

FRANKFORT PLANNING COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING
Meeting Minutes
January 13, 2009

Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call – Present: Clingman, Condon, Duncan, Hommel, Johnson, Larson, McLaughlin, Ogilvie, and Superintendent Mills. **Absent:** None

Also Present - pim Dodge, and Council Members Glynn, Stransky, Storrer

Ogilvie: Declared a quorum present, commenting on good community spirit of all attendees to come out in extreme cold weather.

Approval of Minutes

December 9, 2008 – approved, with corrections to identify Charlevoix-Cannon Park as Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park.

- **December 29, 2008** – Approved with no corrections.

Moved McLaughlin, seconded Johnson, to approve the above minutes. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved.

December 16, 2009 – required no approval because, with no quorum present, it was Work Study Session only.

Approval of Agenda

McLaughlin: suggested adding to the agenda, further consideration of last month's Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park proposal because at that meeting no formal action was taken.

Moved McLaughlin, seconded Clingman, to approve agenda, with the addition of "Consideration of Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park Proposal" to New Business. Ayes: 7: (Clingman, Condon, Duncan, Hommel, Larson, McLaughlin, Ogilvie). Nays: 1 (Johnson). Motion approved. Agenda is amended.

Public Input – General Issues

Johnson: noted his appreciation of the presence of three City Council Members (Glynn, Storrer and Stransky) but questioned, since this constitutes a quorum of the Council, whether this is permissible.

Mills: clarified that provided that no City Council business is transacted or discussed by the Council Members, the presence of a quorum is permissible.

Duncan: complimented the City on its continued removal of unusually large volumes of snow.

Chair Report

- **1. Selection Process for Consultant**

The Planning Commission has performed a diligent and extensive effort to seek and recommend a Planning Consultant to assist in the determination of what to do our present (1998) Master Plan (1998).

The entire process is detailed on the 4-page **PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY OF FRANKFORT, RECOMMENDATION FOR PLANNING CONSULTANT** document that was provided to commissioners and is attached to these minutes.

By 12/4/08, six consultant proposals were received.

On 12/29/08, commissioners voted to recommend Wade Trim as consultant, subject to consistently positive reference checks and satisfactory answers to questions. By 1/8/09, selected references were checked (all were positive) and satisfactory answers received from Wade Trim on outstanding questions.

Discussion:

Mills, Hommel, Clingman, Johnson, Duncan: commented on the good work of Ogilvie and Storrer in collating the information into a document.

Ogilvie: One of Wade Trim's advantages is the amount of research they have already done, and the knowledge thus gained, in their work for Frankfort.

Mills: the contract with Wade Trim needs to specify that the agreed fee and expenses is "not to exceed" specific cost to city.

Ogilvie: noted that Wade Trim provide good reporting of their accounting and progress to their client communities.

Mills: is not sure that the Wade Trim contract will be in place by 1/20/09 (the date scheduled for City Council approval of Wade Trim as consultant). He will be in touch with Cristy Fox of Coastal Zone Management. Wade Trim have advised him of their willingness to hold their charging the City until the CZM funds are in place. Wade Trim are willing to assist us in obtaining grant money, though we do not yet know how much they would charge for this assistance.

2. Kick-off Meeting with Planning Consultant, for "decision step" of Phase I Master Plan consideration.

This was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday 1/20/09. It is now confirmed that Wade Trim's one-hour Project "Kick-off Meeting" will take place on Tuesday 1/12/09, starting at 9.30, with all members of Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, and City Council invited. This is an open meeting to which the public are invited and encouraged to attend. This meeting will be preceded by a half-hour Special City Council meeting to consider Planning Commission's Recommendation for Planning Consultant, prior to formal City Council approval at the regular 1/20/09 7.pm City Council Meeting.

3. City Council authorization of Planning Commission under new Michigan statute

Ogilvie: Effective 1 September 2008 the Michigan Planning Enabling Act and effective 28 February 2008 the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act effective immediately, requires the amendment of the Charter provisions relating to the appointment and authority of the Planning Commission, Zoning Commission and the selection and appointment of Planning Commissioners. The City Charter and the Planning Commission by-laws must be amended and approved by the City Council no later than September 1, 2011. Because of the substantial nature of the contemplated amendments and changes to the City Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance, these up-dating amendments and changes can not wait. In my initial meeting with City Planning/Zoning Counsel, Peter Doren, I emphasized the urgent nature of our need to be current in our application of the enabling statutes in our operating by-laws and City Code.

- **Subcommittee Reports**

1. **Bob Johnson - Zoning Ordinance Subcommittee** – no report, mentioned issue of re-submitting the Permitted Special Use after Planning Commission approval in Residential Districts. This item is scheduled on the agenda under Old Business.
2. **Joe Hommel – Community Fact Book** – no report, but plans to es-establish with subcommittee member.
3. **Suz McLaughlin** – provided minutes of **Grant Subcommittee** meeting of Friday, 1/2/09. McLaughlin and subcommittee member Andrew Martin have done much research, but feel they have made frustratingly little actual progress. Since the 1/2/09 meeting, McLaughlin has established contact with the local High School Art Teacher and with the High School Honors Society to discuss the possibility of student poster production and/or other involvement in the forthcoming “Vision Fair” portion of the Wade Trim project. McLaughlin has also re-established connection with Jim Lively of the Michigan Land Use Institute.

Following are minutes (provided by McLaughlin) of 1/2/09 Grants Sub-committee Meeting:
FRANKFORT PLANNING COMMISSION
Grants Sub-Committee

Meeting: Friday, January 2, 4:15pm at Frankfort Rec Center
Present: Andrew Martin, Bruce Ogilvie, Pat Storrer, Julie Clingman and Suz McLaughlin

Goals for Meeting:

1. *More potential Foundation Funds/Andrew*
2. *Discuss ‘targeting’ Wade Trim Budget for grants*
3. *Matching dollar discussion*

Andrew briefly discussed Grand Traverse Regional Community Foundation with Benzie Board member, Larry Miller. There will be a GTRCF Board meeting on Tuesday, 1/6/09 which Andrew will report on at our next meeting. Andrew did more digging to find other potential Foundations: Carls, Frey, Oleson, Herbert & Barbara Dow, and Grand Haven Area Foundations were all briefly described and added to our resources.

Copies of the Wade Trim fee breakdown were discussed with the ‘target’ areas being identified as Project Kickoff meeting, Vision Fair and Surveys. The goal will be to find granting dollars for these specific areas with specific dollars attached for target funding. Several great ideas were shared in this process of not only including the community, re-connecting with local experts (i.e. Jim Lively, MLUI, accredited planner) but also the schools for ideas and assistance. We also discussed a regular agenda item that will offer an opportunity for creative ideas generated from not only the Planning Commission members but also the attending public to enhance this process of building good community consensus for the Master Plan process.

We are waiting for follow up information from the Coastal Zone Management Department to discover if the \$22,500 in the City’s Water/Sewer Budget will qualify as matching dollars for the awarded \$25,000 from CZM. Josh stated at the December 9th meeting, he needed to re-check those figures to see if those dollars were still available. We have a committed \$10,000 from the City Council towards the Master Plan, however the \$25,000 is a matching dollar grant. We had a brief discussion on the possibilities of finding funding that doesn’t require matching dollars to meet our qualifications for this CZM grant. Needless

to say, this will be very tricky, especially given today's economic situation.

Meeting dismissed at 5:20pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Suz McLaughlin

1. **Pat Storrer – Public forum subcommittee** – in progress of analyzing the issues raised during last year's Public Forum sessions, identifying for each issue: how many times raised, counts of for and against (where applicable), and the city sections involved. This exercise will produce an "importance-ranking" of each issue raised. This analysis is expected to be complete by 1/20/09. Although no longer a Planning Commission member, Storrer has committed to completing all aspects of the Public Forum Report.

- **City Superintendent's Report**

Superintendent Mills reported as follows:

President-Elect Obama has called for an "infrastructure Development Plan". There was a big push, before Christmas, for submission of projects that could qualify for funding under this "Obama Initiative". Projects submitted to NWMCG and Governors' Office for the City of Frankfort included:

- a) \$17.5million requested for rest of Phase 2 Water/Sewer capital improvement project and expansion. These projects include **replacement** of undersized water-mains, replacement of undersized sanitary sewer mains and expansion in areas not served currently, primarily in the north and northeast sections of the city.
- b) Streets needing repairs and expansion to underserved and unserved sections of the city.
- c) Creation of sidewalks on at least one side of each street.

Launch Ramp Improvements: **Master Plan review, Monday, January 19th, 6:30 pm**

LED [light emitting diodes] Retrofit of Frankfort street lights, totaling about \$70,000 for all the lights, would reduce electricity costs substantially for the City.

Responding to Harold Chase of Senator Carl Levin's Traverse City office request of additional information, Mills sent spreadsheets with additional information. Will provide these spreadsheets to the Planning Commission for review.

Duncan: should the Commission make a motion to approve this?

Mills: Council has already been advised. The Capital Improvements Planning Process is a function of the Planning Commission, especially under the new Planning Enabling Statute.

McLaughlin: requested a written narrative for our meeting of 1/20/09.

Ogilvie and Mills: agreed that this is needed for the 1/20/09 meeting and will provide it. Mills will use the kick-off meeting to distribute the Capital project spreadsheet to the Planning Commission.

Ogilvie: Planning Commission has the responsibility to produce a 5-year Capital Planning Plan.

Condon: asked for better water for Frankfort.

Mills: for water quality, we must follow DEQ guidelines. Mains replacement will help.

McLaughlin: asked, when Mills gets written CZM grant, that it be entered into the public record along with dollar matching details.

Mills: agreed, saying it should take about a month.

Report from Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)

Hommel, Planning Commission Liaison with the ZBA No meeting to report.

- **Old Business**

-

1. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance in R-1 and R-2 Districts: motion tabled at 12/9/08 meeting, because it involves legal counsel and a public hearing needs to be scheduled.

2. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance for a revised Tree Ordinance. Referral from City Council for hearing. Not scheduled because final ordinance language not received in time to schedule hearing.

McLaughlin moved, Clingman seconded, to combine both amendments into a single Public Hearing.
Discussion:

Ogilvie: Can we send both amendments to our new Zoning Attorney Mr. Doren?

Mills: Regarding the Tree Ordinance, we can ask Joan McKay to talk to Doren. Regarding the Special Use in Residential zones, Mills agreed it should be sent to Peter Doren, zoning counsel, for review and comment. Mills also asked that he, Ogilvie and Johnson meet to review the existing amendment language before it is sent to Doren. Both Ogilvie and Johnson agreed.

-

Motion, as above, **to combine both amendments into a single Public Hearing.** Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved.

Further Discussion:

McLaughlin: Since we still don't have a completed Tree Ordinance, can the 1/20/09 City Council meeting set a date to be determined once final Tree Ordinance is available from City Attorney?

Ogilvie: We will keep these two items in Old Business. The earliest possible date for a combined Public Hearing is March 2009. Mills and Ogilvie will need to spend at least a week preparing for the two Public Hearings.

- **New Business**

1. Pat Storrer resignation: Ogilvie: read letter from Storrer, advising her resignation from the Planning Commission due to her 12/11/08 appointment to City Council. City Charter prevents any one individual from holding office in both City Council and Planning Commission. In her new position as Planning Commission-City Council liaison, Storrer anticipates continuing to assist Commission endeavors.

McLaughlin moved, Clingman seconded, to accept Storrer's resignation, with thanks for her work. Ayes 7: Nays: 1 (Hommel). Motion approved.

2. Motion to support the selection of a Clerk for Planning Commission, Recreation Board, and Zoning Board of Appeals

McLaughlin moved, Johnson seconded, to recommend that City Council consider appointment of a Recording Clerk for any City Boards and Commissions that carry out City business.

Discussion: **McLaughlin:** If more meetings are covered, this could be viewed as a larger job, and might attract a good professional – which in turn would provide continuity and good recording. Shauna Fite did particularly good work.

Duncan: the work needs to be well paid.

Mills: The City has budgeted for a recording Secretary. Mills will produce another advertisement, and will clarify (from the earlier advertisement) that this would be a contract position.

Duncan: in this litigious period, we must have good notes of our meetings.

Mills: will investigate whether any computer software would be helpful.

Ogilvie: Called for a vote on the resolution to support the selection of a Clerk for the Planning Commission, Recreation Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved.

3. Election of Secretary

Ogilvie: McLaughlin has volunteered to be Secretary for January through June 2009.

Condon nominated, Duncan seconded, McLaughlin for appointment as Secretary to the Planning Commission from January through June 2009.

Ogilvie: Ruled the motion out of order because the next Election of Officers takes place in March 2009, the present appointment can only cover the period until that Election.

Changed the Nomination Motion: Condon nominated, Duncan seconded, McLaughlin for appointment as Secretary to the Planning

Commission from January through March 2009. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved. .

4. Approve “Planning Commission Recommendation (1/13/09) for Planning Consultant” document for submission to City Council.

McLaughlin moved, Condon seconded, that the **PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY OF FRANKFORT, RECOMMENDATION FOR PLANNING CONSULTANT** document, with noted corrections, be submitted to City Council in support of the Planning Commission’s recommendation. No discussion. Call for a vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved. This report will be submitted to the 1/20/09 City Council meetings.

5. Motion to Confirm Selection of Planning Consultant

Ogilvie moved, Hommel seconded, that the Planning Commission officially recommend Wade Trim as Planning Consultant for the determination of whether the current Master Plan (adopted in 1998) should be revised in whole or in part, or replaced entirely.

No discussion. Call for the vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved.

Supplemental question: **Duncan:** Will the City Council members come to our meeting?

Ogilvie: At least two will attend.

6. Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park

McLaughlin: Motion for the Planning Commission to consider the Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park proposal that was described in the 12/9/08 minutes. **Support: Johnson.**

Discussion: **McLaughlin:** After the Recreation Board advised the sponsors to bring their proposal to the Planning Commission.

Johnson: the sponsors are not ready.

Mills: thinks Planning Commission should give directions. But we should not proceed “without the public being on board”.

Ogilvie: It is Planning Commission responsibility to see if the proposal fits the City’s Master Plan. Suggested the sponsors ask the Recreation Board for a formal recommendation, and then (if positive as an amendment to the Recreation Master Plan) the Recreation Board should hold a Public Hearing on the proposed amendment and hold a final vote to refer this amendment to the City Planning Commission for potential inclusion in the City Master Plan.

McLaughlin: There is a precedent for a public referendum (on such an issue). Last time, there was a proposal for the Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park (i.e., siting City Hall there), it was put to a public vote (after a process of consideration).

Johnson: this proposal will cost the City money.

Council Member Glynn: discussion of this proposal should be postponed until the summer of 2009.

Ogilvie: The Planning Commission has the primary responsibility. Any proposal that involves a change to the Recreation Board's Master Plan must have Planning Commission approval, and that only following an approved process of consideration, including the Recreation Board consideration, a public hearing at that level and a formal request to the Planning Commission to amend the City Master Plan as it relates to the Parks and Recreation Plan of the City.

Unidentified speaker(s): *Should there be a motion to recommend to include in the Recreation Board's Master Plan. "The public must have a voice" and the process must be followed.*

Ogilvie: *the motion was to consider the proposal presented on 12/9/08 as a "site plan" for a city owned property. It is my decision that the motion is not in order because it violates the by-laws of the Recreation Board and its relationship to the Planning Commission. Before the Planning Commission could consider the citizen proposal, the Recreation Board must have approved the amendment (following their procedures) of their Master Plan and have formally asked the Planning Commission to approve its inclusion. Therefore, the motion is invalid and not a qualified motion before the Planning Commission.*

Public Input – Agenda Items only.

Susanne Glynn, 105 Forest Avenue: Thought the Recreation Board thought that Father Charlevoix-Cannon Park is not part of the Recreation Board Master Plan.

Ogilvie: Campbell and Jenks cannot submit a site plan because they do not own the land.

pim Dodge, 649 Crystal Avenue: Thinks the idea of hiring a recording clerk is "wonderful" but we will have a hard time finding someone. Asked whether the Planning Commission is in touch with the Grand Vision.

Moved Johnson, seconded Condon, to adjourn meeting. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Next Meetings:

Tuesday 1/20/09, 9.00am, Planning Commission Presentation to City Council on Selection of Public Consultant

Tuesday 1/20/09, 9.30-10.30am, Planning Consultant Kick-off Meeting

- **Tuesday 2/10.09, 7.00pm Regular Meeting**
-

PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY OF FRANKFORT, RECOMMENDATION FOR PLANNING CONSULTANT

Tuesday, January 13, 2009			
Summary of Planning Commission Recommendation of Planning Consultant.			
	Document provided for convenience of Planning Commission to confirm recommendation of Planning Consultant, "subject to satisfactory references and answers to commissioner questions".		
● Description of Project Requiring Planning Consultant Assistance			
	Planning Consultant assistance for and written recommendation to Planning Commission on whether the current Master Plan (adopted in 1998) should be revised, in part, or replaced entirely. This determination is part of Phase I of the 5 Phases to produce and implement updated Master Plan		
Planning Budget Approved by City Council on 11/18/08			
	Phase I.	Land Use & Planning Concepts as applicable and determining community consensus	\$38,000
	Phase II.	Mapping Survey with Digital Output	\$22,750
	Phase VI.	Master Plan/Ordinance Legal Reviews	\$10,000
		Subtotal	\$70,750
	Phase III,IV	Construct Virtual Reality/Simulation Computer Model	\$50,000
	Phase V.	Implement & Enact Ordinance Standards with Test/Illustrations	\$20,000
		Subtotal	\$70,000
		Total	\$140,750
		15% contingency	\$21,113
	This Budget Approved by Planning Commission on 10/14/08	Grand Total	\$161,863
● Summary of Target Timelines Agreed by Planning Commission on 10/14/08			
	11/7/08	Distribute Requests for Proposal with Responses due by 12/4/08	
	12/31/09	Decide Planning Consultant for 1 st part of Phase I.	
	3/31/09	Receive Planning Consultant Recommendation concerning whether 1998 Master Plan should remain unchanged, be amended, or be replaced.	
	4/1/09 - 9/30/09	Implement Master Plan Amendment or Replacement project, as decided by PC	
	9/30/09	Submit Master Plan amendment or replacement for 90-day review by local & county governments.	
	01/01/10 – 3/31/10	Process of adopting Master Plan, incorporating needed amendments. Includes submission to City Council and required public hearings.	
	4/1/10 – 9/30/10	Zoning Ordinance development.	
	Requested for earlier, must be before 9/2011	Preparation of State Enabling Legislative Charter Amendments for City Planning and Zoning Ordinances. Must be completed no later than September 2010 (from agendas)	
Requests for Planning Consultant for Phase I.			
	11/08	Requests for Proposal and Qualifications, distributed, via City website, in local newspapers, and by mail	
	12/4/08	6 Proposals received	
Factors in Deciding Best Consultant for Project. Consultant proposals were required to include this detail.			
● Required Scope of Work to complete engagement			
		1) Benchmark Meeting CC,PC,ZBA 2) Public Meeting & Materials 3) Action 3: Prepare Community Survey 4) Analyze Public Meeting & Survey 5) Collect Data: 6) Analyze Data, 7) Recommend Viability of 1998 Master Plan	
● Consultant Qualifications and References			

	Experience in Michigan and familiarity with State Enabling Acts
	Assignments completed within last years as Principal or as supplemental adviser
	References from at least three municipalities for Master Plan work
	Qualifications and work experience of all professional staff assigned to our project
Decision Factors: Consultant Qualifications and References (continued)	
	• Directions to any available website presentations of consultant Master Plan work
•	Budget
	Total dollar amount for Phase I project, through end of March 2009
	Number of hours (estimated) and hourly rates for each assigned team member
	For any outside contractors/subcontractors, C.V., special expertise, and costs
	Identification of all types of reimbursable expenses, with dollar estimates.
•	Work Plan and Time Line
	Detailed work plan, schedule and milestones, in narrative and graphic forms
	Description of consultant's understanding of project
	Description of consultant's overall approach to project
	Description of consultant's proposed approach to public participation
•	Master Plan Deliverables
	Firm recommendation concerning viability of current Master Plan
	Meet Five Year Master Plan Review criteria in LUSC List #1H & MI Statutory Authority
	Detailed consultant analysis of Survey Materials and application to the City of Frankfort Master Plan.

Consultants Listed, with Pricing Detail for each:

Consultant Name/Location	Proposal Pricing	Expenses	Estimated Hours	Number of Professionals
Wade Trim, Traverse City	\$13,360	\$2,000 included in price	104	5
R. Clark with Williams & Works, Traverse City and Grand Rapids	\$ 25,856	Included in price, details not specified	305	6
Beckett & Raeder, Ann Arbor	\$ 9,660	Mileage charge, in addition to price	108	2
Nederveld, Grand Rapids	\$ 9,800	Not advised	116	4
Gourdie-Frazer, Traverse City	\$11,060	Not advised	Not advised	1
Main Street Planning, Grand Rapids	\$20,410	\$1,660 included in price	216	4

• **Selection Process**

12/16/08: Initial identification of top 3 choices by commissioner work/study session.	
12/16/08: Commissioner work/study session identified initial top 3 choices of consultant. Top two were of highest quality while middle two met most RFP requirements but with some significant omissions.	
Wade Trim, Traverse City	Top tier
R. Clark with Williams & Works, Traverse City and Grand Rapids	Top tier
Beckett & Raeder, Ann Arbor	Middle tier
Nederveld, Grand Rapids	Middle tier
Gourdie-Frazer, Traverse City	Lower tier
Main Street Planning, Grand Rapids	Lower tier
12/29/08: With more study and with more commissioner rankings included, Wade Trim emerged as top choice.	
12/29/08: Planning Commission voted to recommend Wade Trim, subject to positive reference checks with selected municipalities and satisfactory answers to commissioner questions and issues.	

12/29/08: Positive aspects of Wade Trim proposal	
	Experience of soliciting and considering public opinion
	Consideration of Alternative Energy
	Good visualization methodology (VIZ software) for Buildout Analysis
12/29/08: Positive aspects of Wade Trim proposal (continued)	
	Suggestion of "Vision Fair" for Frankfort: commissioners thought this a good idea.
	Detailed project descriptions of what Wade Trim did for each reference community.
	Clarity of written proposal.
	Clarity of Master Plan presentations. .
	Availability to public of Master Plan process and supporting information. .
	Commissioner experience, from Marina Authority, of Wade Trim being "fun to work with"
	Familiarity with all aspects of Frankfort waterfront
	Delivery of 5-year plan review based on MSU/E & Land Use Series Checklists
	Well-sized and strong team of professionals named for project.
12/29/08: Negative aspects of Wade Trim proposal	
	Need clarification of "build-out analysis" and confirmation that data analysis is included.
	Need clarification of expenses
12/29/08: Municipalities selected for reference verification, based on similarity to Frankfort in terms of either or both of size and water proximity.	
	Village of Milford, MI (assigned to McLaughlin)
	City of Yale, MI (assigned to McLaughlin)
	City of Manistee, MI (assigned to Condon)
	Leelanau Township, MI (assigned to Johnson)
	City of Grand Haven, MI (assigned to Clingman)
12/29/08: Planning Commission agreed questions to ask of reference municipalities, including the following:	
	Any expectations not met?
	Were project timelines met?
	Was project within budget?
	Effectiveness of consultant communications with Planning Commission?
	Effectiveness of communicating with public via meetings and materials?
	Caliber and ability of assigned consultants – particularly those assigned to Frankfort?
	Use of best planning practices?
	Municipality's overall experience of working with consultant?
	Would you work, or are you working, with this consultant again?
1/8/09: Reference Checks Completed. Comments were positive and consistent across the board. Representative comments include:	
On overall experience:	
	"A big enthusiastic EXCELLENT!" ".. Happy with the work product, and ... project completed on time and on budget." "Overall, very happy with the experience" "Wade Trim did their research well";
On working again with Wade Trim:	
	"We have used them for several years for engineering & planning projects and we will likely continue"; "Most definitely!" "Yes, this is the second or third time the township used Wade Trim"; "The City would not hesitate to consult with WadeTrim again";
On use of "best planning practices:	
	"Yes, always "on-top" of the project and was great assistance in obtaining a Coastal Zone Management grant this past year."

	On consultant caliber:	
		"Superb" (of Adam Young); "Nick Lomako is very well prepared and informative. He is innovative and constructive solutions to planning issues and problems."
	Reference Comments (continued)	
	On timelines and budget:	
		"We are actually a little bit ahead of the schedule"; "their cost analysis was "right on the button"; "We are right on schedule"; "Everything (cost) is well documented and completed on time"; "Planning Commission has a budget and Wade Trim worked within those parameters"; "They were very helpful in setting up the (budget process) to include two fiscal years so could fund this"; "The City was happy with the work product, and related that the project completed on time and on budget. Overall, very happy with the experience."
	On any expectations not met: "	
		"Not so far. However, the process is not completed. Very happy with process to date"; "So far, everything is as expected"
	On effectiveness of communications with public:	
		"everything has been completed well"; "There were a great series of study sessions with good participation"; "Adam did an excellent job helping to coordinate and focusing the public discussions".
	On effectiveness of communication with Planning Commission:	
		"all communications very timely and responsive to questions and issues raised." They always appear eager to help and suggest ways to solve problems."
	Issues Needing Clarification by Wade Trim:	
	Clarification of "build-out analysis" and confirmation that data analysis is included:	
		1/9/09: Yes, included in proposal final report. Asked that it be included to PC earlier, before Vision Fair. This was agreed.
	Clarification of expenses for travel and miscellaneous items:	
		1/9/09: item is a rough estimate, clarification still needed from N. Lomako, Corporate Principal.
	●	
	● Funding	
	Wade Trim	\$13,660
	City Council Allowance	\$10,000
	To be determined	
		\$13,660