

**Meeting Minutes
Cascade Charter Township
Downtown Development Authority
Board of Directors
August 4, 2008
Cascade Township Office
2865 Thornhills Ave. SE**

ATTENDEES: David Huhn, Ray James, Julie Johnson, Mike Julien, Diana Kingsland,
Joann Noto, Dan Wallace

Absences: Ron Clark (excused), Kirt Ojala (excused)

Others Attending: Assistant to the Manager Sandra Otey; Admin. Assistant Lisa Hern.

Guests: None.

ARTICLE 1: Call the Meeting to Order

Chairman Huhn called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ARTICLE 2: Approval of the Agenda

Chairman Huhn requested a motion of approval of the August 4, 2008 DDA Agenda. No revisions, corrections to the agenda. The agenda of the August 4, 2008 was approved as submitted.

ARTICLE 3: Approval of the Minutes of May 20, 2008

Chairman Huhn requested a motion of approval of the May 20, 2008 minutes.

Member James motioned for approval of the minutes as presented, supported by Member Noto.

All in favor of the May 20, 2008 DDA Minutes as presented; none opposed.
Motion carried.

ARTICLE 4: Discussion of Streetlights for 28th Street streetscape.

Assistant to the Manager Otey said the bids for the streetscape project are in and went before the Township Board last week for approval. Ron Meyer & Associates received the low bid and approval for the project. There was a provision in the bid documents about using an alternative light fixture. The bid came in at \$699,997 and if the Township were to use the alternate light, it would be approximately \$143,000 less.

The DDA has discussed the street lighting in length at previous meetings and the July 2007 DDA Minutes indicated that the DDA wants to remain with the Lumec (existing) lights as they are installed heading west on 28th Street.

She noted that representatives from Lumec and Michigan Lighting Systems (MLS) along with the engineer from Fishbeck Thompson Carr & Huber (FTCH) were present to address any questions from the Board.

Greg Smith, representative from Michigan Lighting Systems, provided the board with printed materials regarding the alternative lighting fixture and posts. He noted that the lights are environmentally friendly and are carbon neutral. A similar light is being used in East Grand Rapids. The fixture is die cast aluminum.

The light is shielded downward and the lamps provide up to 15,000 hours of life. The enclosure around the bulb is debris-free and bugs and dirt will not get trapped on the inside of the glass housing.

Chairman Huhn asked what the differences are between the two light fixtures. Mr. Smith said that they are competitors and both are highly specified by architects and engineers but there is no difference in quality.

Bob Wolf, a representative of Lumec, said that AAL makes a fine fixture and both companies use the same casting and seals, etc. He noted that in the original bid for the project, Lumec was the base-bid and AAL was the alternate.

Mr. Wolf did note that one difference between the two (2) fixtures is the current height difference: Lumec is 19-inches high and AAL is 12-inches high. Lumec also designs a heftier, beefier base for the fixture. Lumec has an inner glass re-fracture that matches the current fixtures and have been used by the Township for a long time.

Lumec has also developed a disc, owned by Phillips, is a carbon footprint for LED capabilities in the lighting fixture. The LED module is fitted into the enclosed system. Mr. Wolf also noted that the new lighting is retro in fit with the Township's current lighting.

The Lumec fixtures are 45-inches tall and the AAL fixture is 36 1/2-inches tall.

Member Johnson believes the difference in size would be quite noticeable to those passing by. Member Noto believes that some people may notice but is not sure if the difference is great enough for people to pay attention to.

Member Johnson also noted that if the DDA were to agree to use AAL, the DDA district would have three (3) different streetlight designs in the area. Mr. Wolf noted that if the Township remained with Lumec, the light fixtures and posts are inter-changeable throughout the area for when one breaks or needs repair.

Mr. Smith said AAL could install one of its lighting fixtures so the Board could compare the similarities of the lights. Engineer Kuhtz of FTCH supported having an example installed for the Board to consider. He does not believe there would be a visual difference in the height of the fixtures but noted that it would possibly take up to two (2) weeks for AAL to install their

example. Member Noto supported AAL installing an example of their street lighting.

Engineer Kuhtz asked the Board if they wanted to re-open the bid to Lumec to see if they could adjust their pricing. He noted that both fixtures and poles are similar in quality. The Board agreed to ask Lumec to re-bid the project.

Member James motioned to award the contract to Lumec if they lowered their bid, seconded by Member Julien. Chairman Huhn called the motion to question.

Member Julien noted that there are seventy-five (75) lights/fixtures for this project and Lumec is asking an extra \$2,000 per fixture. Lumec is preferred but the cost is expensive.

Member James asked what if Lumec declines re-bidding the project and Member Kingsland believe the Board should pursue AAL and have the example lighting installed so Lumec knows the Board is considering AAL as well.

Chairman Huhn asked Engineer Kuhtz to ask the contractor to approach Lumec for a re-bid and if they will not re-bid, then the Board will pursue the alternate fixture.

Member Johnson believes it is important to remain with the current lighting fixtures, the differences will be noticeable.

Chairman Huhn summarized that the Board would like to see the differences between the two (2) fixtures. The current bid received from Lumec is unacceptable to the Board and the cost difference is too great. He believes the Board wishes to ask Lumec to re-bid the project and the Board would accept their bid if they could keep the project at approximately \$143,000 lower than originally bid. If Lumec cannot re-bid the project then the Board would like to investigate AAL's fixtures.

Member James revised his motion of support asking that the Lumec contractors be asked to re-bid the project and if they are unable to do so the Board may investigate utilizing AAL, the alternate contractor, for the project. Member Julien supported the motion. All in favor with none opposed. Motion carried.

ARTICLE 5: Any Other Business

Chairman Huhn noted the new construction throughout the DDA District. He asked if the new businesses are asked to conform to the sidewalks, trees, capes and lighting in the DDA District. Assistant to the Manager Otey said that the projects are overseen by the Planning Commission and Township Board. The Board agrees to the sidewalks and ensures the lighting is uniform.

Chairman Huhn also noted that property maintenance needs to be enforced and businesses held responsible for maintaining their lawns and weeds. Assistant to the Manager Otey noted that the Township Ordinance requires maintenance of grass/weeds over 8-inches tall. If someone is in violation, they are notified and have a period of time to correct the problem and if they do not, the Township takes care of the problem and assesses the owner's taxes for payment.

Chairman Huhn also noted that the signage within the DDA District needs to comply and Assistant to the Manager Otey noted that the Township is addressing the temporary signage issues.

ARTICLE 6: Adjournment

Chairman Huhn requested a motion for adjournment. At 8:12 p.m. Member James motioned for adjournment, supported by Member Julien.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Hern, Recording Secretary

Approved as to form by:

Sandra Otey, Assistant to the Manager