

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2005

Garfield Township Hall

2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein
Virginia Coulter
Gary Derrigan
Joe DeKoning
Linda Forwerck
Kathleen Guy
Heather Harris-Brady
Jay Hooper
Ken Kleinrichert
Andy Knott
Bill Kurtz
Jim Lagowski
Glen Lile
Jim Lively
Doug Luciani
Doug Mansfield
John Nelson
Bob Otwell
Patrick Pahl
Rise Rasch
Wayne Schmidt
Derith Smith

Ken Smith
Warren Studley
Lee Wilson
Janet Wolf

Members Absent

Jennifer Cohoon
Robert Gattin
Linda Smyka

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Facilitators Present

Gerry Sell
Tom Shea
Paula Sagala

Staff Present

Matt McCauley
Megan Olds

-
1. The meeting began at 2:00 p.m. Facilitator comments – T. Shea welcomed everyone and made some comments on the facilitation process so far. The purpose of today's meeting is reflected in items 4-8 on the agenda – for the Group to get a handle on the RFP issues that are being addressed at the subcommittee level and to solicit the larger group's input. He explained the RFP Subcommittee's progress to date. He said that other issues on the agenda are related to funding and communications. He said that from the viewpoint of the facilitators, he recommended all group members review the group consensus items (the gray sheet in mailed packet). He read some of the consensus items aloud. He also said that there was a meeting handout which offered further clarification regarding funding issues. He said the facilitators feel that many in the group are learning about how to apply the consensus process. He said that facilitators are available to hear your comments and suggestions. He praised the group for their hard work on issues that have been challenges for the community for the past 20 years. He also gave a refresher about the proposal presentation and review process.
 2. The proposed agenda was reviewed. One addition was made – setting meeting dates will be done right after Announcements.
 3. The minutes from the November 1st meeting were reviewed. No corrections were suggested. The minutes were accepted by consensus.

4. J. Lively reported on Robert Grow's presentation on November 30th. Robert Grow, of Envisoin Utah, a leader expert in regional visioning, spoke at the Traverse City Area Chamber of Commerce's leadership retreat. J. Lively said that about 20 people from the Coordinating Group were there to hear him talk. Mr. Grow met with Homebuilders, realtors, and others on Wednesday morning and gave a separate presentation. He also met with government representatives on Wednesday late morning. In the afternoon, he met with business leaders/business community at the Chamber retreat, and was able to share the process and outcomes of the Envision Utah initiative and how we might be able to accomplish the same thing here. He said that the comments from the business community were very helpful, and that a lot of people want to see this process succeed. He said that he has copies of a video that he will give to NWMCOG and the Chamber, and a copy of the Powerpoint that Mr. Grow delivered that can be posted on the Land Use and Transportation Study Coordinating Group's website. The video will also run on TC-TV2. K. Kleinrichert said that he was impressed with Mr. Grow's background as an attorney and with the business community in land development. He said that he was impressed that Mr. Grow was able to put himself in everybody's shoes. He said that he was excited about the opportunity to work with him to help the group work on the RFP. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that Mr. Grow's illustration of how critical everyone is to the solution is important and also his recognition that people at the table have different perspectives that should be honored. W. Schmidt said that it would be beneficial to work with him as a "general contractor" to advise on the process. J. Wolf said that Mr. Grow put a new definition of community input for her and that the Envision Utah process was a strength. J. Lively said that the difference he noticed was that their process was business-led. He said that the Group might want to go back and "bring the business community along." R. Soyering made some comments on behalf of Linda Smyka. She liked the approach used by Robert Grow and stressed the importance of looking around the table to make sure that the Group was inclusive and involving the right stakeholders. J. Wolf commented that there was a lot of non-verbal communication around the room at the Chamber meeting regarding agreement with Robert Grow's assessment that there might be "battle-fatigue" in the community. K. Kleinrichert said that after the presentation, there were verbal comments backing that up. He also said that Robert Grow advocated bringing more stakeholders together. K. Smith said that what resonated with him was the "battle fatigue" comment, as well as Mr. Grow's explanation of the type of public participation process that was used in Envision Utah. He also said that the various groups that brought Mr. Grow in did a great job and he would like to see that type of thing done regularly throughout this process. V. Coulter said that highlights for her included that the roadmap and a budget and timeline were essential components, particularly when trying to involve the business community. She also said that the large group met quarterly, and that a steering committee met more often. She also said that she liked his comment that "if you present good choices, the public will make good decisions." She said that she also liked they also did not bring in a lot of consultants, but brought consultants in to do specific tasks like a housing study, values survey, etc., and that they used the resources and staff that were available in the community in order to maintain sustainability. S. Erickson-Bornschein also said that Robert Grow was more familiar with the consent process rather than the consensus process. H. Harris-Brady said that the use of locally-specific/meaningful terminology was also stressed by Robert Grow. She also indicated the use of the Quality Growth Toolbox in Envision Utah's implementation phase. B. Otwell said that the length of time that they were planning for – 50 years – impacted their outcomes and was important. D. Luciani thanked the Homebuilders, CVB, MLUI, and TAAR for their co-sponsorship. He felt that it was a call to action for the Group. He felt that this was time well spent.

J. Lively said that he felt that this would inform the process of the RFP development and the Group's work. W. Studley said that involving stakeholders from around the commuter-shed was important.

5. M. Olds reviewed the Draft Synthesized RFP.

6. T. Shea informed the group of the purpose and process of the Fishbowl Activity. Four representatives were asked prior to the meeting to talk for three minutes about their understanding of the issue and progress, concerns, and potential resolution. He said that after the Break, then participants from the Group could come and stand behind the chairs of the representatives and talk about their opinions. The four volunteers were Ken, Ginny, Sally, and Wayne.

K. Smith said that he felt that significant progress was being made. He said that it was been difficult, and that there were several drafts that were visions of the process that could occur. He said that his concerns were that there were two clusters about what we were about. He said that one cluster saw this process as an opportunity to conduct technical analysis and a public involvement process and out that into a plan. He said another cluster was that the group's purpose was to engender a dialogue, discussion, and debate about challenges and solutions with the outcome being a vision.

S. Erickson-Bornschein agreed with some issues K. Smith raised, but she saw less of a division. She said that she thinks that the Group wants to guide the process, respect natural resources, emphasize that this is not just a study, and that consultants should be used as guides. She said that she believes that the community has been invested in this type of thinking for a long time. She says that one thing she is hoping for is that all of the groups can be brought to the table, and that issues can be addressed from a broader spectrum, and that fiefdoms can be addressed. She said she does not think that the Group has two separate visions – that it is time for scenarios to be presented to the public and to learn their ideas and preferences.

W. Schmidt said that he saw an opportunity in this process to hear what the “silent majority” had to say about these issues – not just environmentalists and elected officials. He liked what Robert Grow said about the public making good decisions, given good scenarios. He said that public outreach would be really important. He said that 3-5 years is too long for the timeline. He prefers closer to 18 months. He said that as far as contracting out for services, he said he that thinks bringing consultants in to offer assistance and direction will be important.

V. Coulter said that she thought that the Group had a lot in common. She complemented the new draft RFP and is excited about moving forward and perhaps with Robert Grow's involvement. She said that she prefers a time limit of two years, particularly given the “head-nodding” at the Chamber meeting regarding process fatigue. She said that she thinks that piggybacking on past visioning efforts and the New Designs for Growth effort is important. She said that she liked how the new RFP required the consultant to give costs for each phase component, so that the Group could pick and choose based on what it felt was important. She also advocated looking at the Wasatch visioning process for its content and its consultant qualifications. She said that the consultant/consultants the Group hires would be able to help design the process, with the Group's direction. She also stressed that she feels that a process outline, budget, and timeline needed to be identified.

K. Smith said that he would be comfortable with an addition to the revised draft RFP including the following type of language – “community dialogue, community consideration of alternative scenarios, aided and facilitated by the consultant team – NOT a consultant study driven by experts” – in order to clarify the role of the consultant within the community effort. He also agreed that having someone like Robert Grow to have some front-end assistance would be beneficial.

S. Erickson-Bornschein said that identifying implementation activities would be an important part of the process. K. Smith said that it would be good to start now, within general terms, to define this, and then keep refining strategies as we move forward. K. Smith also said that using local talent is something we can draw upon. He said that the overarching consultant team needed to be someone who is far enough removed that they will not be biased.

V. Coulter said that on pg. 2 of the draft synthesized RFP, additional stakeholders needed to be listed. K. Smith agreed. K. Smith said that a deliverable should be strategic initiatives or fundable projects. He said that there was no reason to wait until the end of the study to implement initiatives.

T. Shea asked if there were questions, comments, or observations from the group. J. Lagowski said that a transportation planner would need to be involved and that the scope of work needed to clearly address this. K. Smith said that this is where he saw the disagreement – that there needed to be dialogue and community engagement about transportation, not having a transportation planner come in and tell us how to fix the problem. V. Coulter said that what she heard J. Lagowski saying was that a transportation planner needed to be involved. J. Nelson said that the results should be produced by the community, and not by the consultant. He said that the choices should come from the community, not the consultant. D. Luciani said that you cannot just leave it up to the community to come up with scenarios – that this would ignore the consultants’ expertise and could waste months of time and would not. He said that just a dialogue without the understanding that there will be a product, a plan, that is part of the deliverable, then it doesn’t have the same value. K. Smith said that people working together can learn what is possible, as presented by a consultant, and then the public can apply those potential solutions to the community. He said that the spirit of what J. Nelson is suggesting is that the consultant not “spoon-feed” solutions, but that the community would develop the solutions. J. Nelson said that scenarios and different than choices, and he hopes that the choices will be fleshed out by the community through workshops. J. Lively said that he feels that the Group found something to agree on with Robert Grow as a potential leader to help develop this process. He said that he hopes that at the end of the Fishbowl, we can focus on the opportunities that have been presented. D. Aloia said that he heard Robert Grow say that a smaller group developed scenarios. He wondered if there was public input into that process. J. Wolf said that what she understood was that the small group developed the scenarios based on community values surveying. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that the scenarios and outcomes were based on a variety of analysis. W. Schmidt said that geographical constraints and other factors were also part of building the scenarios.

7. Break

8. J. Wolf and A. Knott presented proposal: ***That 1) the Coordinating Group submit further comments to staff by December 9, 2005 regarding the draft synthesized work plan and that 2) the RFP Subcommittee develop a contract with Robert Grow to define a work plan and design process and report back at the January meeting.*** B. Otwell asked who would take the comments and what will the purpose would be. A. Knott clarified that the comments would be compiled and worked into the RFP to be shared with Robert Grow. K. Smith said that he is comfortable with staff integrating comments received by the 9th to be compiled and then reviewed by Robert Grow. ***There was consensus on this proposal.***

K. Smith said that the overall timetable still needed to be addressed. He asked if the group might consider making a decision on that today. W. Studley advised relying on Robert Grow’s expertise regarding a potential timeline. K. Smith said that there is the perception from those in the community

that progress is not being made. He said that the timeline could be changed or elaborated on further with Robert Grow's input.

9. M. Skeels gave a report on funding usage and referred to the handout that was distributed at the beginning of the meeting. He explained the match and reimbursement process. He explained that the \$3.3 million dollars is really a commitment from the federal government to offer access to funds. He also explained the Rotary Charities grant of \$20,000. Local match was "strongly encouraged" as part of the grant award. Rotary has agreed that the \$6,000 used to bring Doug Henton into town could be used to match the Rotary grant. S. Erickson-Bornschein asked if the Robert Grow funds could be used as match. M. Skeels clarified that no match could be used retroactively for the federal funding. A. Knott said that some people are paid to be here and wondered if this time could be used as match. M. Skeels said that soft match was allowable for the federal grant.

10. J. Lively read the Funding Subcommittee proposal and shared some background information. There were no questions. K. Guy asked if Rotary had been contacted. J. Lively said that Marsha Smith said that it is really up to the Group. D. Luciani said that there was public notice of the meeting and that this strengthens the case that the expenditure was a benefit to the Coordinating Group. V. Coulter asked if there was any reason not to. There were no concerns. ***The proposal was accepted by consensus.***

11. M. McCauley gave a report on the Centers for Regional Excellence grant. He said that the Funding Subcommittee had directed staff to write the grant proposal. He said that upon further investigation, the RFP explicitly states that funding for this grant could not be used for studies or for planning consultants. He said that this limits the group's application. K. Smith asked if there were other applications - other than hiring a consultant - that could be pursued. He mentioned his visit - with the Convention and Visitor's Bureau visioning initiative - to Chattanooga was an example. K. Smith said that there was a draft work plan developed in response to a suggestion by the MDOT representatives, articulating the vision of the group. He advocated getting the work plan completed so that these types of funding opportunities can be pursued.

12. B. Otwell said that the match letter was not sent out. He said that based on the possibility of hiring Robert Grow to assist with the design process, maybe it does make sense to wait to send out the match letter. A. Knott asked if some groups might need to write checks before the end of the year. B. Otwell said that TART approved his request for \$2,500. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that for her group it was important to let them know what was happening - that they wanted something concrete to base a funding decision on. She said that what concerned her was that we decided to do something and then didn't do it as a group. J. Nelson said that he thought it was important for the Group to have access to "unrestricted" money to pursue different activities, such as another presentation. J. Wolf said that this seems to be a bureaucratic issue. She said she couldn't ask Munson for money without a letter. K. Smith said that NMEAC is prepared to put money in. He also thought that having access to unrestricted money was important. K. Guy said that from a fundraising perspective, it is probably wise to go out and ask for bigger gifts first, and without a plan, it will not be productive to go out and ask some groups for \$2,500 then ask others for larger amounts later. M. Skeels said that it would be important to identify what the funds are for. He said that the TC-TALUS Board meets December 20th, and that he thought this issue could be resolved easily. A. Knott said that there was a question about how much hiring Robert Grow might cost and that the unrestricted money might be able to be used to fund his services. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that the letter needed to be sent out and that the scope is the purpose of the Group. J. Lagowski said that he has never encountered resistance from the TC-TALUS Board, but that the Group should defer asking for the funds until the scope of the study was defined. He said that the

concern was related to waiting until there was something to ask about. P. Sagala said that under the consensus process, there needed to be consensus to change a consensus item. J. Hooper asked what it would take to get a letter from TC-TALUS. He said it the quicker the better to get a letter out and that it should be left open-ended, so that additional funds could be requested as needed. M. McCauley read the previous consensus item related to this topic. D. Aloia suggested having the Chamber of Commerce or some other non-governmental group hold the money. ***S. Erickson-Bornschein made a proposal: That 1) the Chamber Foundation act as fiscal agent for a fund whose disposition would be made by the consent of the Coordinating Group; 2) that the Group send a letter to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) requesting an initial \$2500 contributions to that fund.***

B. Otwell said that the purpose of the money's use should be added to the proposal. K. Guy expressed a concern that the group identify the use of the funding and explain the sense of urgency. K. Guy suggested that this be deferred back to the Funding Subcommittee. She offered to attend the subcommittee meeting. ***In response to expressed concerns that the donors should be told to what purpose their contributions might be put, the determination of the precise content of that letter was deferred to the Funding Committee to finalize at its December 12 meeting. The Subcommittee was authorized to send the finalized letter to the NGOs without further review by the full Coordinating Group.***

P. Sagala indicated that there as no more time left on the agenda to address this topic.

13. K. Kleinrichert read Part 1 of the Communications Proposal. D. Luciani expressed a concern that this funding could be used for something else, other than taping, editing, and archiving the taped meetings. K. Guy asked who the audience was for this. K. Kleinrichert said that the public was the audience and that all of next year's meetings will be held at the Library and has the potential to be televised. K. Smith said that he would rather tape things, like the Robert Grow presentation, rather than the meetings. He supported tweaking the proposal to tape things like the Grow event rather than the meetings. J. Wolf said that she felt that this issue had been addressed at a previous meeting. J. Kelly said that he believes that it is important that these meetings be televised in order to maintain transparency, which is a goal of the Group. He said that the public needed to know what is going on with this group. ***There was consensus regarding this proposal.***

K. Kleinrichert read Part 2 of the Communications Proposal. J. Lagowski said that this was included in the RFP. No concerns were expressed. ***There was consensus regarding this proposal.***

K. Kleinrichert read Part 3 of the Communications Proposal. J. Nelson expressed concern that the proposal was redundant and that he did not want to set a precedent to ask TC-TALUS to direct the Group to do something. His concern would be alleviated if the last sentence of the proposal were removed: "Additionally, if such a schedule is not available by February that TC-TALUS creates an RFP schedule for the group to adhere to."

D. Luciani said that accountability was been missing from this Group. He asked that there be some accountability to set the timeline and a consequence for not getting it done be implemented. He said that there needed to be progress. K. Smith proposed striking the last sentence. V. Coulter said that this is a schedule for getting the RFP done and that Robert Grow will need a timeline too, to complete his work if he is hired. J. Nelson said that TC-TALUS has no authority to hold us to a timeline. J. Hooper said that TC-TALUS is the fiscal agent. Derith Smith said that at some point we have to trust each other that there is a common goal between the Coordinating Group and TC-TALUS. J. Nelson said he would

stand aside. K. Kleinrichert said that the proposal was not meant to block in the Group, but to provide a framework to communicate with the public. He said that the timeline could be accepted and then modified. K. Smith said that he stood by his stated concern. There was no more time left to address this issue.

14. New business items were proposed.

K. Smith proposed that the Group host a public forum in February that would provide the general public with a chance to hear what the Group has in mind for the process, and to gather their ideas and feedback, and suggestions.

P. Sagala clarified that New Business items are sent to the Agenda Subcommittee for review.

M. Skeels proposed that the match funding to hire Robert Grow using the federal funds be addressed by the Funding Subcommittee.

J. Nelson proposed that the Agenda Subcommittee be addressed as the Steering Committee, with the agenda development be one component of the subcommittee's responsibilities.

K. Smith proposed changing the way that the public is involved in the Coordinating Group meetings.

S. Erickson-Bornschein proposed moving to a consent format rather than a consensus decision-making format for the process, per Robert Grow's presentation.

15. M. McCauley read the consensus items.

16. D. Luciani thought the Fishbowl Exercise was very helpful and worked well. V. Coulter said that it was nice to have refreshments.

17. There were no Announcements.

18. The subcommittee meeting dates were set:

The Funding Subcommittee will meet on December 12th at 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

The RFP Subcommittee will meet on December 19th from 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

The Agenda Subcommittee will meet on December 20th at 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.

The Communications Subcommittee meeting date was not set.

19. Public comment.

J. Kelly shared that he attended the Robert Grow presentation and was very impressed by his expertise. He thanked the sponsors who made that presentation possible.

20. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by M. Olds on December 6, 2005.