

**Grand Traverse Area Land Use and Transportation Study
Coordinating Group
DRAFT Meeting Minutes
May 1, 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
Linda Racine
Paula Sagala

Staff Present

Matt McCauley
Matt Skeels

1. Welcome, introductions, & facilitator comments

The meeting began at 2:05 p.m. P. Sagala welcomed participants. Roundtable introductions were made.

2. Review proposed May 1, 2007 agenda

The agenda was reviewed and accepted by consensus.

3. Review March 2007 meeting minutes

The March 2007 minutes were reviewed and accepted by consensus.

4. Consultant contract report (M. Skeels)

M. Skeels reported that the sub-consultants have submitted all of the appropriate financial information. He stated that contract negotiations are currently being convened by MDOT officials.

5. LUTS staffing update (M. Skeels)

M. Skeels stated that the funding for NWMCOG staff time to the LUTS group is not being covered by the federal funding to the project. He discussed possible options to make LUTS eligible for federal funding. M. Skeels stated that he and NWMCOG are working with MDOT officials to resolve the issue. L. Smyka asked for clarification on why the language describing the LUTS group is used as “Project Advisory Committee.” M. Skeels stated the past sensitivities by the group to not be a subcommittee of TC-TALUS. J. Cartwright asked about options beyond federal reimbursement. M. Skeels discussed the possibility of Grand Traverse County providing the funding for LUTS staff. J. Nelson also suggested that the group approach federal officials to solicit approval.

6. Stakeholder proposal (J. Lively)

J. Lively discussed the proposal and gave national examples on how similar studies handled stakeholder involvement. He discussed the proposed role of the LUTS group in soliciting stakeholder involvement. L. Smyka asked for clarification on what the expectations of the stakeholders are. J. Lively replied that the stakeholders would receive communications relevant to the study. He further stated the stakeholders may be asked in the future to official endorse the study process. L. Smyka suggested that LUTS receive the current stakeholder list. J. Nelson suggested that before the individuals are identified, LUTS membership should speak to the stakeholders. J. Wolf asked for the first stakeholder event be planned prior to stakeholder identification.

7. Pursuing a coordinated contract proposal

J. Lively gave some background on the proposal. He discussed the history of the group and the original intention to provide land use and transportation study process to the 5-County region. He discussed the current restraints of the current federal dollars and stated the need for locally driven funding to complete the original intent of the group. B. Otwell stated that he asked Fregonsese & Assoc. to provide a proposal to address regional scenario planning in the surrounding counties.

8. Pursuing a coordinated contract discussion

S. Bornschein expressed that the proposal is a critical component of the study process. She stated the geographic diversity of the workforce in Grand Traverse County. J. Wolf expressed concern about the

increased level of LUTS involvement as a result of the proposal. She also expressed her desire to include Wexford County. D. Smith asked for clarification on the ability of LUTS to enter into a contract. J. Cartwright expressed concern that any plan should have local government endorsement before pursuing funding and contract. M. Pitcher asked what the local match would be. K. Smith stated that the issue has not been addressed yet. K. Kleinrichert suggested that local match be provided by all of the affected counties. B. Otwell expressed concern about the coordination of two studies. K. Kleinrichert expressed concern that as the TC-TALUS nears a contract, a side effort to seek a separate and coordinated contract might adversely affect the TC-TALUS process. J. Lively discussed the potential role of the NWMCOG to administer a coordinated contract.

9. New business

No new business was addressed.

10. Announcements

S. Bornschein announced that she spoke to the Economic Club about the LUTS process. She stated that the Economic Club expressed that the study should be results oriented.

M. Gillis stated the financial situation of the Grand Traverse County Road Commission. She also discussed the possibility of the road commission forming an advisory committee to address current financial situation. K. Kleinrichert endorsed the involvement of LUTS in other transportation planning activities.

11. Meeting evaluation

No comments were given.

12. Set Subcommittee meeting times

Staff set the following subcommittee dates / times:

Funding / Regional Scenario Planning: May 17, 3-4:30 p.m. @ Michigan Land Use Institute Offices

Agenda: June 18, 3-4:30 p.m. @ NWMCOG offices

The LUTS group requested that staff seek an alternate date for the next LUTS meeting. The LUTS group directed staff to cancel the July 3, 2007 meeting date and suggested June 26 or July 10 as replacement dates.

13. Public comment

Mary Gillis of the Grand Traverse County Road Commission stated some of the current activities the road commission is involved with. She also stated some of the current financial limitations of transportation planning and discussed the possibility of LUTS being able to collaborate with road commission activities.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by M. McCauley on May 1, 2007.