

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

February 7th, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein
Virginia Coulter
Joe DeKoning
Gary Derrigan
Linda Forwerck
Heather Harris-Brady
Bill Kurtz
Andy Knott
Jim Lagowski
Glen Lile
Jim Lively
Doug Luciani
John Nelson
Bob Otwell
Rise Rasch
Wayne Schmidt
Derith Smith
Ken Smith
Linda Smyka
Janet Wolf
Lee Wilson

Members Absent

Jennifer Cohoon
Robert Gattin
Kathleen Guy
Jay Hooper
Ken Kleinrichert
Doug Mansfield
Patrick Pahl
Warren Studley

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

William Ballard
Richard Lewis
Dennis Aloia
Bob Carstens
Tom Kellog

Facilitators Present

Wanda Joseph
Tom Shea
Gerry Sell

Staff Present

Matt McCauley

1. Welcome, Introductions, & Facilitator Comments – 2:00 p.m.

W. Joseph introduced the facilitators welcomed everyone and led a roundtable introduction.

2. Review Proposed Agenda – 2:02

W. Joseph explained the consensus process and stated the guiding principles of the group.

No changes were suggested to the proposed agenda.

3. Review January 3rd Meeting Minutes – 2:05

No changes were suggested to the January 3rd meeting minutes.

4. Announcement of vacancies; procedures for filling – 2:07

Staff stated that J. Cohoon has resigned from the group, due to educational reasons and that GT County has produced an ad to fill the vacant “youth” position.

Staff also stated that D. Mansfield is seeking to find a replacement for his position. J. Nelson stated that the MTA will be working towards nominating a substitute.

5. Report on match funding – 2:08

Staff reported that the non-governmental match thus far has equaled \$3300, representative of contribution from The Watershed Center, NMEAC, and TART.

M. Skeels reported that GT County has confirmed \$2500 towards the match, too.

Staff reported that MDOT has not made an official statement in regards to the level of match they will contribute.

6. Report from RFP Subcommittee – 2:10

A. Knott discussed the progress of the RFP group and the RFP document. Further discussed some of the key issues that were discussed during the RFP Subcommittee meeting. Discussed that a final version would be available for the larger group to approve the RFP at the March 7th meeting, then TALUS, then MDOT for final approval.

D. Luciani suggested that the LUTS group may want to consider meeting before the next scheduled meeting to expedite the process. He further expressed that credibility of the process is linked to the RFP creation and he believed February be the month the RFP was finalized. D. Luciani stated that a strong commitment to finalizing the RFP would help public perception of the process. A. Knott discussed the process of the RFP finalization as it relates to the meeting schedules of LUTS and TALUS.

V. Coulter discussed the possibility of moving both the LUTS and TALUS meetings. J. Nelson stated that he would prefer the meeting dates remain for the LUTS group. B. Otwell proposed that the group meets a week from today (2/7) with the singular purpose of approving the RFP. J. Wolf suggested that the process be done via e-mail. L. Smyka stated the importance of meeting. J. Lively stated that someone should be able to relay the process to TALUS. L. Smyka suggested that e-mail be used as a tool in the process to expedite the process.

H. Brady suggested that changes be distributed to the LUTS group by 2/8 for staff revisions. She then suggested a meeting on 2/13 to discuss RFP approval.

J. Nelson asked how the group can approve the RFP without viewing a final version.

R. Lewis informed the group that the meeting cannot be done via e-mail.

K. Smith stated that he is not in favor of a special meeting based on group scheduling conflicts, suggested keeping the regular meeting.

S. Bornschein proposed making the meeting @ 4:00 p.m. on 2/13 to finalize the RFP. Consensus.

M. Skeels stated that he has attempted to contact Mr. Grow, regarding the “sole source contract” but has been unable to.

7. Discussion of Memorandum of understanding / Resolutions of Support – 3:05

V. Coulter suggested moving the consultant selection committee be part of the March agenda.

J. Nelson asked if the MOU is a statute or a policy of MDOT. Asked if a subcommittee could approach the MOU authorship, in coordination with M. Skeels. Staff stated that differentiating between MOU and Resolution of Support might be made on behalf of MDOT to better accommodate the governmental and non-governmental entities of the group.

S. Bornschein suggested that the cover letter and a resolution of support also be part of the RFP Subcommittee's duty.

L. Smyka discussed that only the governmental units would be required to participate in the MOU process. Further asked the usefulness of a MOU for non-governmental bodies.

7. Discussion of role and composition of LUTSCG going forward – 3:05

J. Lagowski discussed the relationship between the process timeline and the role of LUTS.

J. Nelson expressed that when the consultant comes on board the real work of LUTS will begin. K. Smith discussed the need of a stakeholder group as the process continues. Further discussed the need of a citizen-led process. B. Kurtz stated the need for community support throughout the process.

G. Derrigan stated the possible need for broadening stakeholder membership.

L. Forwerck stated the need to know how to replace members as needed.

L. Wilson stated that the largest hurdle in the process will be effectively engaging the public.

D. Smith stated that public involvement will be a duty of the consultant.

S. Bornschein stated the need for additional membership to the stakeholder group to achieve buy-in at an early stage.

J. Lively stated that expansion of the group to county representation is critical to the success of the process.

J. Wolf stated the need for understanding what the public will want out of the process.

L. Forwerck discussed the importance of being inclusive to within the county, too.

J. Lively proposed the formation of a subcommittee to discuss geographic and functional representation.

J. Nelson suggested that the Agenda Subcommittee be asked to complete that task.

G. Coulter expressed concern that expansion may not be necessary.

K. Smith suggested adding the issue of turnover to the Agenda Subcommittee Agenda.

J. Lagowski suggested that "public" include seasonal and non-seasonal residents, tourists, and those who provide good, services, and jobs.

W. Schmidt expressed that much of the definition of public will be facilitated by the consultant.

J. Nelson expressed the need to place the activities of LUTS on all of the agendas of the groups represented.

V. Coulter expressed the importance of guarding the process and not defining the outcomes.

8. Review decisions – 3:30

Staff restated the date and time of the special RFP meeting to occur on 2/13; 4:00 p.m.

9. New Business – 3:35

None stated.

10. Announcements – 3:40

J. Lively stated that MLUI recently received a PAL Grant.

D. Luciani stated that NDFG received a Kellogg Grant for the guidebook publication.

11. Meeting Evaluation – 3:45

J. Nelson expressed that he was pleased with the group adherence to the “guiding Principles”, especially with regards to patience and trusting.

K. Smith stated the work of the RFP Subcommittee has been very positive.

12. Set Subcommittee meeting times – 3:47

Staff coordinated the meeting time of the subcommittees with the group.

13. Public Comment – 3:50

None.

This meeting was adjourned at 3:51.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by M. McCauley (NWMCOG) on February 8, 2006.