

# Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

## DRAFT Meeting Minutes

March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

### Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein  
Virginia Coulter  
Linda Forwerck  
Kathleen Guy  
Heather Harris-Brady  
Jay Hooper  
Andy Knott  
Jim Lagowski  
Glen Lile  
Jim Lively  
Doug Luciani  
John Nelson  
Bob Otwell  
Patrick Pahl  
Rise Rasch  
Derith Smith  
Ken Smith  
Linda Smyka  
Warren Studley  
Janet Wolf

### Members Absent

Joe DeKoning  
Gary Derrigan  
Robert Gattin  
Ken Kleinrichert  
Bill Kurtz  
Doug Mansfield  
Wayne Schmidt  
Lee Wilson

### Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Tom Kellogg  
Bill Ballard  
Doug Christensen  
Bob Carstens  
Matt Skeels

### Facilitators Present

Linda Racine  
Tom Shea  
Gerry Sell

### Staff Present

Matt McCauley

---

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

L. Racine welcomed everyone and explained the agenda.

#### **2. Review Proposed Agenda – 2:02**

No changes were suggested to the proposed agenda.

#### **3. Review February 7<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes – 2:05**

No changes were suggested to the February 7<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes.

#### **4. Report on RFP Status – 2:07**

M. Skeels reported on the status of the RFP. He stated that no official comments were received yet. He suggested that when the comments are received, TALUS appoint a tech-oriented subcommittee to look over the proposed changes. M. Skeels further stated that any changes suggested would be reviewed by LUTS before TALUS approval.

K. Smith asked for clarification on what “technical comments” would include. He stated concern for drawing out the process longer and suggested having the RFP Subcommittee look at any new comments. K. Smith suggested that TALUS Tech. Comm. members attend the RFP meeting.

V. Coulter expressed the importance of getting revisions done by the April meeting.

B. Otwell suggested that people outside of the process to give feedback on the RFP.

J. Lagowski proposed to post the draft RFP on the LUTS website in order to provide additional feedback.

R. Rasch stated that by posting it so publicly might cause a future conflict of interest.

V. Coulter suggested putting a disclaimer on the document to avoid conflict of interest.

L. Smyka suggested deferring to the RFP Subcommittee for further investigation.

#### **5. Report from delegation to MDOT – 2:28**

J. Lively reported on the meeting the LUTS delegation had with MDOT. He stated that the meeting was informative for the new MDOT director regarding the purpose of the project. J. Lively stated that no match was obligated by MDOT at this time, but that it was under consideration by them. D. Luciaini also stated that MDOT positively react to the inclusion of additional counties in the LUTS group.

#### **6. Report on match funding – 2:10**

M. Skeels discussed the governmental match received thus far. He also stated that the local match obligation for the Rotary Grant has been received.

B. Otwell discussed the local match progress of the non-governmental entities. He also stressed the importance of 100% participation.

J. Nelson suggested that the group seek other sources of funding as the process moves forward.

#### **7. Proposal on selection of Consultant Selection Committee – 3:05**

M. Skeels stated the time commitment involved is expected to be approximately 2 hours per proposal received. He also suggested that MDOT meet with the Consultant Selection Committee prior to explain the methodologies involved to pick a consultant. M. Skeels stated that 60-100 hours throughout the hiring process can be expected.

K. Smith asked what the range in time would be between proposals received and interviews. R. Rasch stated approximately 2-4 weeks.

J. Wolf stated that the time of year will also dictate who can be involved.

J. Lagowski presented the proposal regarding Consultant Selection Committee guidelines. Consensus, as stated below (changes in italics):

“It is proposed that the membership of the Land Use & Transportation Study Consultant Selection Committee be consisted of 6 or 8 LUTS members, three of which *holding* membership ~~to~~ *on both* the TC-TALUS Board and the LUTS Coordinating Group. The Consultant Selection Committee will be broadly representative and members must be willing to participate in the process fully.

*The Consultant Selection Committee will be facilitated and operate under the consensus model, with compliance to MDOT and FHWA procedure guidelines.*

The Consultant Selection Committee will welcome the attendance of the LUTS Coordinating Group and TC-TALUS Board during the oral interview stage of the process. LUTS Coordinating Group and TC-TALUS Board members will have an opportunity to comment on the oral interviews to the Consultant Selection Committee. Any recommendation made by the Consultant Selection Committee will first be subject review and consideration by the LUTS Coordinating Group before a final recommendation is made to the TC-TALUS Board.”

J. Wolf asked how the committee would be chosen. Expressed concern that the committee is broadly representative, she suggested that the conveners decide. J. Nelson suggested that a list of willing participants be made first. J. Lagowski agreed.

K. Smith stated that the final decision be made by consensus decision making. D. Luciani stated that the intention of the proposal was to operate under consensus.

R. Rasch asked how this proposal would align with TALUS responsibility as project manager. K. Smith expressed that ultimately the final approval would be through TALUS.

V. Coulter expressed concern that some TALUS members might feel left out of the process.

R. Rasch expressed concern that the scoring process be replaced by the consensus model. She stated that the consensus model might not acceptable by MDOT.

J. Wolf suggested that the RFP Subcommittee outline an expected consultant selection timeline prior to the next meeting.

#### **7. Proposal on the adoption of a LUTS Fact Sheet – 3:05**

K. Kleinrichert discussed the proposal regarding a group “Fact Sheet”. Consensus, with the stioulation that acronyms be spelled out and that the version be dated.

The group also requested that staff post the LUTS Fact Sheet of the study website.

#### **8. Update on MOU and Resolutions of Support – 3:30**

M. Skeels stated the content of the MOU and explained that a formal MOU for governmental units is forthcoming. He also stated that there will be a Resolution of Support document for use by non-governmental entities.

J. Lagowski asked when a formal MOU will be required. M. Skeels stated that a completed MOU would be needed prior to receiving the federal funds.

The group suggested that further MOU discussion be part of RFP Subcommittee Agenda.

#### **8. LUTS Membership – 3:35**

J. Lively discussed the LUTS member replacement progress and presented the “expand LUTS membership” proposal.

L. Smyka asked if there was consideration to expanding to a media and utilities representative.

D. Smith stated that the group shouldn't overly seek membership, so as to not slow the progress.

W. Studley suggested for an agricultural representative, the group might want to consider contacting the Farm Bureau.

J. Lagowski expressed concern that the invite is perceived to be at the tail end of the process.

W. Studley expressed concern that a specific number of new members not be invited because it might preclude interest by others that the group did not think to invite.

D. Smith asked if it was within the powers of the group to expand or if such a function is the duty of GT County as the original appointer. J. Lively said that formal approval would have to be made by GT County, but could originate in the group.

K. Smith expressed that to have better regional participation is important, it is also important that the right people are appointed that will effectively disseminate information to their constituents.

J. Lagowski expressed concern that additional counties be confused about their role

V. Coulter expressed that the duty of the consultant will be to bring in all the appropriate stakeholders. She further expressed that the group might not be able to give a clear definition of the group's role to new members.

D. Luciani stated that he feels expanding the group geographically is desirable, but the group might want to avoid too much expansion.

J. Hooper suggested expanding only to the geographical interests.

W. Studley expressed concern that the group is being exclusionary.

L. Smyka stated that much of the concern might be attributable to defining what the role of LUTS will be going forward.

W. Studley chose to stand aside on this proposal item. Consensus, as stated below (changes in italics):

*“It is proposed that the membership of the Land Use & Transportation Coordinating Group be expanded by ~~seven~~ five members, to ~~Five members would include a~~ representatives from Antrim, Benzie, Leelanau, Kalkaska, and Wexford Counties, with representation named by each respective county board. ~~The remaining two members would include a manufacturing and agricultural representative. Grand Traverse County will solicit and approve applications for the manufacturing and agriculture appointment.~~”*

New members will be asked to adhere to the group's mission statement and it will be expressed that the responsibility of the membership will include participation in the consultant selection process and assisting with the broadest public input in the visioning process.”

## **9. Review decisions – 3:40**

M. McCauley stated that decisions made by the group during the meeting.

## **10. New Business – 3:45**

H. Harris-Brady stated information regarding the MSU Land Policy Summit. She also asked for further clarification on the consultant selection guidelines.

J. Nelson suggested that staff write a grant application to the MSU Land Policy Summit.

**11. Announcements – 3:47**

M. Skeels announced the TV2 schedule of the LUTS meetings.

**12. Meeting Evaluation– 3:50**

J. Lagowski expressed that 2 hrs. was an appropriate length of time for the LUTS meetings.

S. Bornschein stated that the role of the group will constantly be reviewed by the group. K. Kleinrichert stated that a consultant might provide clarity on the group's vision.

**14. Set Subcommittee times – 3:55**

M. McCauley coordinated subcommittee meeting times with the group.

**15. Public Comment – 3:56**

B. Carstens expressed his pleasure with the group's continuing respect for each other and their synergy.

**This meeting was adjourned at 3:58**

---

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