



# VILLAGE OF CLEVELAND

HIKA PARK MASTER PLAN PLAN COMMISSION PRESENTATION OCTOBER 21 , 2020

# Cedar Corporation Planning Staff



Ken Jaworski, PM/TC

Office: (920) 785-7328



Email: ken.jaworski@cedarcorp.com



Patrick Beilfuss, AICP

Office: (715) 235-9081

Email: patrick.beilfuss@cedarcorp.com

# The Hika Park Master Plan Project Directives

- 1. Update and expand elements of the previous Hika Park Master Plan: *Hika Bay Park & Dam Impoundment Area Master Plan*
- 2. Plan to include all three areas of the park:
  - 1. Hika Park (Launch/Parking Area)
  - 2. Hike Sands and the
  - 3. Centerville Creek Restoration Area
- 3. Create conceptual site plan options for the three areas for review
- 4. Involve community stakeholders to provide input and review the conceptual site plans
- 5. Presentation of initial findings to the Village of Cleveland Plan Commission and public
- 6. Investigate grant and funding options for recommended plan options





## **The Hika Park Master Plan Planning Process**

- 1. Gather community input.
- 2. Met with a wide variety of community stakeholders to hear their ideas and vision for Hika Park, Hike Sands and the Centerville Creek Restoration Area.
- 3. Created conceptual site plans for the three areas incorporating the main ideas that came out of the stakeholder meetings.
- 4. Held a meeting with the community stakeholders to review the conceptual site plans and vote on their preferred choices. They provided further comments.
- 5. Shared concepts with two engineering firms to gather their perspectives on the options. Pros. Cons. Scale of cost.
- 6. Presentation of initial findings to the Village of Cleveland Plan Commission.
- 7. Hold a Public Informational Meeting and select recommended plan options.





# **Community Stakeholders**

- 1. Cleveland Lions Club
- 2. Cleveland Fish and Game
- 3. Dan Welch, Sport Fishing
- 4. East Wind Garden Club
- 5. Cleveland Athletic Club
- 6. Friends of Hika Bay
- 7. Business Owners
- 8. Cleveland Elementary School
- 9. Adjacent Property Owners and Residents





## **Hika Park Stakeholder Interview Questions**

- 1. What are your thoughts and ideas for future development at Hika Park (Opportunities).
- 2. What impacts do you think will occur locally, regionally if park upgrades are pursued?
- 3. Is there a preference for the types of recreation (passive vs active) or can a balance be achieved at Hika Park?
- 4. What is the desired level of intensity for new facilities?







# **Initial Concerns/Barriers**

- 1. Repeated damage to the Hika Park boat ramp and pier. Running out of Band Aids. Protection needed. Boat launch safety concerns. Fluctuating lake levels.
- 2. Protect park and adjacent privately owned shoreline. Erosion/Sedimentation
- 3. Need for expanded boat and trailer parking
- 4. Future of municipal garage on Hika Sands. Hika House location impacts.
- 5. Balance intensity of facilities and uses
- 6. Loss of passive lake viewing opportunities
- 7. Scale of project must be based on ability to fund. Research funding opportunities.
- 8. Invasive specie control in Hika Sands and Centerville Creek. Continued restoration.
- 9. Pedestrian safety to access park locations

10.Park surveillance

11.Loss of "Dark Sky"





# **Opportunities**

- 1. A growing fishery. Good off shore fish structure. WDNR three year stocking commitment.
- 2. Improve boat launch safety and parking to accommodate boating needs
- 3. Utilize exceptional passive lake views
- 4. Promote beach access and passive beach use
- 5. Supporting neighbors if improvements are kept in balance
- 6. Further enhance past investments in Hika Sands and Centerville Creek. Improved access.
- 7. Enhance the business community through increased park users
- 8. Educational opportunities for Cleveland Elementary School
- 9. Promote "Dark Sky"
- 10.Promote bird watching
- 11.Utilize technology for surveillance
- 12. Funding opportunities









- 1. Provides the most protection in a sheltered harbor design
- 2. Provides off shore fishing and lake viewing opportunities on breakwater
- 3. Provides protected boat transient dock
- 4. Provides flow through parking and launching
- 5. Loss of parked vehicle passive lake viewing
- 6. More intensive use of entire lake front area
- 7. Potential harbor entrance sediment issues
- 8. Is a "Harbor of Refuge" really needed due to proximity of Manitowoc and Sheboygan?
- 9. Most costly option likely by a factor of 4 or 5 over options 2 & 3.
  Five million or more.



breakwater expansion. 10

Phase 1 of Option 1.







- 1. Most sheltered boat launch option. Saves significant cost of putting large riprap into lake.
- 2. Will require substantial initial creek dredging to achieve required depth for boats
- 3. Potential creek sediment issues. Possible more frequent dredging. Can install groin feature to trap sediment from entering mouth. Likely needs jetty adjustments into lake.
- 4. Tight boat maneuverability. No safe holding area for boats
- Will require moving existing bridge
- 6. Parking allows for passive lake viewing and use
- Cost will be less by a factor of 4 to Option 1

# **Indicate Your Preferred Options**

Stakeholder Preference

Place Sticker Here Hika Park Option 1 Option 2 **Option 3** 



# **Preliminary Engineering Assessments**

- 1. Boat launch options reviewed by two very unqualified firms: Miller Engineering and Edgewater Resources.
- 2. Both firms agreed more lake bathymetry (lake topography) study is needed to determine boat launch design, sediment movement and the impact of water levels. A Wave Energy Study would also be required to determine facility design/stamina and sediment movements based on directional wave action.
- 3. Both firms agreed all options will have sediment and erosion issues. Also, continual Lake Michigan maintenance cost.
- 4. Both firms agreed Option 2 holds the most promise to achieve the objective of accommodating a boat launch with some protection in the most cost effective manner. It also offers the opportunity to expand in phases (enlargement) based on financial resources.
- 5. One firm felt Option 2 could be Phase 1 of Option 1. Add more breakwater as boater demand and conditions warrant. Most fishing boats won't attempt 3' waves.
- 6. Both firms agree all options present artificial obstructions to the natural north to south movement of sand & silt along the shoreline. Potential impacts of built obstructions would
   require further wave study analysis.

## Hika Sands

- 1. What level of development is appropriate?
- 2. Can the existing Public Works building be utilized?
- 3. Protect private property to north
- 4. Address invasive species. Further ecological study and restoration.
- 5. Promote beach access and passive beach use.
- 6. Accommodate overflow parking from ramp?
- 7. Keep shoreline as natural as possible. Protect lake views.







- 1. Calls for removal of village garage
- 2. Maintain as a low impact, passive use area. Natural shoreline.
- 3. Provides parking for lake viewing/use. However, no overflow boat parking
- 4. Improves and better defines access to beach area
- 5. Expands trail system to North
- 6. Includes a playground area
- Invasive specie reduction.
   Plant restoration.





- 1. Calls for removal of village garage
- 2. Maintain as a low impact, passive use area. Natural shoreline.
- 3. Provides some parking for lake viewing/beach use.
- 4. Parking lot accommodates overflow boat parking
- 5. Improves access to beach area in several locations along the trail
- 6. Expands trail system to North
- Invasive specie reduction.
   Plant restoration.





- 1. Calls for removal of village garage
- 2. Maintain as a low impact, passive use area. Natural shoreline.
- 3. Provides some parking for lake viewing/beach use.
- 4. Circular parking lot more natural in appearance but does not accommodate overflow boat parking
- 5. Improves access to beach area in several locations along the trail
- 6. Expands trail system to North
- Invasive specie reduction & restoration plantings
- 8. Includes lake observation deck



## Hika Sands Stakeholder Preference

# **Indicate Your Preferred Options**





## **Centerville Creek Restoration Area**

- 1. What level of development is appropriate? Trail expansion?
- 2. Provide a safe connection to Hika Park and Hika Sands
- 3. Address invasive species and need for further ecological study and restoration.
- 4. Allow for overflow parking?
- 5. Enhance opportunities for "hands on" outdoor education



# Centerville Creek Restoration Area: Option 1 Village of Cleveland, Manitowoc County, WI



#### **Key Considerations**

- Includes defined crossing 1. for connection with Hika Sands
- Includes an observation 2. deck and picnic area
- 3. Portable picnic table area along Franklin Dr. will allow greenspace to still be used for overflow boat trailer parking
- Invasive species control 4. with new plantings



# **Centerville Creek Restoration Area: Option 2**

Village of Cleveland, Manitowoc County, WI





#### **Key Considerations**

- Includes defined crossing for connection with Hika Sands
- 2. Expands natural trail system along the creek including two bridge crossings and creek testing locations
- Preserves greenspace along Franklin Dr. to still be used for overflow boat trailer parking
- 4. Includes an observation deck and Environmental gathering area.
- 5. Invasive species control with new plantings

# Centerville Creek Restoration Area Stakeholder Preference Indicate Your Preferred Options Centerville Creek Restoration Area Place Sticker Here



Option 1

Option 2

# **Tonight's Objectives**

- Educate. (We hope you learned about the process, options and input to date)
- Answer your questions.
- Discuss Recommendations/Future Study.
- Discuss format for Village Public Informational Meeting.







# THANKYOU



KEN.JAWORSKI@CEDARCORP.COM

🔆 нт

HTTP://WWW.CEDARCORP.COM/