

Comprehensive Plan Committee
Regular Meeting
June 11, 2007

Present: Chariman Art Bassin, Barry Chase, Kyle Lougheed, Leah Wilcox, James Bryant, Nancy Broe, Don MacLean, Clerk Monica Cleveland

The meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee was called to order at 7.30 pm by Chairman Bassin. The committee welcomed 7 members of the audience.

A motion was made by member Chase and seconded by member Broe to accept the June 4, 2007 minutes as read. Motion carried.

Chairman Bassin asked each of the members to give their opinions on and rank the proposals.

Member Leah Wilcox stated that she rated:

1. Nan Stolzenburg because the proposal reached out to the community.
2. CT Male Associates.
3. Phillips
4. Saratoga
5. Barton, Saccardi, River – Three way tie

Member Jim Bryant ranked his choices as follows:

1. Nan Stolzenburg- Familiarity with other local towns, costs least expensive and will post the proceedings on her web site.
2. CT Male - Competitive costs and had worked with Copake and Tannersville
3. Saccardie & Schiff - 20 person staff, but will charge a per diem above the \$36,000 and they might be too big for Ancram.
4. B & L- Felt they were expensive and focused on engineering, not land use.
5. Riverstreet- Would be okay if we were along a water way
6. Phillips - Were vague, and dealt with larger communities
7. Saratoga- Too big a firm and very pricy.

Member Nancy Broe ranked her choices as follows:

1. Nan Stolzenburg
2. CT Male- Felt they had a good rapport with small towns
3. B&L- Has family who knows of them and had good results
4. Phillips
5. River
6. Saccardi – Only familiar with larger towns
7. Saratoga -- Only familiar with larger towns

Member Barry Chase ranked his choices as follows:

1. Nan Stolzenburg- Deals with smaller towns like Ancram
2. Saccardi - Spoke of Ancram in the proposal

3. Riverstreet- Deals with smaller towns
4. Phillips
5. CTMale
6. Saratoga
7. Barton

Member Don MacLean ranked his choices as follows:

1. Nan Stolzenburg- He has worked with Nan; she has a simple approach, is straightforward, direct and has the best handle on the public process.
2. Phillips – Simple understandable approach, reasonable costs
3. CTMale – Simple understandable approach, reasonable costs
4. Barton
5. Saccardi
6. River
7. Saratoga -- Too pricey; every added item was an additional cost.

Member Kyle Lougheed ranked his choices as follows:

1. Nan Stolzenburg- well thought out and has done work around the area
2. PPSA- liked the simple language and approach
3. Riverstreet- would like more information from them
4. Saccardi
5. Barton
6. CTMale
7. Saratoga

Member Art Bassin ranked his choices as follows:

1. Nan Stolzenburg- balanced and thoughtful; lots of relevant experience
2. Philips – balanced and thoughtful; limited small town experience
3. CT Male – balanced and thoughtful – limited small town experience
4. Saratoga – 2x more expensive than the rest, but some interesting ideas
5. Riverstreet- liked their simple, understandable no frills writeup
6. Saccardi – proposal not complete...no phase 2 costs
7. Barton – proposal disjointed and not at all clear

The rankings for each member based on a 1 (best) to 7 (worst) scale were put together and the following is the ranking according to the points assigned to each proposal (lowest score is best):

1. Nan Stolzenburg (7)
2. Philips (22)
3. C & T Male (23)
4. Saccardi (33)
4. Riverstreet (34)
4. B & L (36)
5. Saratoga

Saccardi, Riverstreet and Barton were essentially tied for fourth.

Member Leah Wilcox stated that she felt that we should interview a firm regardless of their ranking on our list. Chair Bassin agreed, suggesting that the interview may reveal more than their proposal did. He suggested that the committee interview on Mondays, two firms each night for 45 minutes each; 15 minutes for a presentation and 30 minutes for the committee's questions.

Audience member Paul Spencer asked if the board would be willing to speak to firms who did not send in a proposal. Chair Bassin felt that there were a good number of very credible proposals already available, and that the Committee would be well served selecting one of them. Member Barry Chase stated that if they had not sent in a proposal that they must have not been interested and that the committee was not going to hunt them down. Chair Bassin told Paul Spencer the Committee would not reach out to any of the consultants who had not responded, but he was free to do that and encourage any of the consultants who he talked with to submit a proposal. Bassin stated if any "late" proposals were received, the Board would accept them and schedule interviews if that were appropriate and if time permitted.

Member James Bryant stated that he was okay with interviewing all seven firms who sent in a proposal. Everyone on the committee was in agreement.

Chair Bassin stated that he would begin setting up interviews beginning this next Monday.

Member MacLean stated that the committee should do what it takes to schedule meetings with the first three choices of the committee. The additional four will need to fit into the Monday slots. Chair Bassin suggested using the next three Mondays, but reported he had been in touch with Nan Stolzenburg and she could not do any Monday for the next month. The Committee agreed to use Tuesday nights as the back up for consultant interviews if Mondays did not work for all the consultants. The committee will meet at 7:00 pm and begin the interviews at 7:30. The committee will meet Monday June 18, 25 and July 2, and Tuesday June 26 and July 3, and then make a decision on which consultant to retain by Monday July 9, 2007 for presentation to the Town Board at the July 12 meeting.

Key Issues

Chair Bassin asked if there were any additions to the existing key issues list.

The suggestions were:

1. Ridge Lines
2. Logging
3. Lighting, Light pollution
4. Affordable Housing
5. Technology
6. Recreational activities ie: Camping facilities

Chair Bassin stated that the e-mail list is going well and will be ready to turn into a web site when ready.

Member Bryant gave a report on a Town Website. He called Data Processing and the County does not have the capability to help but did steer him in a direction. The Town will need to first register a domain name and then find a host server. The Host will post the domain name and information. Jim will post a RFP for this and plans on having someone come to the July board meeting to address the members. He is looking for someone local.

There was no New Business

The committee decided on the following questions to ask the firm representatives the following questions:

1. Specific details on how other jobs with other towns they have worked with have evolved.
2. Understand their public involvement processes.
3. SQRA issue
4. How many copies of the plan will be made
5. Will they or will they not help us seek grants
6. How many and how often will they hold meetings
7. Make sure the person interviewed will be the primary contact
8. Their approach to public info gathering process
9. The committee believes what they are saying and feels they can work with them
10. What they have to offer in dealing with Ancram and why hire them and not another firm.
11. How would they deal with a small town like Ancram
12. The transition from phase 1 to phase 2 in a small town. Can they make both the comp plan and the zoning one package, beginning the zoning 6 months into the comp plan and adopt them both together.
13. Who is going to write the plan?
14. Are they aware of the strengths Ancram and can appreciate them?
15. Their philosophy and solutions

Member Wilcox stated that once the interviews are set up, the members should review the proposals in depth. Their questions may be answered in the presentation.

Chair Bassin asked that each member write down their 3 most important questions that they would like to ask the representative and circulate them to the other committee members. The committee will meet again on Monday June 18, 2007 at 7:00 with the first interview being held at 7:30.

A motion was made by Member Bryant and seconded by Member Wilcox to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.