to do that. He also stated that means he could -- the hell with the Advisory Committee -- if he is going to have to be 495 feet or whatever it is, if he wanted to change it, so he has got 495 feet that still

comes sort of straight in, he would be allowed to do it. He stated that in other words, if he could go either, he will say you would have to go north two feet, and he would have a very short road to put in, he would have exactly what he is trying to do. He also stated that he means to say he would have to follow the committee's report when he has options, we should allow him to do whatever option he wants to do. He also stated that if you say you have got to do this and bam that is it, that's not right.

A. Landers asked if they want her to put the site plan on screen so everyone could see. She asked W. Premeau if he is talking about just relocating the existing middle curb cut to make it 495 feet and then tie into the existing paving. A. Landers asked if they want her to share the plan on screen. J. Cardillo stated to go ahead and do that, please.

M. Dunn stated that he actually agrees with Wayne, but he thinks they should vote down the motion that he just made if they are going to change it. J. Cardillo stated that she guesses her only question is, Dave sort of mentioned earlier that they need to have a site plan approved, so it cannot be sort of some abstract thing of what is going to happen. W. Premeau stated that he does not believe the site plan shows that curb cut being closed right now. He also stated that it just shows that it is there. J. Cardillo stated right, but the motion sort of indicates a very specific action as opposed to sort of -- because she originally suggested let's do something a little more open ended so we can come back with some kind of creative solution, but she does not think -- and asked D. Stensaas to correct her if she is wrong -- that they can do something that is kind of open to interpretation with the site plan. D. Stensaas stated that he does not think that is good practice. M. Larson stated that it would be a conditional approval. He also stated that they make conditions of approval all the time. He stated that they are following guidelines and updating it, as W. Premeau is suggesting, updating it to that 490. He stated that he would agree with that and allowing some measure of decision-making on Mr. Parker's part to come into compliance with that.

M. Dunn stated that as he is looking at this, that portion that says to close the middle access drive, that was not something from staff. He also stated that it sounds like that was the exact recommendation of the Advisory, and so now he is changing his tune from a second ago because he does not have the expertise to change what the Corridor Advisory Committee is saying, so if that is what they recommend, that is what he thinks they should go with. J. Cardillo asked if he is standing by the motion as he made it. M. Dunn stated that is correct. J. Cardillo stated that is okay. She asked if they have a second on that. She stated that they had Commissioner Mittlefehldt. She asked if they go ahead and vote on this, and if it does not pass, then they can see where they are at. She asked if there is any other discussion they want to have about this. She stated that it does not sound like it. She stated that she is going to do a roll call vote.

It was moved by M. Dunn, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt, and carried 4-2 that after review of the site plan dated March 22, 2021, and the Staff Report for 01- SUP-04-21, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Sections 54.1403, 54.635, and 54.1402, and hereby approves 01-SUP-04-21, with the following conditions – 1) that an amended plan is submitted to meet the parking requirements, for 18 additional parking spaces; and 2) implementation of the site access recommendation of the Marquette County US41/M-28 Corridor Advisory Group – to close the middle access drive on the parcel and create a driveway from the northernmost access drive - and that this amended plan may be administratively reviewed by staff.

Yes – E. Brooks, M. Dunn, S. Mittlefehldt, J. Cardillo

No – W. Premeau, M. Larson

J. Cardillo stated the vote passes, and thanked Mr. Parker and she wishes him all the best with his business and they look forward to having this as part of their community, and that he could work with staff to finalize his site plans. Mr. Parker stated thank you and good night.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no discussion of the report.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

E. Brooks stated that he just wanted to comment that at their last meeting, D. Stensaas brought up about possible safety corridor for the bike path that basically where Craig Street ends, once you cross the highway, the bike path starts right next to Superior Collision there where the creek runs through it. He also

stated that he walked back there and checked it out, and If there were a safety corridor, he would think that would be a really good option just looking where the bike path ends there, and what is interesting about it too is if you were to take the bike path there, then it just ends by Superior Collision there, but there is no actual walking access then up to the corner where you actually have the crossing of 41/28 there, so once that is being discussed, that might be brought up too that maybe a pathway from the end of the bike path could go up to the corner of Genesee because that is where you actually push the button to cross the highway. He stated that is it, just bringing that up from the last meeting.

W. Premeau stated that he is just curious if you would have an option if you needed to go to the Traffic Advisory Committee and say look, "I am going to move this down another - I will have to go look at that plan again - but move it down 20 feet, or 100 feet, "can I still come into my business the way I want to?" He stated if he understands it right because that is the way the motion was made, that no matter what, you cannot do that. He asked if he has somewhat of an option, because it is really hard for people when you are in a meeting and everything is flying around, and you are trying to make sense of it, it's difficult, but once you go sit down and think about it for a little bit, maybe for \$10,000, \$15,000, he can have what he wants, only a little farther down to meet the distance between. He asked if they just blocked him out of that.

J. Cardillo asked A. Landers what her thoughts are on that process-wise. A. Landers stated that she thinks that if it had just stated to close the middle access drive and then discuss with MDOT a revised plan, that may have been, but that is not what was made. W. Premeau stated that he knows, and that is a mistake, but they do a lot of them, so it is just one of many. He also stated that there has got to be flexibility in what they do.

D. Stensaas stated that if he had wanted to close the other drive by the motel, that would have been an option, and that there would not have been a situation where he had to close one. He stated that it doesn't meet the standard, and he gets it, but then you are talking about two main access drives, and which one is the main drive?, he stated that they cannot both be the main drive. W. Premeau stated that one goes directly to those buildings. He also stated that those buildings were put up in the '70s, and it was a schoolteacher from Gwinn, and they were built by Dickinson Homes of Iron Mountain if you want to know the history, and Paul Umari designed them and that is where that T-shaped house came in, and we put all foundations in. He stated that that is how long it has been there, but his point is, how many feet would he have to move north on that second drive to become a legal drive. D. Stensaas stated that it is really close to where the existing northernmost drive is. He also stated that it is probably not that far, maybe a little more than halfway, maybe 250 feet to the north from the middle. W. Premeau stated that, again, if you had an engineer out there, someone that is doing a little thinking, they might be able to come up with a practical idea that would work for him at a reasonable cost. He stated that that is all he is saying.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she just wanted to let them know for her environmental policy class, students are researching strategies to help Marquette become carbon-neutral by 2050 that align with the Community Master Plan, so they have taken some of the strategic actions that are listed in our Community Master Plan and they are trying to quantify investing in the cycling infrastructure, and what E. Brooks was talking about like how much carbon could we actually sequester, what would it cost, looking at different options, and we will see what they come up with. She stated that that is kind of their big final project, but they are so excited, and they are really pumped, and she hopes to have some kind of memo that she can synthesize and bring to them all. She also stated that Commissioner Hill came and spoke to the class and really got them all excited, so they are excited to see where that could lead.

D. Stensaas stated that he would like to follow up with some things from the last meeting that he told them he would follow up with them about. He also stated that one thing they talked about was that crossing of M-553 at the ski hill, and he talked to their contacts at their MDOT Service Center here, and found out that he had had some contact with the owner of the ski hill. He stated that they (MDOT) had heard through the City about one or two complaints about near misses there, and, of course, that site has been the site of a fatal accident several years ago. He stated that they kind of looked at the corridor the way it is laid out. He stated that the actual right of way for the corridor butts up against the farthest point of the building that sticks out towards the corridor, so the right of way actually is almost at the building's edge. He stated that one of the things he was thinking is that maybe the MDOT could agree to have something where people are kind of funneled to a point where they have to, like a railroad crossing, if you have ever seen a bike path cross a

live rail grade, they use barriers so you have to stop. He also stated that you cannot just coast through a live railroad crossing. He stated that you have to go through a turnstile often. He stated that he thought maybe they could do something like that, but since that building is right there, you could not put anything on that side, any kind of fixed objects, because it is in the right of way. He also stated that you are right there when you step out the building and you are practically right in the right of way, even though there is a little access drive in front of the building and a small, small strip of grass with a curb before you are in the highway. He stated that on the other side, there is a little more room between the highway and the parking lot, so kind of what they thought was what would make the most sense is for the property owner to put something to funnel people to a point where you come out of that parking lot to the highway and you have to stop and think before you enter the highway, something that forces you to either to a turnstile or just something that is real in-your-face - "Hey, you are about to step into a 55-mile-an-hour highway." He stated that according to MDOT, they cannot do anything to slow traffic down through there, and that is what they say. He stated that part of that is just the unfortunate topography you have got there. He also stated that you have bad sight distances coming around curves, down hills, so people gravity pulling them faster down into the valley, and it is just an unfortunate place to have an overflow parking lot. He stated that it is really kind of incumbent on the property owner because there is not a whole lot that the state can do to slow traffic down coming through there because of the way -- he does not know if they understand the way they set speed limits -- but there is a formula that is used everywhere for state and federal highways that basically makes it impossible to take a speed limit from a higher to a lower speed limit. He stated that it is called the 85th percentile calculation, so they put traffic counters in the road and take data on all of the traffic, the volume of the cars and their speed. He stated that if the traffic of the 85th percentile is above the speed limit, they will not reverse the speed limit. He stated that the only thing it ever does is ratchet up the speed limit when they do 85th percentile studies, so once they set it at 55, unless everybody in that community just gets really old and quits driving or starts driving really slowly and nobody goes fast anymore, the 85th percentile speed is always going to be at or above the speed limit, and oftentimes that is how you get speed limits that go from 55 to 65 or 65 to 70, because they look at the 85th percentile, and if they can statutory raise the speed limit, they will because they determined that that is the safe speed to travel. He also stated that the 85th percentile speed has been determined by God at the traffic agency to be the safe speed limit for that road, and you cannot fight that. He stated that the only place you can change the speed limit is in a local jurisdiction. He stated that the City Commission or Council can change the speed limit, but that is on a road that they control, not a road the state or the Federal Highway Administration has any authority over.

M. Dunn stated that it sounds insane to him that all of those calculations may work for vehicular traffic, but it is certainly not considering safety of pedestrians, and he gets it, but he guesses in one aspect, it is out of their hands, but asked who he does he talk to at MDOT because that is insane to him. D. Stensaas stated that he can put him in touch with their contact there. He also stated that the other issue about the ski hill that they discussed was that they have determined that something like 97% of the traffic that goes by that area on any given day is local traffic, even in the winter when people are coming to the ski hill, the average is above 95%, so they are saying that the people speeding through there are the people that live in the area, and they know these conditions, so they are not going to reach a lot of people that do not understand that there is an overflow parking lot at the bottom of that hill.

M. Dunn stated that he gets it. He also stated that it is just that the idea that you cannot lower a speed limit based on pedestrian safety, and it just seems like there has got to be a better way to do it because no one is going to voluntarily go slower there, even if they know. He stated that he has caught himself doing it all the time. He stated that he knows there are mountain bikers crossing, and he knows there are going to be skiers crossing, but he is still usually doing close to 55, and sometimes he can catch himself and slow down, and obviously, if he sees people, he slows down, but to get people to go slower, you have to lower the speed limit and then enforce it. He also stated that you cannot expect people to voluntarily go slower when the speed limit is what it is. He stated thank you for looking into it.

W. Premeau asked D. Stensaas how many years ago it was when the City was on them to get a stoplight on Grove Street, said it could not be done, but they ended up doing it. He also stated that the second point is when he is coming down, the ski hill part does not bother him at all. He stated that it is as you start up the hill, they have got that snowmobile sign on a road, and apparently, a lot of the bikers and hikers think that that means they can walk across anytime they want, because the last time he came through there, there

was a guy just started right across, and there was traffic going both ways. He also stated that he means it is just as much a problem up where you come out of the trailer park there and you are coming off the -- it must be a bike path on that hill, so, again, he does not think there is a clear answer, but he thinks they should also educate the people and the bikers that part of this is their responsibility. He stated that it is not all up to the drivers of the vehicles. He stated that that is it. He stated sorry to J. Cardillo.

J. Cardillo stated thank you. She also stated that that is a good point. She asked if additional signage be an option. She stated that that is her first question, and then her second question is more of a very hypothetical, which is that if, say, the private owner of the ski hill or some private owner, maybe it was even Rippling River, wanted to do, say, like a pedestrian bridge over the highway, and she realizes there would be logistical issues to be dealt with that, what would right-of-way issues be with that. She asked if that would be something that could be worked through. D. Stensaas stated that they did talk about that. He stated that they talked about the issues with the bike trail head up the road and the fact that most of the trails people ride require you to cross the road. He also stated that the trails on the on the east side of the highway, you have got trails that go up the mountain and trails that go through the river valley and you come out to the road that takes you back over to the bike path along the lake, but most people are crossing the highway, and eventually something bad is going to happen, and they are aware of that. He stated that they have talked about that area, and it is definitely an area of concern. He also stated that he does not know that there is any real proactive way to address it further. He stated that they have looking at it and talking about it for a while, and they do not have any solutions. J. Cardillo asked they being what, MDOT? D. Stensaas stated yes, MDOT. He stated that MDOT knows that whole corridor through there is problematic because of the speed and the curves, sight distances. He also stated that he is highly concerned that there is going to be something bad that is going to happen in there because, like W. Premeau said, there are people that cross that do not really -- there are young bike riders crossing there that do not understand the potential danger. He stated that he will turn these minutes over to the Traffic Advisory Committee and let them know that that is a concern, and maybe they can work with MDOT on something, something proactive. He stated that the bridge idea, they talked about that too. He also stated that there used to be a bridge down at the ski hill, according to Ben. He stated that he said 30-something years ago, maybe when it was not quite new, but apparently, they had some kind of a bridge down there at one point, and it got hauled off. He stated that he does think the property owner can take some steps that will make that crossing a lot safer, and there is an opportunity for them to do that because they control the access from the parking to the road, which is really the most critical point, that is where you are going to get somebody's attention before they ever step into the highway, that this is a dangerous crossing. He stated that how we communicate that, he is not sure. He stated that E. Brooks brought up a good point, and, again, he is really frustrated because he talked to them about their 2022 project for South Front Street. He stated that MDOT is really not -- they have got a problem with that side of the street because that is where all the power poles are, and they are not very far off the private property right there, so they are saying they don't have room to create any extra pedestrian space on that side of the road on the east side of Front Street. He also stated that they did tell them yesterday, though, that they are going to pay for putting in sidewalk extension on the other side from Hampton Street around the corner, and he thinks there is a little bit somewhere else, but for the crossing at Genesee they are still working on a new type of crosswalk and new type of push buttons apparently, so they are trying to do something. He stated that he has been talking to the city engineer about that, the frustration with the fact that -- the other thing he wants to know is if they cannot set the speed zone down as you come into Marquette because he thinks that is part of the problem in that corridor is people are going 55, 60 all the way to the top of the hill when they are coming into Marquette, Shiras Hill, and so you are at the top of the hill. He stated that if you are going 55 or 60, you are supposed to be going 35 just down the hill, so it doesn't really make sense that they do not have the speed zone lower farther out because you only see the sign that you are supposed to be going 45 when you get on the other side of the hill as you are coming down at 55 or 60, and then you are at the bottom of the hill where you are supposed to be going 35, so he thinks maybe there is an opportunity for them to stretch the speed zones out there. He stated that he will ask him about that.

D. Stensaas stated just one other follow-up thing - M. Dunn brought up the question about Robert's rules, and can you discuss after making a motion before there is a second. He stated that according to the book, you cannot. He stated that you are not supposed to discuss once you make a motion. J. Cardillo asked before there is a second. D. Stensaas stated that's right. J. Cardillo asked if after there is a second, you can. D. Stensaas stated that yes, just like you did today.

D. Stensaas also stated that the City Commission had a work session last week, and they talked for a half an hour or 45 minutes about transit stuff that they each thought was important, all things that were already in our plans. He also stated that they had not looked at the transit plans that were done previously or the Master Plan, it appeared, so they are trying to bring them up to speed on that. He also stated that he talked to Taylor Klipp recently, and he just said that whenever they get to the point where they are going to have a meeting [on transit], he would be glad to start coordinating with them. He stated that he did talk to the MarqTran director today and they are going to have a conversation tomorrow so they can get some kind of an estimate of the kind of high range of cost of having a transit route established on North 3rd down to the station downtown, over to the hospital and around the NMU academic campus to the UC, something like that, and take it from there. He also stated that hopefully the City Commission will either designate a subcommittee or allow the Planning Commission to start coordinating some kind of discussions on that, but he will keep you posted as we go.

J. Cardillo stated that to D. Stensaas just a quick clarification to the earlier point. She asked after a motion is made and it is seconded, do they have to suspend the rules again to discuss or can they -- like today, they just kind of started discussing it. She asked if that is okay. D. Stensaas asked if it is after you have made a second. J. Cardillo stated yes. D. Stensaas stated that after you made -- that is if there is a motion on the floor, so you would not suspend the rules. J. Cardillo asked if they can just discuss it. D. Stensaas stated that you can discuss it at length at that point. J. Cardillo stated okay, which is what they did. She stated that she just wanted to clarify that.

D. Stensaas stated that one more thing, not to beat this to death, but he did pedestrian and bikeway planning for five years for a transportation agency, and bike/pedestrian advocates have been frustrated for at least 20 or 30 years with this whole 85th percentile thing and been trying to change it and pretty much getting nowhere, so it is not something new. He stated that it is just something almost insurmountable. He also stated that almost everybody that is concerned with pedestrian safety is really frustrated with how that ends up affecting/impacting cities, like that South Front corridor is a perfect example. He stated that you cannot have a crossing where that bike path comes out with a midblock safety refuge island or anything because they say the numbers do not support it. He also stated that they have got to move traffic through. He stated that there is that volume of traffic, and you do not want to have that delay in there, and there is lots of stuff in the book that explains why that makes sense, but it really does not seem to make perfect sense. M. Dunn stated to D. Stensaas thanks again for looking into that.

E. Brooks asked D. Stensaas concerning the end of Craig Street there after looking at it, he means obviously a pedestrian bridge would not work at the Genesee Crossing. He also stated that he just does not think there is the space. He stated that pedestrian bridge that is by Bothwell that goes over McClellan, and he was just trying to wrap his brain around, thinking if any place to put a pedestrian bridge, that would be like the ideal location. J. Cardillo asked where. E. Brooks stated on the end of the Craig Street where the bike path ends or by Superior Collision. J. Cardillo asked to put a bridge. E. Brooks stated yes, a pedestrian bridge in there because then you would have enough area on either side to make it so you have to go up and on steps, so you could actually elevate it like you did on McClellan Street, and it would be really ideal then if you could do a sidewalk from the corner of Genesee down to the pedestrian bridge because, as they know, as this new hotel opens up, as these new condos are being built, you are seeing a lot of this south Marquette development going on that it is just going to get worse, and there are just really no good safe areas in there, and a lot of people from south Marquette cross that Genesee area, and it is just a ticking time bomb because you have people walking dogs, people going on the bike path, but it is just going to increase in volume and traffic, so he means he does not know if anything can be discussed with the Department of Transportation about a pedestrian bridge like they've got at McClellan. D. Stensaas stated that is a good idea. He also stated that he does not know what they say about spacing. He stated that it is definitely far enough from the signalized intersection. He stated that they got to look at how far it is from the nearest signalized intersection, but there are all kinds of studies of how far people will walk to a signalized intersection versus just try to jaywalk or run across a highway, and that is far enough. He stated that he thinks it is a great idea, actually, and he will bring that one up for sure. He stated that he thought they might be amenable to putting the refuge island in there and why that makes sense is a lot of studies, and you can go out and watch it in cities that have bridges on urban expressways. He stated that he remembers one by a high school, he was standing there watching students running across the highway, dodging cars, rather than going over a bridge that was there, and that is why they usually say they will not spend \$1,000,000 or

whatever to put a bridge over a road like that because people are just going to run across the road anyway, but he thinks he has got a good point. He stated that he thinks it is worth talking about and seeing if it is a possibility. He stated that maybe that could even be built into a gateway to Marquette because they have been talking about having some kind of a gateway project on that side of town for years, you know, a Welcome to Marquette gateway, and people really miss the old downtown railway trestle, even though it was not pretty. He also stated that maybe that could be the new trestle, so it is something to definitely explore further.

J. Cardillo stated that this is great to get all the ideas flowing on this. She asked anybody else, any other comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair J. Cardillo at 7:25 p.m.

Prepared by:

David Stensaas

David Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator
Planning Commission Secretary
nb/ Imedat