



ACME TOWNSHIP
NEW URBANISM CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Monday, November 21, 2005, 9:00 a.m.
Acme Township Hall
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690

Meeting called to Order at 9:10 a.m.

Members present: M. Krakow , L. Craig (Co-Chairs), D. Krause, D. Rohn, N. Veliquette
Ex-officio representatives A. Andres Sr., L. Bussa, J. Collins, S. Corpe, J. J. Goss, L. Grant

Members absent: A. Andres, Jr., P. Brink, T. Gokey, J. Iacoangli, J. Lively
S. Nowakowski, R. Reinhold

Staff present: N. Edwardson, Recording Secretary

Krakow provided updated timeline. He also passed out copies of the Smart Code Book. This is based planning ordinance from Duany Plater-Zyberk, a document on funding opportunities from www.smartgrowth.org and a letter drafted by Paul Brink proposed to go out today to the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Krakow hopes everyone will review the funding opportunities to look for resources that might be applicable to Acme Township.

Craig covered her progress on calling firms. She started by finding e-mail contacts for each firm on her list and sending them a copy of the RFP. Today she plans to make follow-up phone calls with key individuals at each firm.

Krakow stated the the committee came to feel the the preliminary response date of last Friday was unrealistic for both the township and potential applicants. The committee has agreed that by December 5th we should have enough information to learn which firms to explore further. Current expectation is to provide a recommendation to the Board on January 3, 2006.

Grant noted that the committee asked for a letter of interest for initial review, and was going to select from those to request additional specific information about project approach. He is hearing that the two halves of the project have been merged and is concerned that if some firms have provided marketing materials and some detailed project proposals the firms can't be assessed on an equitable basis.

There was general concern about whether there is a long enough timeline to receive the needed information. Veliquette suggested that the committee operate on a rolling basis. As qualifications are received they can be evaluated and then a detailed proposal can be requested.

There was a discussion about whether the current RFP is adequate for applicants to be able to prepare both qualifications and proposals. Grant feels the piece is well written and provides enough basic information to get a interest going. Applicants with interest will actively ask for more information.

Krause does not feel that a rolling process is ideal. We need to start narrowing down, and if we accept/respond to some early on and then receive better ones later. We are still looking at too many people. As they come in everyone should review the qualifications and begin putting them in piles: definite, maybe and no. It's unfair to ask someone to put together a full proposal when they might not stack up.

Krakov was surfing the web last night, found reference to a firm called Streetworks that he found exciting. They do Mixed Use development and shopping areas with great parking. Most of their work is on the eastern coast. He passed out some information from the web.

Krakov asked each member to identify two more new firms and contact them before the meeting on Monday, November 28. He would like calls today with names. Corpe will continue pursuing two extra sign-ons for CNU membership.

The deadline for RFP responses is noon on Friday, December 16th. We will choose who to interview the week of December 19-23. We will invite firms to interview in early January. Rohn asked Goss how he felt about extending deadline out. He personally feels that "time is money" and people in the industry don't stop working for the holidays. Krakow suggested having interviews the first week of January. We would make a recommendations by January 10. Goss felt this would be acceptable.

Andy Andres, Sr., noted that when he bids on jobs for his cleaning business, his bid had to be in by an established deadline or it wasn't opened. The committee established a timeline and he feels they should stick to it. Krakow appreciated this comment but expressed that the committee started with a timeline goal and has been learning more about what's actually a realistic timeline. Andres expressed that the three key developers will ultimately make the choice.

Veliquette feels new proposed timeline should work well. He recognizes that it has been extended somewhat but feels its really been kept somewhat close to the original.

Krakov asked for thoughts on criteria against which applications will be evaluated by all committee members. 1. Experience with sites of our size and scope of mixed commercial/retail.

2. Climate – have they worked in a four season area?
3. Professionalism – firm strength & ability to serve now and later.
4. Breadth of experience – other abilities along with urban design to answer a wide range of questions.
5. Can your staff support in house or out-of-house?
6. Responsiveness – can they be adaptable but still meet our timeline
7. Project team: are the personalities a good fit for our landowners, officials and community
8. References
9. Accessibility – what presence do you have

10. Relationships with agencies – build quickly locally?
11. Approach to our specific project. Did you do your homework?
12. Price

Kurtz expressed comfort with advised timeline, saying the Board committed to landowners to keep process moving and sees the committee working hard. The Board will hold a special meeting in January to keep things going.

Krause and Craig will work on criteria/scoring sheet for interviews.

There will be a extra meeting on Wednesday, November 23, at 9:00 a.m. Those who can't attend can provide written comment in advance. We will discuss criteria and evaluate.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.