

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

November 1, 2005

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein
Virginia Coulter
Gary Derrigan
Linda Forwerck
Heather Harris-Brady
Ken Kleinrichert
Andy Knott
Jim Lagowski
Glen Lile
Jim Lively
Doug Luciani
Doug Mansfield
Bob Otwell
Patrick Pahl
Rise Rasch
Wayne Schmidt
Derith Smith
Ken Smith
Linda Smyka
Warren Studley
Lee Wilson
Janet Wolf

Members Absent

Jennifer Cohoon
Joe DeKoning
Robert Gattin
Kathleen Guy
Jay Hooper
Bill Kurtz
John Nelson

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Tom Kellogg
Dennis Aloia
Bob Carstens
Richard Lewis
Matt Skeels
Gerry Harsch
Kelly Thayer
Ann Rogers

Facilitators Present

Wanda Joseph
Gerry Sell
Tom Shea

Staff Present

Matt McCauley
Megan Olds

-
1. The meeting began at 2:00 p.m.
 2. T. Shea reviewed the completed evaluations from the previous meeting. Suggestions from group members included: allowing time for more weighty agenda items to allow for intensive discussion, more small group involvement. T. Shea encouraged the development of proposals and active participation in committee work – these move the process. He also indicated that the process is a forum for interaction and that after a proposal is developed that it becomes the property of the group, not an individual. He said that the group is designed this way to be transparent and encourage active participation.
 3. The proposed meeting agenda was reviewed. There were no suggested changes. The agenda was accepted by consensus.
 4. The October meeting minutes were reviewed. There were no suggested changes or concerns. The minutes were accepted by consensus.

5. M. Olds reviewed the handout synthesizing the notes from the previous brainstorming exercise. T. Shea explained the purpose of the new brainstorming exercise. Members broke out into groups of three and discussed and prioritized, as a group, the brainstorming ideas presented in the raw data for each of the three categories – study process and public involvement, data needs and analytical methods, and desired products and outcomes. Members’ priorities will be compiled by staff and presented to the RFP Subcommittee for review and integration into the work plan and scope of work. When reconvened as the large group, members were offered a chance to share comments. No comments were offered.

6. D. Luciani invited members’ participation in the Traverse City Area Chamber of Commerce’s winter retreat on Wednesday, November 30th at the TC Golf and Country Club. The purpose of the event is to develop the Chamber’s strategic plan for the coming year. Transportation and land use and the business community’s role, and economic development are the two topics for this year’s retreat. With the help of the Michigan Land Use Institute, the Chamber will be bringing in Robert Grow from Envision Utah to discuss the transportation and land use portion of the agenda. The engagement of the business community with these topics and outcomes will be discussed.

Registration on the day of the event will begin at 12:45 and the meeting will start at 1:15 and go until 5:30. D. Luciani indicated that each Coordinating Group member would receive an invitation to the event, via NWMCOG staff.

J. Lively added that this was an excellent opportunity to hear from a region in the county that has demonstrated how land use and transportation can be integrated in a visioning process. He applauded the Chamber for inviting Robert Grow and for inviting Coordinating Group members to attend the retreat.

7. W. Schmidt presented the funding proposal on behalf of J. Nelson. ***The proposal, generated by the Agenda Subcommittee would ask the Funding Subcommittee to review the Centers for Regional Excellence grant opportunity and authorize them to pursue the grant, then present a complete proposal to the Coordinating Group for review and approval at the December meeting.*** L. Smyka asked a clarification question regarding timing, then supported the proposal. V. Coulter asked who the applicant would be. J. Lively said that it would be up to the Funding Subcommittee. A. Knott asked about the grant’s evaluation parameters. W. Schmidt said that there were no set criteria and that the opportunity was open. A. Knott asked if the grant could be used for matching funds for the federal highways grant. J. Lagowski indicated that the funding agency should be one of the fiduciaries. J. Wolf asked if the draft grant could be sent out for comment prior to the December meeting. B. Otwell said that he had some concerns – mainly regarding how funding can be used, including the Rotary grant, the federal grant, and the process of pursuing match money. He said that the specific scope of work for the Centers for Regional Excellence grant would need to be identified. W. Schmidt said that the Coordinating Group could deal some of those issues, but that the scope that the state is seeking for this grant will not be identified. ***The proposal was accepted by consensus, as presented.*** S. Erickson Bornschein asked if there was enough time to prepare an application. W. Schmidt said that the Funding Subcommittee could work on it.

8. T. Shea explained the visioning exercise and then called for questions about the exercise. There were no questions. The group counted off and broke into seven small groups. The group reconvened. W. Joseph asked for members to share their comments. K. Smith shared that his group identified three important groups to include: policy makers (planning commissioners, township boards), traffic

generators (businesses), commuters, and stakeholders who need to buy into solutions (BATA, TART, TCAPS, Board of Realtors, etc.). Strategies included going to them where they are, using surveys and focus groups. B. Otwell said that his group identified shoppers as an important target group, as well as business leaders, and people with long commutes. J. Wolf reported for her group said that informal leaders and naysayers, PTOs, neighborhood organizations, and elected officials were important stakeholder groups. Strategies included using existing meetings to reach out to groups, respecting individual groups' busy seasons, assigning people from the Coordinating Group to reach out to specific groups and encourage involvement, holding meetings in comfortable locations with food. J. Lagowski said that his group identified some major stakeholder groups: vehicle drivers, those who provide goods and services (businesses, etc.), emergency services representatives, and the less fortunate, people in poverty or without personal transportation. P. Pahl reported for his group and said that important stakeholders included business owners, planning commissioners, and users of the system. High quality surveys were identified as an involvement method. V. Coulter added that agriculture and developers were two other stakeholder groups. S. Erickson Bornschein reported for her group and said that property owners, religious leaders, human service agencies, and unions were important stakeholder groups. She said that it would be important to have multiple strategies to involve stakeholders and that informal connections were important, as well as formal opportunities for engagement, and that food and hospitality stakeholders were important. J. Lively reported for his group and said that large property owners and local government officials are two other stakeholder groups. He said that finding "cheerleaders" was important, and that asking non-profit groups to reach out to their members to encourage involvement was also an important strategy. K. Kleinrichert indicated that the project website is a tool for marketing this initiative to stakeholders.

Staff will compile the comments and present them to the Coordinating Group members for integration into the scope of work and work plan.

9. There was a break from 3:27 p.m. – 3:40 p.m.

10. D. Smith and K. Kleinrichert reviewed the communications proposals. K. Kleinrichert invited others to participate in the Communications Subcommittee. He read Part 1 of the proposal, amending it slightly to read, "***Propose that the Land Use and transportation Coordinating Group select up to six additional people each month to the Communications Subcommittee for the sole purpose of creating a Public Awareness, Education, and Engagement Strategy.***" W. Joseph asked if there were questions about the proposal. K. Smith said that this was a neat proposal – to involve different people each month. D. Luciani asked what exactly the volunteers would be asked to do. K. Kleinrichert said that managing the website and reaching out to groups to link to the project website and also to develop a list of people to notify would be specific activities. D. Luciani volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. K. Smith also volunteered, but for a future month. K. Kleinrichert said that the Communications Subcommittee would contact people. ***Consensus was reached on Part 1 of this proposal, as amended.***

K. Kleinrichert read Part 2 of the proposal and provided some background. G. Lile said that he does not feel comfortable paying someone for this when TC-TV2 can tape it for free. Deri Smith clarified that TC-TV2 tapes things voluntarily, and that paying for the filming and the editing ensures that it will be filmed and presented on TV2. W. Joseph asked if there were addition questions. There were none. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that this would a good idea and that there were some people who would be willing to do this. She asked if Rotary money could be used. J. Wolf asked if organizations were going to be approached for match money later, that this funding could be rolled into that amount. J. Lively offered MLUI staff as volunteers. ***K. Kleinrichert amended the proposal to read: "Proposal to seek***

\$200 per meeting for the filming, editing, and archiving the meetings of the Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group when a volunteer is not available”.... M. Skeels indicated that he could volunteer to tape some of the meetings, but could not do every meeting. R. Rasch said that as long as there was not an expectation that every group offer funding for tapings, then she was ok with the proposal. ***Consensus as reached on Part 2 of the proposal, as amended.***

K. Kleinrichert read Part 3 of the proposal, ***amending it to read...”that the Land use and Transportation Coordinating Group request permission from Garfield Township...”*** J. Lively asked if the group could meet at the Library instead of Garfield Township. B. Otwell said that there are more alternative modes of transportation available at the Library – bus route, close to bike trail, etc. He was advocating having all of the meetings at the Library. W. Joseph asked if people agreed with or opposed the proposal. No opposition was expressed. ***Consensus was reached on this proposal, as amended.***

K. Kleinrichert read Part 4 of the proposal. W. Joseph asked if there were concerns. K. Smith said that if an issue comes up, that we could deal with it as another proposal. ***Consensus was reached on this proposal, as presented.***

11. M. Olds presented an oral progress report on behalf of the RFP Subcommittee.

12. M. McCauley read the consensus agenda items for the meeting. ***He indicated that in the next meeting packet, staff would provide a list of all of the consensus items for each meeting as a reference for consensus decisions reached by the Group. This list will be updated for every meeting.***

13. J. Lagowski advocated that members read the *Citizens Guide to Transportation Planning and Benchmarks Northwest*, two publications created by the Northwest Michigan Council of Governments. He also presented background information on TC-TALUS, its Board and bylaws. He also indicated that there was information in the packet regarding the basics of metropolitan planning and the federal highway administration planning process. H. Harris-Brady asked how the TC-TLUS Board was informed of the activities of the Coordinating Group. M. Olds indicated that an update of the group’s activities was a standing agenda item for the TC-TALUS Board meetings.

14. New Business – Several items were listed.

a) H. Harris-Brady asked that the 2006 calendar be set.

b) She also asked that staff prepare a synopsis, less than a page, of the Groups’ activities that could be used by the Communications Subcommittee.

c) TC-TALUS correspondence.

d) Food.

Each new business item was addressed. S. Erickson Bornschein made a proposal that the same schedule be used. M. McCauley offered to review the Library’s schedule to see if this time slot was available. R. Lewis went upstairs to check on availability and the item was tabled until he returned.

The development of a synopsis was addressed. Members directed staff to develop this item. Staff will prepare a brief, monthly synopsis.

M. Skeels reviewed and explained the TC-TALUS memo that was distributed to Coordinating Group members at the meeting. B. Otwell indicated that no units of government were to be approached for the \$2500 – just non-profit and private groups. He said that the group needed to approach the non-governmental groups and that perhaps that TC-TALUS was not the appropriate fiduciary for those funds. He said that he was getting nervous about moving forward with no money. J. Lagowski said that the group is not far away from a Request for Proposals being developed and that an approved work plan had not been developed and that there was no basis for asking anyone to share in funding something that had not yet been defined. He said that the TC-TALUS Board was asking for a pause until there was a better sense of the project costs and what kind of match requirement would be needed. K. Smith said that TC-TALUS's concerns seem to be directed toward the units of government. There was discussion about the proposal that was approved at the September meeting. L. Forwerck suggested that the group postpone making a decision about this issue for a future agenda. K. Smith said that the Funding Subcommittee could address this issue and offer clarification.

R. Lewis returned and M. McCauley reported that the same time slot was available at the Library for next year's meetings. Staff will schedule the meetings at the Library.

The food issue was addressed. L. Forwerck said that everyone could give NWMCOG \$1.00 and that we could have food at the next meeting. There was consensus.

15. M. McCauley reported that the discussion forum was up and running on the www.landuseandtransportation.org website. J. Wolf said that BATA's hybrid bus had arrived and would be running soon. J. Lagowski said that he got a call from Peter Payette at Interlochen Public Radio to speak about regional planning. He also said that he did not think that he or anyone else should be speaking on behalf of the Coordinating Group. B. Otwell reported that TART's new trail on the east side of the Boardman Lake was now open.

16. W. Joseph asked for meeting evaluation observations. Among the items that group members indicated were helpful:

- Small group sessions
- Communication proposals were very specific
- Jim Lagowski's handouts on Metropolitan Planning

Items that were indicated would be helpful for the next meeting:

- Appreciate not using consensus on minor housekeeping items
- Small groups felt a little like busy work – not as meaty as it could have been
- Public involvement techniques handout prepared by NWMCOG staff was helpful – similar approach could be used for explaining federal transportation planning process
- Look at group's progress as compared to initial schedule

17. Meeting times for subcommittees were set.

November 7, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. – RFP Subcommittee meeting

November 14, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. – RFP Subcommittee meeting

November 15, 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. – Funding Subcommittee meeting

November 22, 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. – Communications Subcommittee

November 28, 8:30 – 10:30 a.m. – Agenda Subcommittee meeting

18. Ann Rogers offered public comment. She said that communication has been lacking from this group. She said that she hoped that there would be more information on the website and in the *Traverse City Record Eagle* – perhaps a forum piece. She said that she recommended bringing in expertise from the outside to subcommittee meetings. She also said that a definition of terms would be helpful. She said that she enjoyed the article that J. Lively sent over the web regarding a systems approach. She also discussed a *Time* magazine article about peak oil. She also brought handouts to distribute from the *Ecologist* publication regarding the peak oil situation. There were no other public comments.

19. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by M. Olds on November 8, 2005.