

**Grand Traverse Land Use and Transportation Study Coordinating Group
Coordinating Group
Draft Meeting Minutes**

Members Present

John Cartwright
Virginia Coulter
Joe DeKoning
Gary Derrigan
Jim Lively
John Nelson
Bob Otwell
Mary Pitcher
Rise Rasch
Sheridan Rhoads
Wayne Schmidt
Ken Smith
Linda Smyka
Mary Tonneberger

Public Present

Harold Chase
Doug Christianson
Tom Emling
John Fregonese
Robert Grow
Richard Lewis
Christine Maxbauer
Matt Skeels
Lynn Wilson

Staff Present

Sarah Lucas
Matt McCauley

Facilitators Present

Linda Racine

September 11, 2007

1. Welcome

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. L. Racine welcomed participants.

2. Review proposed agenda

B. Otwell noted that minutes for the May 21 meeting should be compiled and posted. K. Smith requested that participation and attendance be addressed under New Business. The agenda was accepted as modified by consensus.

3. Review May 2007 Meeting Minutes

J. Cortwright stated that he was in attendance, but the minutes do not reflect that. Staff will make corrections as noted. The minutes were accepted as modified by consensus.

4. Review Study Timeline

D. Christianson of Meade and Hunt handed out copies of the study timeline covering the next three months and reviewed the schedule. He noted that the license plate video project was scheduled to occur today; however, due to the weather, the company is holding off. They will be here all week and will wait for better conditions, to ensure that we have good data. He continued that the logo and theme have been selected and referred to the logo titled "The Grand Vision."

Other activities for this week include a radio interview, project “champions” meetings, presentations at Munson Healthcare, presentation with planners and zoning administrators, and public presentations. A draft of the “Task 1” document will ready by September 21; the final draft will be complete by October 12. The first scenario planning workshop will be held on October 17, from 6:30 to 9:30, with another workshop held in early November. He stated that participation at workshops is low between mid-November and mid-January. J Nelson asked if the group would agree on a set of philosophical principles prior to the scenario planning workshops to help guide the process. Fregonese replied that there are already a number of common themes and goals that have come out of other studies and plans. At workshops, we can invite people to acknowledge these common themes and focus on how to achieve them. D. Christianson explained that the Task 1 document will take all studies that have been done and create a “Reader’s Digest” format which will be available before the first workshop. Grow explained that the consultants will start with a couple scenarios. use of the “trend scenario,” which will show where you’re going, versus where you say you want to go. There have been a lot of regional studies with guidelines and goals, but what has been happening here doesn’t match those goals.

M. Pitcher asked if scenario planning workshops were going to be held in other locations. J. Fregonese answered that there would be 6 workshops; the first would be overall, but we would also like to “zoom in” on certain areas within the study area. J. Nelson asked if there is a list of stakeholders and how would the consultants decide who to interview. D. Christianson answered that there is no list and the consultants do need guidance on who to interview.

J. Lively discussed the Public Involvement Committee (PIC) and said there’s a lot of work to be done in getting more people involved in the process. He feels that if the LUTS committee wants to stay engaged in the process, this committee is where they should focus their energy. B. Otwell feels the PIC is an effective group and should be formally adopted as a subcommittee of LUTS. J. Nelson and K. Smith expressed support for that idea.

J. DeKoning asked for clarification on the “champion” concept and B. Otwell explained that the champion idea evolved out of the PIC. The committee came up with categories, i.e. agriculture, and came up with a list of 18 people that are very recognizable and can speak positively about this study process. J. Lively noted that many of the champions that were identified by the committee have already been contacted and some came to the meeting yesterday. J. Nelson clarified that this group is not making any decisions but will only “champion” the process in terms of public relations and will not issue directives.

Fregonese commented that the champions should be able to offer advice on how to improve on the process. Grow agreed and said that the more people that “own” the process the better the study will be. These champions have “convening” power; people and the press will listen to them.

K. Smith stated he hopes that all of us in this group are champions as we all have credibility within our own networks.

J. Nelson clarified that if B. Otwell's proposal is adopted, the PIC will be endorsed by two groups, TC-TALUS and LUTS. We should be careful about what this group can and can't do. He added that he hopes the consensus process would be used in this group. J. Cortwright asked how those of us that are not in the PIC would be involved in this discussion. J. Lively stated that this committee is the place where we all need to be paying attention.

By consensus, the LUTS Coordinating Committee formally adopted the PIC as a subcommittee, to operate by informal consensus. Membership is open to anyone in the community that's interested. Meetings are held at 9 a.m. in the Governmental Center on Wednesdays.

5. Funding/RSP Subcommittee Report

J. Lively explained that the RSP committee was formed to address the possible expansion of scope of contract in order to include the contiguous 5 counties in the study. One critical issue is that funding is currently constrained, by federal language, to Grand Traverse County. The language needs to be changed by Congress. Also, we still have to reach out to these counties.

[Aide for Representative Dave Camp] reported that Representative Camp is supporting the change and hopefully the bill will pass by the end of the year. Harold Chase reported that the language change is part of a bill that Senator Levin has been trying to pass. He thinks there's a hold on the bill, which is not a good sign. They are looking at adding this language to other legislation.

Grow stated that if this language will eventually be amended, we should work on getting the paperwork figured out ahead of time. Nothing would happen financially until it's approved. M. McCauley reported that at the RSP Subcommittee, we agreed that we will start talking to contiguous counties to encourage their participation in the Grand Traverse study, and in their own regions in the event the language is approved.

6. Role of LUTS - Discussion

K. Smith explained that the committee would break into groups for discussion on the responsibilities of the committee. The three questions for discussion would be: What opportunities exist for LUTS to make the study more successful? How can LUTS best ensure that the Study is engaging the public? What LUTS meeting schedule best suits the outcomes of the above questions? Committee members broke into groups for discussion.

Group 1 reported that saw the committee's role as working through the PIC. Not all LUTS members can engage weekly; but we should have weekly meetings with good agendas and minutes that show discussion. Also we should focus on implementation; this group should ensure that this study doesn't just sit on a shelf.

Group 2 summarized that they felt the role was to endorse the PIC and use the broad base of representation as opportunities to network within our own groups – through newsletters, county commissions, etc. This can help determine who should be interviewed and identify more people to get involved.

Group 3 reported the group's role should focus on networking. Members should be alert to both the coordinating group and to concerns within our networking group, and should bring concerns to consultants, this group, and the PIC. We should encourage opposition to get involved directly.

Fregonese stressed the importance of getting local government involved. You will need local government champions; as well as local government representatives that will listen to peers who have gone through this process. The coordinating committee should be integrated with local government.

Grow clarified that the PIC would become a day-to-day coordinating committee. He felt the overall LUTS group may want to consider changing the name to The Grand Vision. He noted that the coordinating group will ensure fairness and stability in the process and will function as "guardians" of the process.

V. Coulter noted that there are several groups involved - LUTS, TALUS, champions, stakeholders – which is confusing. She feels we need to converge and focus on how we influence our communities.

Consensus to extend meeting by 15 minutes.

J. Lively handed out copies of an organizational chart and explained the relationships between the groups. Fregonese summarized that there are not different "ranks" of participants, but there are different levels of commitment.

J. stated that all of this group should become implementers. He noted concern over attendance. M. McCauley noted that the meeting date was changed, which could account for the low attendance.

K. Smith stated that all these groups should be wrapped together and brought into a single activity. We have to be sure it has flexibility, integrity, and accountability. R. Rasch felt the value in this group is to hear from other committees and be debriefed on public input, etc. V. Coulter felt we should empower our operational group that meets every Wednesday. She sees the coordinating group as "guardians" in case issues arise. We have an open committee to handle public awareness, etc.

It was agreed by consensus to keep the next Coordinating Committee meeting date for November 6, with two agenda items: 1.) debrief first scenario planning and 2.) determine schedule for next year.

8. New Business

Withdrawn – attendance addressed.

9. Announcements

M. Skeels handed out information on an asset management workshop handout from the Road Commission.

M. McCauley introduced new staff person, Sarah Lucas, who will be working as a Regional Planner in the Council of Governments office.

J. DeKoning reported that BATA has a millage renewal question on the ballot on November 6.

10. Meeting Evaluation

K. Smith commented that it was helpful to have the consultant team present.

11. Set Sub-committee times

It was agreed by consensus that the next Agenda Subcommittee would meet from 3-5 p.m pm October 23, at the NWMCOG office, with invitations extended to the full LUTS committee.

12. Public Comment

Tom Emling commented that he sat in on the PIC meeting and on the meeting held with “champions” and was impressed by the attendance. He heard several champions say that lots of visioning has gone on and ask how will this be different. In identifying local officials to participate – we could recruit those that have gone through the Citizen Planner program, and the elected officials that are involved in planning commissions.

Christine Maxbauer commented that she went to LUTS website and couldn’t access agendas. M. McCauley stated staff will address website issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.