



**ACME TOWNSHIP**  
**NEW URBANISM CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Friday, November 11, 2005, 1:00 p.m.**  
**Acme Township Hall**  
**6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690**

**Meeting called to Order at 1:05 p.m.**

**Members present:** M. Krakow , L. Craig (Co-Chairs) D. Krause, R. Babcock (for D. Rohn), N. Veliquette  
Ex-officio representatives S. Corpe, A. Andres, Sr., A. Andres, Jr., J. Goss, L, Grant, S. Nowakowski, M. Spanolga  
**Members absent:** D. Rohn, P. Brink, L. Bussa, J. Lively, R. Reinhold, J. Iacoangeli

**Ex Officio Membership:** Krakow will contact Todd Gokey again to see if he is interested in participating. Corpe will follow up with Midge Werner in the County Planning Office to see if they will be sending a representative.

**Timeline:** The advisory plans to provide a status update to the Board on December 6 and a planner recommendation on January 3.

**Funding:** It is uncertain how much actual project costs might be, and it would be excellent if state, federal and/or private grant funding could be obtained to assist. Everyone was encouraged to talk to any likely contacts.

**RFP:** Krause presented the draft RFP. Four firms have expressed interest so far: Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio, Duany Plater-Zyberk (DPZ), Nederveld Associates, and Wade-Trim. Krause suggested getting a list of registered firms from the Congress for New Urbanism (CNU) that could be contacted to generate additional interest. The group spent a few minutes reviewing the RFP and suggested a few minor adjustments.

Everyone was encouraged to me making contacts with potentially interested planners, and to also be sure to share detailed information about those contacts with the group so that detailed records can be maintained and we can avoid duplication of effort or seeming disorganized by having more than one person call the same firm. Krakow shared some brief comments about a meeting he attended a few days earlier with a representative from the Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio, and provided copies of the information they brought with them.

Discussion turned again to the project timeline and when the RFP should indicate that interviews may be held. Grant, noting that he represents a firm bidding for the work and that he has a level of conflict of interest, observed that it would be unrealistic to think that a firm could receive the RFP just before Thanksgiving and have a good response prepared by December 1. A thorough firm might fly a representative in to look at the site and the community and talk with landowners as part of their research before preparing their proposal. If RFPs are sent out on December 18 it might be possible to have responses back by December 1.

Krause suggested that if responses are expected by December 5 and the committee chooses 3 semi-finalists by December 9, interviews could be held December 19-21 and a recommendation to the Board prepared between December 26-30.

Krakov shared a long conversation he had with Senen Antonio from DPZ in Miami. That firm is currently assisting with the rebuilding of New Orleans on a *pro bono* basis. They will review our RFP and they hope to submit a proposal, and indicated that having as much information as they could up-front would be helpful.

The group felt that as much of the prior history of the township and the properties involved in the project should be given as can be so that there are no surprises for the candidates. Nowakowski will prepare a packet of information relative to Meijer. Goss has instructed Gourdie Fraser to cooperate with the township and share any requested information with us so the process keeps moving forward.

Krakov asked how the process was going so far? Nowakowski replied that it seems fine and should be kept moving. Grant was impressed with the RFP, saying that it will make planner responses easier and permit better decision-making on our end. Any firm that does its due diligence will see what has been done and the resolve of township, landowners and citizens to make things work and their input will matter. Babcock expressed appreciation for this committee and its process, and that it's good to see everyone trying to work as a team.

Andy Andres, Jr., commented that we need to be flexible in our expectations, and that we need more than five letters of interest. We should not have to "settle" just to stick to a time schedule, because if we fail we will have to start over. He also said that we need someone who can meet candidates who come to do research and be a tour guide with meaningful information resources. He also asked when smaller surrounding properties will be included in/informed about the process?

Andy Andres, Sr., agreed with Andy Jr. When he first heard about the Village at Grand Traverse he came to the township hall and asked who they were and was told they weren't interested in him.

Goss recounted the process VGT used at the outset of their application. They went around to various property owners to discuss their general concept. If people are unaware of their proposals and the issues at this point, they clearly have not been paying attention. He thanked everyone for their hard work and wants the coming development to be exemplary. He and his group will help in any way possible.

Craig thanked the committee for staying active and vocal in this process. She believes that it is possible to create and enhance a community.

Noelle Knopf, 5795 US 31N, is disappointed by Krause's earlier comment that downtown Traverse City is an example of New Urbanism. She hopes that if the design presented by the planner eventually chosen is different than expected that the committee will remain open-minded. She commended the landowners and developers for coming to the table for the third time to try to work things out. She hopes that the township is ready to take on responsibility of dictating to developers what should be on their properties, believing that the township will have a financial stake in the ultimate success or failure.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.**