

Land Use and Transportation Study Group
DRAFT Meeting Minutes
June 23, 2005
6:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.

Oleson Center, Northwestern Michigan College
Traverse City, Michigan

Coordinating Group Members Present:

Sally Erickson Bornschein	Homebuilders Association
Jennifer Cohoon	Youth Representative
Virginia Coulter	Traverse City Housing/Home Stretch
Gary Derrigan	Traverse City Area Public Schools
Linda Forwerck	Citizen-at-large
Robert Gattin	Traverse City Convention and Visitor's Bureau
Heather Harris-Brady	Citizen-at-large
Ken Kleinrichert	Traverse Area Association of Realtors
Andy Knott	Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians
Bill Kurtz	Acme Township
Jim Lagowksi	Traverse City Transportation and Land Use Study
Glen Lile	East Bay Township
Jim Lively	Michigan Land Use Institute
Doug Luciani	Traverse City Area Chamber of Commerce
Doug Mansfield	MI Township Association-Grand Traverse County Chapter
John Nelson	Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay
Bob Otwell	Traverse Area Recreation and Transportation Trails, Inc.
Patrick Pahl	Blair Township
Rise Rasch	Michigan Department of Transportation
Wayne Schmidt	Grand Traverse County
Derith Smith	Elmwood Township
Ken Smith	Northern Michigan Environmental Action Council
Linda Smyka	City of Traverse City
Warren Studley	Citizen-at-large

Coordinating Group Members Absent:

Joe DeKoning	Bay Area Transit Authority
Cheryl Gore Follette	Northwestern Michigan College
Jay Hooper	Grand Traverse County Road Commission
Megan Olds	Northwest Michigan Council of Governments
Janet Wolf	Munson Healthcare
Lee Wilson	Garfield Township

Meeting Facilitators:

Tom Shea
Linda Racine
Wanda Joseph
Gerry Sell

Notetaker/Timekeeper

Patty O'Donnell

Public Present:

Bob Allen
Dennis Aloia
Bob Carstens
Suzann Jacobs
Jack Kelly
Tom Kellogg
John Olson
Matt Skeels

I. Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator T. Shea led the group in an introduction exercise. Roundtable introductions were made. Facilitators and Notetaker were also introduced to the group. T. Shea explained the goals of the agenda; including, consensus training and to setup a steering committee.

Proposal: K. Kleinrichert asked for the break timeline to be shortened. The group agreed.

Proposal: V. Coulter requested approval of the minutes at the beginning of every meeting.

II. Pros and Cons for Consensus

Group members broke into small groups of three or four and introduced themselves. The following two questions were asked of the group:

1. What are the advantages of Formal Consensus Decisionmaking? and 2. What issues, concerns, or questions do you have? Each small group then reported out with discussion. T. Shea answered most of the questions.

III. Standards for Meetings

Discussion of creating group “principles” as highlighted in the book, *On Conflict and Consensus: A Handbook on Formal Consensus Decisionmaking*. A written “code of conduct” which along with the mission statement is the criteria for evaluating and accepting proposals. The facilitators, notetaker, and member from the Committee held a mock meeting with the group observing and critiquing.

There was discussion on developing a set of principles for the group to function by. There was consensus to bring the list of the basic principles outlined in the Handbook as a base model to the group at the next meeting.

IV. Structure, Flow, Rules for Consensus

T. Shea stated that this group will be working under the Formal Consensus process shown on Page 17 of the Handbook – Level 1: Broad open discussion; Level 2: Identify Concerns; Level 3: Resolve Concerns. Alternative Closing Options: Stand Aside, Send to Committee, Declare a Block. Discussion followed.

Committee members read aloud the Rules for Consensus (Pages 15-16 of the Handbook)

V. Office Meeting Using Consensus

A. The facilitators open the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

B. Agenda Review

The group reviewed the agenda and there was consensus that any proposals for the group should be made in writing and sent out prior to the meeting.

C. Proposals

1. That a mission statement be developed for this group
2. That a steering committee be formed for the next meeting
3. Doug Henton be invited as a guest speaker at the next meeting

D. Discussion

1. Discussion on the development of a mission statement. There was a question on the timing of drafting the principles and the mission statement together. The group spent a few minutes reviewing the wording of the Richard Lewis, Traverse City Manager's presentation at the May meeting. Ideas listed:
 - a. Take request from the three co-conveners
 - b. Make recommendations and proposals back to the co-conveners
 - c. Focused on transportation and land use
 - d. What is the geographic scope
 - e. Transparency and accountability to the public
 - f. Develop scope of work for the world class consultant
 - g. What is the scope of this group
 - h. Identify funding sources
 - i. Alignment with legal process
 - j. Buy-in and ownership of the stakeholder groups
 - k. Initial memorandum/invitation from Dennis Aloia
 - l. Make it short

The concerns that were discussed were geographic scope of the mission statement; funding sources; and the issues of visioning, planning, and implementation of this project.

2. That a steering committee be formed for the next meeting. There was a proposal that the Mission Statement volunteers be the steering committee for the July 2005 meeting.
3. Doug Henton be invited as a guest speaker at the next meeting: Jim Lively presented and distributed a proposal handout regarding the hiring of Doug Henton from the Alliance for Regional Stewardship. Discussion followed on the topics of timing, funding, does this require bid proposals, is this the right person at this time, supportive of outside help, and what is our regional scope.

E. Call for Consensus and Decisions Listed

1. There was consensus that the group develop a mission statement. Volunteers to develop the mission statement include: John Nelson, Jim Lively, Wayne Schmidt, Sally Bornschein, Jim Lagowski, Andy Knott, Jennifer Cohoon.
4. There was consensus that the Steering Committee include the same members for the Mission Statement: John Nelson, Jim Lively, Wayne Schmidt, Sally Bornschein, Jim Lagowski, Jennifer Cohoon.
2. There was consensus to delay the hiring of Doug Henton at this time. This proposal will roll over to the Steering Committee.

F. Proposals (New Business)

1. That the standards for meeting procedures be designed (Principles)
2. Other proposals:
 - A. Clear concise summary of funding related to this project
 - B. Consider frequency of meetings
 - C. Consideration of a budget (subcommittee recommend)
 - D. Meetings be recorded or taped to be available to those who miss meetings
 - E. Clarify role with TC TALUS
 - F. History of what studies pertaining to this study have been already done
 - G. Report out from the participants in the Alliance for Regional Stewardship Boot Camp

G. Review Decisions

Decisions under agenda item E. were read by the notetaker.

H. Evaluation and Close of the Official Meeting

Comments:

1. Need more time – vote to extend time for larger discussions
2. Distribute action items at least a week prior to the full group meeting via the Steering Committee
3. Clarify actions at the end of the meeting
4. Introduce everyone around the table and the public at each meeting

The meeting was closed at 8:52 p.m.

VI. Agenda Committee Practice

Group members broke into small groups of three or four to create an agenda, with time for each item for the July 18, 2005 meeting for experience in setting up an agenda. The steering committee will meet to develop the next meeting agenda. The samples were collected.

VII. Evaluation of the Training

1. Is this a clock-controlled process? It feels that you cannot do business as accurately as possible.
2. Assign realistic blocks of time to agenda items.
3. Need a timeline for items. This is a contract for time, but it can be changed with consensus from the group.
4. Suggested a web site forum for review of proposals. H. Harris-Brady has placed studies for review at www.grandtransport.4t.com.
5. Does everyone have email?
6. Address consensus training for those who were not at the meeting.
7. Practice mocks are good, helped to walk through the process.
8. Not enough time.
9. Breakouts and assignments were helpful to incorporate into future meetings.
10. Timeframe of group's process; no clear ideas of the groups' role, tasks, funding.

VIII. Public Comment

1. Bob Carstens: There is an urgency to accomplish this process as development continues.
2. Jack Kelly, Kalkaska County, NWMCOG Planners Review and Advisory Committee: Please look at a regional focus, not just Grand Traverse County and the limited seats at the table. He has volunteered as the liaison to the Northwest Michigan Council of Governments' Planners Review and Advisory Committee. Land use and transportation go hand in hand.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Patty O'Donnell, Northwest Michigan Council of Governments