

**Land Use and Transportation Study Group**  
**DRAFT Meeting Minutes**  
**September 6, 2005**  
**2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

Traverse Area District Library  
Traverse City, Michigan

Coordinating Group Members Present:

Jennifer Cohoon	Youth Representative
Virginia Coulter	Traverse City Housing/Home Stretch
Gary Derrigan	Traverse City Area Public Schools
Joe DeKoning	Bay Area Transit Authority
Linda Forwerck	Citizen-at-large
Robert Gattin	Traverse City Convention and Visitor's Bureau
Kathleen Guy	Northwestern Michigan College
Heather Harris-Brady	Citizen-at-large
Jay Hooper	Grand Traverse County Road Commission
Ken Kleinrichert	Traverse Area Association of Realtors
Andy Knott	Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians
Bill Kurtz	Acme Township
Jim Lagowski	Traverse City Transportation and Land Use Study
Jim Lively	Michigan Land Use Institute
Doug Luciani	Traverse City Area Chamber of Commerce
John Nelson	Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay
Bob Otwell	Traverse Area Recreation and Transportation Trails, Inc.
Rise Rasch	Michigan Department of Transportation
Wayne Schmidt	Grand Traverse County
Ken Smith	Northern Michigan Environmental Action Council
Linda Smyka	City of Traverse City
Warren Studley	Citizen-at-large
Lee Wilson	Garfield Township
Janet Wolf	Munson Healthcare

Coordinating Group Members Absent:

Sally Erickson Bornschein	Homebuilders Association
Glen Lile	East Bay Township
Derith Smith	Elmwood Township
Patrick Pahl	Blair Township
Doug Mansfield	MI Township Association-Grand Traverse County Chapter

Meeting Facilitators:

Linda Racine  
Paula Sagala

Notetaker/Staff

Matt McCauley	Northwest Michigan Council of Governments
Megan Olds	Northwest Michigan Council of Governments

Public Present:

Dennis Aloia  
Richard Lewis  
Bob Carstens  
Tom Kellogg  
Gerry Selle  
Tom Shea

---

*Proposals are displayed in Italics*  
CONSENSUS IS DISPLAYED IN SMALL CAPS

**I. Welcome and Introductions (2:00 p.m.)**

L. Racine welcomed the group and led roundtable introductions.

**II. Review Proposed Agenda (2:02)**

L. Racine discussed the use of a time “slush fund” to allow for the time extensions of agenda items.

H. Harris-Brady asked why her previous proposal to standardize the way proposals are presented was not an agenda item.

M. Olds stated that her proposal was given to the Communications Sub-Committee for their review.

*H. Harris-Brady proposed that all proposals should either be written by the sponsor or that staff write the proposals verbatim for submission to the Coordinating Group.*

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSED AGENDA AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT IT AS IS.

**III. Review August 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting Minutes (2:04)**

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE AUGUST 2<sup>ND</sup> MEETING MINUTES OF THE COORDINATING GROUP THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT IT AS IS.

**IV. Report on Henton Sub-Committee (2:05)**

J. Lively discussed the activities of the Henton Sub-Committee and stated that September 30<sup>th</sup> as the day Mr. Henton will be coming to speak to the public and to the Coordinating Group. J. Lively also stated that Grand Traverse County and the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians are paying for the costs associated with Mr. Henton’s services.

K. Smith urged that everyone participates and to think of some critical questions to ask of Mr. Henton. K. Smith also stressed the importance of publicizing the event.

B. Otwell asked if the monies rose for Mr. Henton to speak could be used as match towards the MDOT funding.

J. Lively replied that it might not, due to fiscal years not matching between the two activities.

D. Luciani offered to publicize the event through the Chamber’s communication network.

K. Guy suggested that local media outlets be contacted.

J. Lively asked for suggestions on venue.

**V. Communications Sub-Committee Proposals (2:17)**

K. Kleinrichert discussed the Communications Sub-Committee proposals.

**PART 1**

AFTER NO CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE INTEGRATION OF BULLETIN BOARD SOFTWARE INTO THE COORDINATING GROUP'S WEBSITE AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS.

**PART 2**

AFTER NO CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE CONTENT OF THE COORDINATING GROUP'S WEBSITE AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS.

**PART 3**

H. Harris-Brady discussed the timeframe necessary to place e-mail to sub-committee members.

J. Wolf expressed concern about the transferring of e-mail viruses.

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE USE OF E-MAIL AS THE PRIMARY METHOD OF COMMUNICATING SUB-COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS.

**PART 4**

J. Wolf asked where the NWMCOG office is.

J. Nelson asked how written notes would be displayed.

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE USE OF A DESIGNATED COMPUTER AT THE NWMCOG OFFICES TO ACCESS ALL ELECTRONIC INFORMATION RELEVANT TO THE COORDINATING GROUP ACTIVITIES AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS.

**VI. Public Engagement, Awareness, and Education Proposal (2:27)**

J. Lively discussed the proposal and the reasoning behind it.

H. Harris-Brady asked if such a proposal should be part of New Business. L. Racine explained that the proposal was an outcome of the Agenda Sub-Committee.

J. DeKoning asked if the intent of the proposal was to reach the public or the media. J. Lively responded, "both."

K. Smith stressed that the reasoning behind the proposal was to increase public awareness of the group and the process.

J. Lagowski stated that local units of government need to be part of the proposed strategy, too.

K. Kleinrichert asked the group for input to be used at the next Communications Sub-Committee.

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE TO CREATE A PPPUBLIC EDUCATION, ENGAGEMENT, AND AWARENESS STRATEGY AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS.

**VII. Funding Sub-Committee Proposal (2:35)**

B. Otwell discussed the Funding Sub-Committee proposal, including the fee schedule and timing required, with the group.

J. Wolf suggested that staff draft such a letter to research funds available.

M. Olds asked for clarification on whether the letter is from TC-TALUS or the Coordinating Group.

J. Wolf suggested both. J. Lively agreed.

B. Otwell offered to help staff draft the request letter.

J. DeKoning suggested stressing how the funding received would work in regards to local match and to include a better definition of the “funding formula” as stated in the proposal.

H. Harris-Brady expressed concerns that local citizens will have no stake in the process if all of the funding is received from organizations and agencies.

D. Luciani stated that the public is contributing through the possible contributions of the local units of government.

K. Guy asked of the match requirements and their purpose towards implementation or towards the hiring of a consultant.

K. Smith suggested that the public could be financially involved if they choose to.

H. Harris-Brady suggested putting a contribution mechanism on the website.

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP DISCUSSED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE CREATION OF A FUNDING REQUEST LETTER TO VARIOUS UNITS OF GOVERNMENT AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS, WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE “FUNDING FORMULA” BE BETTER DEFINED AND THAT STAFF DRAFT THE LETTER.

#### **VIII. Break (2:55)**

#### **IX. RFP Sub-Committee Proposals (3:11)**

J. Lively discussed the RFP Proposals.

##### **PART 1**

R. Rasch asked for clarification on what counties is part of the “5-county area.”

K. Smith asked for clarification on what the TC-TALUS service area is. M. Skeels stated the service area.

J. Jagowski stated that the group should refer to the legislative wording concerning the geographic area.

R. Rasch commented that Grand Traverse County is the primary focus of the language, but that other counties could be involved to extent of their impact; however, Grand Traverse County should be the focus of federal funding request, scope or ask for clarification from FHWA geographic scope as related to federal funding.

V. Coulter suggested rewording the proposal.

J. Hooper expressed concerns about the language regarding five counties.

K. Smith expressed that the intent of the proposal was to be considerate of the five county area, with implementation in Grand Traverse County.

W. Studley suggested mirroring the legislative language in describing the geographic scope.

R. Rasch suggested different wording.

J. Lively suggested that a five county study would look primarily at land use and that transportation would be the focus in Grand Traverse County.

J. Nelson expressed concern that the group might be constrained in its activities by funding requirement wording.

J. Wolf suggested sending the proposal back to the sub-committee for revision of the wording.

L. Smyka suggested not sending back to sub-committee, expressed that conversation was productive.

H. Harris-Brady suggested that the consultant assist in the determination of the geographic scope. K. Smith disagreed.

R. Gattin suggested that the study would determine the geographic scope.

J. Wolf asked if townships should be included in the language as well.

J. Hooper suggested merging the legislation language with the geographic scope language. R. Rasch agreed.

K. Smith stated that the role of the consultant should be to facilitate the visioning. Also asked if the proposal gave enough emphasis on land use. J. Lively agreed.

J. Lagowski stated that the focus of the study needs to be transportation oriented and suggested the use of the TC-TALUS service area.

J. Lively expressed concern that some areas might be neglected by using the TC-TALUS service area.

L. Smyka stated that the TC-TALUS area is not static and change is expected.

L. Racine stated that the agenda item expired in its allotted time.

K. Kleinrichert suggested a 10 min. extension.

J. Wolf suggested sending the proposal back to the sub-committee. V. Coulter agreed.

J. Hooper stated that language that includes a five county region might be problematic.

J. Lively suggested that J. Hooper be involved with the RFP Sub-committee to discuss rewording options and stressed the importance of this decision towards acquiring a consultant.

THERE WAS CONSENSUS BY THE COORDINATING GROUP TO SEND BACK THE RFP SUB-COMMITTEE PROPOSAL TO THE RFP SUB-COMMITTEE FOR REVISION.

### PART 3

K. Smith discussed the need for “boiler plate” language as a starting point towards the creation of an RFP. Also, K. Smith suggested that the RFP include visioning, study, and implementation duties to one consultant.

P. Sagala stated that the agenda item expired in its allotted time.

K. Smith suggested adding twenty minutes to complete exercise.

D. Luciani and R. Rasch asked what the outcome of the exercise will be.

K. Smith stated that the exercise would provide context and qualities of a consultant and study.

L. Racine suggested that small breakout groups handle the exercise and the results be given to K. Smith. The group agreed as such.

J. Nelson expressed concerns of the process being rushed.

AFTER NO FURTHER CONCERNS OR COMMENTS, THE GROUP REVIEWED THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE STANDARDIZATION OF THE RFP LANGUAGE AND TO BROADEN THE RFP SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND THERE WAS CONSENSUS TO ADOPT AS IS.

**X. Attendance Proposal (4:42)**

J. Wolf suggested that the last two agenda items be deferred to the next meeting.

H. Harris-Brady stated that agenda items should be kept.

BECAUSE OF TIME LIMITATIONS, THE GROUP REACHED CONSENSUS THAT THIS AGENDA ITEM SHOULD BE ADDRESSED AT THE NEXT COORDINATING GROUP MEETING IN OCTOBER.

**XI. REPORT ON COMPILATION OF EXISTING STUDIES AND REPORTS (4:44)**

BECAUSE OF TIME LIMITATIONS, THE GROUP REACHED CONSENSUS THAT THIS AGENDA ITEM SHOULD BE ADDRESSED AT THE NEXT COORDINATING GROUP MEETING IN OCTOBER.

**XII. Review Decisions (4:45)**

M. McCauley stated each of the agenda items that the group achieved consensus on.

**XIII. New Business (4:48)**

H. Harris-Brady asked how Mr. Henton's time will be spent by the Coordinating Group.

K. Smith suggested that group members attend the next Henton Sub-Committee meeting.

J. Nelson suggested that the group seek some flexibility in the use of the funds.

**XIV. Announcements (4:50)**

J. Lively announced the work of Envision Utah and suggested that group members look at it as a possible best practice.

M. Olds announced the "How to Pay for Infrastructure Conference"

M. McCauley announced the web address that will be used for the Group's website ([www.landuseandtransportation.org](http://www.landuseandtransportation.org)).

**XV. Meeting evaluation (4:55)**

L. Forwerck suggested that refreshments be served at the next meeting.

J. Wolf suggested that agenda time be followed more closely.

L. Smyka suggested that if there are any future exercises that the exercise be given to the group members beforehand to conserve time.

**XVI. Public Comment**

There was no public comment; however, Ann Rogers left a handout to be given to the group concerning "Peak Oil."

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m. Minutes respectfully submitted by Matt McCauley, Northwest Michigan Council of Governments