

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

October 4, 2005

Garfield Township Hall

2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present

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

Members Absent

Jennifer Cohoon
Linda Forwerck
Robert Gattin
Doug Mansfield
Ken Smith
Lee Wilson

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Matt Skeels
Bob Carstens
Wanda Joseph
B. McGillivary
Kelly Thayer
Tom Kellogg
Dennis Aloia
Richard Lewis

Facilitators Present

Paula Sagala
Tom Shea

Staff Present

Matt McCauley
Megan Olds

-
1. The meeting began at 2:02 p.m. Roundtable introductions were made.
 2. The proposed agenda was reviewed. The proposal by J. Nelson was reviewed (see attached). There were no issues or concerns with this proposal. The agenda was changed to reflect the accepted proposal. No other additions or changes were made to the agenda.
 3. The minutes from the September meeting were reviewed. No additions or corrections were made. The minutes were accepted, by consensus, as presented.

T. Shea shared observations about the group's use of the consensus process. He said that five sub-committees have worked to bring proposals to the Coordinating Group. He said that nine proposals were consented to by the Group. He said that the Agenda Sub-committee has also done a good job of addressing issues of concern and have designed effective agendas with built-in extra time. He said that participation depends on quality and quantity. On the whole, he felt that the quality of participation has been good. Regarding the quantity of participation, about 1/2 of members did not speak at all, some spoke a little bit, and a few spoke a lot. He also said that attendance has been an issue. He mentioned

this because the handbook said that if the group feels that attendance is an issue, that it could be addressed. He also shared his reflections about the RFP discussion at the September meeting. He felt that it was not as effective as it could have been. He said that the agenda is a contract, and that it can be changed by consensus. He also thanked and praised the group for the work they are doing on this difficult issue.

P. Sagala indicated that M. Olds would like to invite members of the public to sign-in and also to sign up to receive information about future meetings, including notices, and agenda packet information.

4. J. Lagowki reviewed the Attendance Proposal (4A) regarding attendance that was enclosed in the agenda packet. He invited discussion, with assistance from T. Shea. T. Shea asked if there were issues or concerns. V. Coulter asked if there had been any discussion about asking for a replacement, since some people are representing an agency. J. Nelson said that the intent was to ask people about their concerns about attendance, not to project those concerns. W. Studley's comments mirrored V. Coulter's. J. Wolf said that consistent attendance from a single person was important. S. Erickson-Bornshein indicated that meetings are held during work hours, and that this has affected her attendance at meetings. G. Lile said that timing was an issue no matter what time the meeting was held, during the day or in the evening. J. Nelson said that he was hopeful that taking into consideration all of these comments, that maybe this issue could go back to the Agenda Subcommittee. V. Coulter said that exploring reasons why attendance is an issue was a good idea. B. Kurtz said that maybe the group could take a vote to determine whether daytime or evening meetings are best. J. Nelson asked if T. Shea could just call for consensus on the first proposal (4A).

J. Lagowksi read Attendance Proposal (4B) regarding scheduling sub-committee meetings dates. T. Shea asked if there were any questions or discussion about this proposal. There were no issues or concerns expressed. There was consensus regarding this proposal.

Regarding the Attendance Proposal (4A): It was agreed that the issues expressed above were addressed by the proposal. ***There was consensus to accept the Attendance Proposal (4A).***

5. H. Harris-Brady presented the Communications Proposal. She shared that it is important to get an initial proposal down as presented. As a side note, she said that she hoped that someone would replace her position on the Communications Subcommittee. T. Shea asked if there were questions, concerns, or issues about this proposal. ***The Communications Proposal was accepted by consensus.***

M. McCauley presented the group's website: landuseandtransportation.org. He said that if anyone had photos that might be more representative of the process, to please feel free to submit them. He presented the home page, which describes the group's operating principles and mission. He showed the page where all agendas and minutes for the Coordinating Group and subcommittees can be downloaded as PDFs, as well as descriptions of all of the subcommittees' purposes. The list of members and contact information for the group are also listed on the site. M. McCauley said that the Bulletin Board/discussion forum software has not yet been integrated into the site. He said that will be up and running in the next few weeks. K. Guy said that the title banner should say "Grand Traverse." V. Coulter said that there needed to be a photo with automobiles. K. Kleinrichert urged other groups to post links to this site on their websites.

6. M. Olds presented the minutes from the meeting where Doug Henton presented. V. Coulter asked how many people attended the morning session. M. Olds indicated that there were about 35 people at the meeting.

7. V. Coulter introduced the brainstorming exercise. T. Shea and P. Sagala handed out an item, provided by V. Coulter, to inform the group about New Designs for Growth's work. V. Coulter briefly reviewed the item before introducing the brainstorming exercise.

T. Shea reviewed the reflections on brainstorming with the Group. He asked group members to suspend judgment and evaluation of each other's ideas. He referred to the handout, which posed some questions to keep in mind during the brainstorming session. J. Nelson clarified that the questions are just to get people thinking, but that people are not limited to answering these questions during the session.

The group broke out into six small groups. The small groups each brainstormed in a facilitated session for 30 minutes. The large group reconvened at 3:17. Each small group made a brief report about their brainstorming efforts, highlighting two or three ideas from their brainstorming session. Staff will be compiling all of the brainstorming notes, and the RFP Subcommittee will be sorting them and using the notes to develop the draft RFP.

8. There was a break at 3:22.

9. The meeting was reconvened at 3:35. P. Sagala reviewed the guidelines for proposal presentations: The proposal is read aloud, background is shared, and existing concerns that have been brought up are addressed.

J. Nelson presented the RFP Subcommittee Geographic Scope proposal. He shared background, and explained that the proposal has not been changed significantly. He explained that the benefits of this proposal are that we need to define the scope to move forward with the development of the RFP. He explained the major existing concern that J. Hooper brought up – that the scope was too broad. P. Sagala asked if there were concerns about the proposal. L. Smyka asked for clarification regarding TC-TALUS's boundaries with reference to Grand Traverse County. J. Hooper said that a concern he had was what was meant by the term "consideration." He said that his concern was related to membership expansion. J. Nelson said that "consideration" as a loose term, but that it did not automatically mean inclusion of new people in the group. He said that it might involve inclusion, depending on the interests of the group. He said that "consideration" does not automatically mean a "seat" on the Coordinating Group. J. Lively said that it was difficult to separate these issues – scope and representation, and that the issue should be addressed. K. Guy asked that the "core" be defined by naming the area. V. Coulter said that a map could also be used, and that maybe this should be an attachment to this proposal. There were no other concerns shared. J. Hooper's concern was revisited. He restated that his concern was about expanding representation of the Group. J. Lagowski said that you couldn't do a Grand Traverse County transportation and land use study without looking at the impacts of surrounding counties and the state. S. Erickson-Bornschein clarified that the group would have to develop consensus about expanding membership if that were to happen. J. Lively said that he would like the group to agree to address the representation issue in the future, as a separate issue. V. Coulter pointed out that the representation proposal had already been set aside at the last meeting as a separate agenda item. B. Otwell said that it did not make sense to change the composition of the Coordinating Group right now. He stated that he was comfortable with what was presented and recommended moving along with the process. J. Nelson

said that some people might approach the group to become part of the process. S. Erickson-Bornschein reiterated that this was an issue that could be addressed later.

The concern about the meaning of “consideration given” was discussed. This concern was addressed.

Hearing no other concerns, consensus was reached on the Geographic Scope Proposal, as presented.

J. Nelson presented a new proposal, per the agenda addition, regarding direction for the RFP Subcommittee (see attached). P. Sagala indicated that the time was up for this proposal. She said that there was extra time built into the agenda, but that there needed to be consensus to add time. S. Erickson-Bornschein proposed that 5 minutes be added to the agenda. V. Coulter proposed that this issue be sent to a subcommittee. J. Lagowski and G. Derrigan supported the proposal to send the proposal to committee. B. Otwell supported adding 5 minutes to the agenda, as did J. Lively. Those who indicated that they had concerns about adding 5 minutes, conceded to stand aside. Five minutes were added for discussion. J. Nelson spoke about how powerful it was for him to meet with Robert Grow of Envision Utah. Mr. Grow advocated for breaking the process into smaller parts, and that the proposal addressed this. L. Smyka said that this process was overwhelming and she would like to see it taken in manageable pieces. S. Erickson-Bornschein and W. Studley both indicated that they would like to see existing studies and data brought together. S. Erickson-Bornschein also said she would also like to have at least three proposals to consider regarding who to hire for this task. W. Schmidt said that this makes the process more digestible and that breaking it down allows the group to analyze which consultants to hire for specific phases and parts of the process. A. Knott agreed that this would be helpful. He said that this also emphasizes the Coordinating Group’s role. S. Erickson-Bornschein asked for clarification regarding how much of the “briefing book” the NWMCOG could create. V. Coulter asked if the parameters of the funding would allow for this. R. Rasch said that if this part of the process could not be covered by the federal funds, then the group would need to explore funding it in other ways. ***Further discussion on this issue will be addressed by the RFP Subcommittee.***

10. This item was dropped from the agenda, by consensus, at the beginning of the meeting.

11. J. Lagowski shared a report on TC-TALUS’s reorganization. He focused on reading the bulleted items at the bottom of the handout that was shared in the agenda packet. P. Sagala asked if there were questions about the report. A. Knott asked which counties might be included in a potential TC-TALUS expansion. J. Nelson said that he welcomed the ideas and openness and future dialogue and updates.

12. Ken Smith was not in attendance to share his report. This item was deferred to next month’s agenda.

13. M. Olds reported that there were two additions to the compilation – the Citizen’ Guide to Transportation Planning developed by NWMCOG, and the draft Visioning TC report, which was developed by William McDonough as a result of the Traverse City Convention and Visitor’s Bureau’s visioning initiative.

14. M. McCauley reviewed the decisions made at the meeting and read them aloud.

15. P. Sagala asked if there was any new business. H. Harris-Brady asked if a thank you letter could be sent from this group to the funders of the Doug Henton presentation. No other new business was presented.

16. A meeting evaluation was conducted. P. Sagala asked that in addition to verbal discussion, that group members fill out the half-sheet at their table to provide their written comments before they leave. J. Nelson commented that he liked the additional instruction regarding the proposal process via the workbook. L. Smyka asked that staff be commended for their work, and thanked them for their organization. J. Lagowski asked if there could be food at the next meeting. J. Nelson asked if a laminated card could be prepared that outlined proposal presenting – related to page 11 of the workbook.

17. Public Comment: K. Thayer made a comment about compiling background information. He said that a timeline should be established about how far back the compilation would cover. He said that of those studies, he hoped that the Hartmond-Hammond study would be included, and also that some thought be given to making people aware of that report as a source document and that there is an effort made to let people know that there are concerns about that report.

18. Subcommittee meeting dates were set. The RFP Subcommittee is meeting from 3pm-5pm on 10/10/05 and 10/17/05 at NWMCOG. A. Knott said that he thinks that R. Rasch needs to be at the meeting. She agreed to attend. The Communications Subcommittee meeting date was set for 10/18/05 from 4pm-5pm at NWMCOG. The Funding Subcommittee did not set a meeting date. The Agenda Subcommittee will meet 10/20/05 from 7am-8:30am.

19. There were no announcements.

20. The meeting was adjourned 4:19pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Megan Olds on 10/05/05.

Proposed Agenda Change for October 4th Coordinating Group Meeting

**Proposal Submitted by John Nelson
October 4, 2005, 11:15 a.m.**

Proposal, Part 1:

Delete item #10 on the proposed agenda.

Proposal, Part 2A:

Add the review of a new proposal, defined below, with item #7 or item #9 on the proposed agenda.

Proposal, Part 2B (new proposal language):

Direct the RFP Subcommittee to develop a scope of work for a first phase of a land use and transportation visioning, planning, and implementation process.

Suggested for inclusion are:

- To develop a design process or work plan for the development of community values, vision, planning, and implementation process;
- To collate existing studies and reports into “briefing books;”
- To suggest and recommend consultants to facilitate the next steps and help develop RFP’s for these next steps.

The Alliance for Regional Stewardship is a natural fit for the above-described work.