

# Executive Summary

## Long Range Planning – City Market Development Decisions

1. Committee is meeting bi-weekly and contains the following individuals:

<u>LEPFA Board</u>	<u>LEPFA Staff</u>	<u>Parks Board</u>	<u>City/EDC</u>
Charley Jansen – P	Eric Hart - P	Dusty Fancher – P	Brian Anderson - A
Tim Haggart - P	Scott Keith - P	Brian Smith – P	Bob Jonson - P
Charles Mickens - P	John Hooper - P	Paul Carrier - P	
John Decker - P		Rick Kibbey - P	

NOTE: A - denotes not present, P - denotes present

2. December 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting
  - a. Studio Intrigue presented the overview of the last 2 weeks of development work at the studio.
  - b. Studio Intrigue and LEPFA have met with CMI architects to coordinate the river corridor between all the projects presently underway.
  - c. There are no solid designs for the first 25' of the riverfront but conceptual plans are in the works and we will be incorporating their conceptual plans into our design presentation tomorrow night.
  - d. Site Plan changes to incorporate a larger plaza area near the river in conjunction with CMI project. Larger patio is more open and integrates the use of river into use of Market.
  - e. Green space has increased on the site based on the new site plans.
  - f. Working to address challenges in regard to site elements and site layout with the CMI designs incorporated.
  - g. We have learned that the DEQ wants the Market, CMI and PowerStation projects to work together in the submission of the appropriate permits. They want a single impact analysis.
  - h. LEPFA has contacted City of Lansing Public Works department to coordinate this process.
  - i. Project budget was discussed. Architect is fully aware of our budget and working to create a design that will work within our \$1.6 million budget.
  - j. Studio Intrigue presented the site plan boards for the public meeting to be held on the 18<sup>th</sup>. David presents some of the changes:
    - i. Tiered retaining wall in lieu of first presented 7-8' wall.
    - ii. Eliminated paved drive around at North end of building
    - iii. Added sloped green area between the retaining walls with and enlarged stair

- iv. Dave discussed the concerns created with the increased amount of fill needed for this new design. More work with DEQ needed to get approval for design.
    - v. David stressed the immediate need to sit with the DEQ and work through the flood plain issues. We are at a critical point.
  - k. After review of the site plan, the committee agrees the designs have improved and are better than the previous plans.
  - l. Comments made about the site plans”
    - i. Overall site plan improved (vendor pods, increased landscaping, multi tiered retaining walls , amphitheater type seating) and line of vision is respected
    - ii. The committee wants to keep the parking and drive along the Eastern side of the building.
    - iii. There is a need to use the Northwest corner of building for landscaping and other vendor displays.
  - m. Discussions concerning the MDEQ began concerning the possible changes that may occur to receive approval for the site. Key points of our discussions:
    - i. Site layout has changed considerably since the first meetings with the DEQ
    - ii. There is a large amount of fill in the 100 year flood plain. This will have an impact on the hydraulics of the river and the MDEQ will require some compensation cut of fill. This is part of what needs to be discussed between the projects with the DEQ.
    - iii. There are some inaccuracies in the original flood plain map and we need to understand that as we move forward the flood way may be in a location we are not expecting and we will need to make other changes in the design to compensate based on DEQ input.
    - iv. The presents flood way map shows that it touches the NW edge of the building. Studio Intrigue does have a plan for addressing this and we may need to make a small wall or slight cut to that edge of the facility.
    - v. Studio Intrigue did discuss having to involve FEMA but the DEQ doesn’t require this and it does take very long to get approval. Committee felt best options were to make minor adjustments in the facility to accommodate the floodway issue.
  - n. Discussions occurred about removing the restrooms and playground area from the park. Parks Board members of the committee indicated they wanted to keep those facilities in their present state.
  - o. Lower level access concerns were addressed with mobility impaired access improvements on the South side of the facility.
  - p. Concerns were discussed about the view of the loading dock and the drive area on the N.E side of the building. The use of vendor displays and natural filler (berms and nursery items) along the boardwalk were good inexpensive solutions.

- q. Vendor parking was discussed. Options were discussed about where to park vendor vehicles once they have unloaded. There are many options and the solutions will continue to be reviewed. Using the Lansing Center lots for the vendors is a possibility that we will continue to pursue.
  - r. Studio Intrigue discussed the elevator room and pit that are designed into the structure and that until the need arises, the rooms will be designed to be used as storage rooms.
  - s. The use of banners and other inexpensive design elements will continue to be researched to give the facility a greater presence along the riverfront.
  - t. Final overview of the public meeting presentation was given to the committee.
3. Events Impacted by the Development
- i. No further discussions occurred on this topic.
4. Design Process
- a. As design progress, the USDA will be contacted for review and discussion as we enter the design/development stage of the design process.
  - b. Once more information is available, we will be working to attend an East Side and Downtown Neighborhood meeting to provide updates on our progress.
5. Bidding Process/PLA – No Update
6. Business Plan Status – No Update
7. Process – No Update