

# **Grand Traverse Area Land Use and Transportation Study**

## **Coordinating Group**

### **DRAFT Meeting Minutes**

#### **March 6, 2007**

#### Members Present

Sally Erickson-Bornschein  
Virginia Coulter  
Gary Derrigan  
Kathleen Guy  
Jay Hooper  
Ken Kleinrichert  
Bill Kurtz  
Glen Lile  
Jim Lively  
Doug Luciani  
John Nelson  
Bob Otwell  
Mary Pitcher  
Rise Rasch  
Sheridan Rhoads  
Amanda Schlagel  
Derith Smith  
Ken Smith  
Linda Smyka  
Mary Tonneberger  
Janet Wolf

#### Public Present (from sign-in sheet)

Tom Emling  
Andy Knott

#### Facilitators Present

Tina Allen  
Wanda Joseph

#### Staff Present

Matt McCauley  
Matt Skeels  
Megan Olds

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting began at 2:05 p.m. W. Joseph welcomed participants. She mentioned that she will be working with staff to prepare a new member orientation program over the next month. The orientation will be scheduled for April 2007. Roundtable introductions were made.

### **2. Review proposed agenda**

The agenda was reviewed and accepted by consensus.

### **3. Review January meeting minutes**

The January 2007 minutes were reviewed and accepted by consensus.

### **4. Record Eagle Editorial Board meeting report**

J. Wolf reported on the meeting with the *Record Eagle* Editorial Board, including meeting participants and message. The Editorial Board urged the group to come back and meet with them again. They also encouraged a Forum piece. They raised good questions about leverage with local units of government and outcomes. There was discussion about media coverage and the importance of communicating the study's process and outcomes. J. Wolf reported that the cost issue and previous articles were addressed very briefly. J. Wolf reported that overall, the meeting was very constructive. J. Wolf also reported that she and B. Otwell will be participating in an interview on WNMC tomorrow morning.

### **5. Consultant Contract report**

M. Skeels gave a report on the consultant selection process. He said that yesterday all information was submitted to MDOT to develop and confirm a contract with Mead & Hunt. He said that this contract process and Commission Audit review will take four to six weeks. B. Otwell said that there was discussion at the TC-TALUS meeting about the consultant team and informed the group that there was a follow-up meeting between him, M. Skeels, and representatives from Mead & Hunt to discuss concerns and solidify how to move forward. K. Smith asked about the timeline that the Project Administration Team might meet. M. Skeels said that he would like for this group to get

together a month or so in advance of the study. K. Smith hoped for advanced notice of the meeting. J. Wolf asked that several dates be proposed. M. Skeels said that he would circulate an email among committee members to identify some potential dates.

## **6. LUTS staffing update**

M. Skeels provided a staffing update. He reported that MDOT has reported that it is not permitted to use the federal funds to support Coordinating Group and LUTS subcommittee activities – these are ineligible activities under the federal requirements. M. Skeels said that he has been instructed not to use the federal funds to support these activities. He said that there is an opportunity - which there has not been agreement to pursue – to have the Coordinating Group function as a subcommittee of TC-TALUS. M. Skeels clarified that the facilitation services will not be impacted. There was some discussion about the proposal regarding the LUTS Group becoming a subcommittee of TC-TALUS. K. Smith said that he felt that it was important that the LUTS Group maintain its autonomy. J. Nelson suggested that this issue be referred back to the Funding Committee. J. Lively suggested that a County representative be involved in this discussion. M. Tonneberger said that she had offered to serve. The Funding Committee will explore funding mechanisms. Staff will prepare a handout explaining funding needs. K. Guy asked how the Group would be compromised by becoming a subcommittee of TC-TALUS. K. Smith talked about the bridge controversy and his feelings that the Coordinating Group be independent.

## **7. LUTS/TC-TALUS Joint Meeting Schedule**

B. Otwell revisited the LUTS proposal regarding the idea of a TC-TALUS/LUTS meeting schedule with back-to-back meetings with a meeting with the consultant in the middle. There was consensus among TC-TALUS Board members that this was a good idea. There was not consensus among TC-TALUS Board members to change their schedule for the year. The meeting schedule will remain the same until further notice.

## **8. LUTS Membership Update**

M. McCauley reported that Warren Studley and Heather Harris-Brady – both at-large members – have resigned and that Mark Roper asked that Mary Pitcher represent Benzie County. He also reported that 12 members have signed and sent in recommitment letters. G. Lile said that he felt that a resolution could be passed by each governing body at the table regarding the commitment, which would be a more binding commitment than an individual recommitment. S. Erickson-Bornschein agreed and said that this could be expanded to include non-profit organizations and other agencies. J. Wolf asked for leeway and discretion with non-profit commitment as to whether Board approval was needed. M. Pitcher said that she felt that G. Lile's suggestion was imperative. J. Hooper agreed that there should be discretion regarding Board approval/involvement at the non-profit level. G. Lie said that he felt particularly strongly about the unit of government resolution of commitment process. S. Erickson-Bornschein mentioned that a resolution could be drafted for the units of government and that a reminder letter be developed and sent annually to other stakeholder members. This issue was sent to the Agenda Committee for proposal development. J. Lively asked that the committee consider how to involve or “sign on” other units of government who are outside of the TC-TALUS service area. M. McCauley clarified that this issue was confined to LUTS membership, not the support of the LUTS process or study.

## **9. Organization/Agency Stakeholder List Proposal**

J. Nelson reviewed the proposal regarding how the study can extend its work within the study area by supplying the consultant with information about stakeholders in the community. J. Nelson shared his own perspective – that the Watershed Center has a mailing list, that a member of the Watershed Center Board is a member of the Three Lakes Association who has its own mailing list, etc., and that these lists might be accessed by the consultant to engage more people in the study process. J. Hooper asked if the consultant had requested this; he was concerned that the list would sit on the shelf. J. Lively said that the consultant has proposed distributing newsletters and those will have to go to someone. He said that helping the consultant develop a mailing list is a useful activity to assist with outreach. J. Nelson briefly discussed the key stakeholder interview process proposed by the consultant and a potential role for volunteers to assist with this to expand public involvement. There was consensus to move forward with the proposal and brainstorm ideas in small groups.

## **10. Stakeholder Identification/Engagement Discussion**

Participants broke out into small groups to 1) identify stakeholders and 2) identify processes for individual members of LUTS to reach out to constituents or members of their own groups, and 3) identify potential unique qualifiers for individual participants based on their specific interest areas, etc. The public was invited to participate. (Notes from small group discussion are attached.)

J. Wolf said that this conversation pointed to the purpose of the LUTS Group; she felt that it was important to be very clear about future activities that this group would perform which would help the consultant. J. Nelson said that he felt that one role of the LUTS Group would be to regionalize the approach. D. Luciani agreed that the regional component of the study needed to be enhanced, regardless of the current, formal parameters. He said that it would be important to have common messages to send to constituents, preparing them to be involved optimistically in the process.

There was a proposal to submit these notes to the Communications Subcommittee. K. Smith felt that the LUTS Group should meet early on with the consultant to determine how the group can best assist the consultant's work. He said that overcoming stakeholder skepticism will be an important job. M. McCauley suggested waiting for the consultant to come on board in order to structure the stakeholder list. J. Nelson said that it was important to get the message out prior to the consultant coming on board. J. Wolf suggested that the Communications Subcommittee develop some bulleted talking points for people to include in newsletters, etc. G. Lile agreed with M. McCauley; he said that developing stakeholder lists were not anything new to them and that they might have a good idea about the direction to head in terms of the list. **There was consensus that the notes regarding stakeholder lists would be sent to the Communications Subcommittee and that the Subcommittee would develop some talking points and unified message to share now with constituents prior to the consultant coming on board.** M. Tonneberger and G. Lile shared a concern and requested that the talking points/message be reviewed by the consultant prior to the message's release.

#### **11. New Business**

No new business was addressed.

#### **12. Announcements**

B. Otwell reported that TC-TALUS's membership has expanded – several new representatives have been added, including John Nelson as a Citizen-at-Large member and TCAPS. K. Smith announced that NMEAC is hosting its Environmentalist of the Year Program at its annual meeting on April 20<sup>th</sup>. He is seeking nominations. J. Wolf announced that BATA was notified that its facility achieved a Gold LEED certification. S. Erickson-Bornschein complimented BATA on their hard work and commitment.

#### **13. Meeting Evaluation/Facilitator Survey**

W. Joseph asked participants to fill out the evaluation before leaving the meeting.

#### **14. Set Subcommittee Meeting Times**

Communication Subcommittee – Wednesday, March 28<sup>th</sup> – 3:30 p.m. at NWMCOG

Funding Subcommittee – Wednesday, March 14<sup>th</sup> – 3:00 p.m. at NWMCOG

Agenda Subcommittee – Thursday, April 26<sup>th</sup> – 9:00 a.m. at NWMCOG

Next Coordinating Group Meeting – Tuesday, May 1<sup>st</sup> – 2:00 p.m. at Traverse Area District Library

#### **15. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

#### **16. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

