

# Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

## DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 04, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

### Members Present

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

### Members Absent

Jennifer Cohoon  
Linda Forwerck  
Robert Gattin  
Heather Harris-Brady  
Jay Hooper  
Doug Mansfield  
Patrick Pahl  
Ken Smith  
Lee Wilson

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

Dennis Aloia  
Bob Carstens  
Matt Skeels

### Facilitators Present

Paula Sagala  
Wanda Joseph

### Staff Present

Matt McCauley  
Megan Olds

---

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

P. Sagala welcomed the group.

#### **2. Review Proposed Agenda**

No changes were made and the agenda was consented to.

#### **3. Review March 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

J. DeKoning had a change to the minutes regarding his attendance. J. Smyka had a clarification on page 4. She said that the second “expressed” needed to read “invited.” She said that the minutes are not very clear and that they should be corrected. The changes were consented to.

#### **4. Agenda Subcommittee**

- **Conflict of interest proposal (J. Lagowski)**

J. Lagowski said that this item was brought up by D. Aloia at the Agenda Subcommittee. He read the proposal. He said the objective was to avoid conflict and the appearance of conflict during the bidding process. P. Sagala asked if there were any clarifying questions. There were none. D. Luciani expressed a concern that he thought a potential consultant would be conducting due diligence by contacting members of the group to learn more about issues within the community. S. Erickson-

Bornschein indicated that she had the same concern. J. Lagowski said that he thought that this proposal was mainly focused on the RFP and the bidding process. He said it was meant to ensure that consultants all had access to the same information. J. Nelson said that he had been approached and that there were two separate issues. One, that consultants might be bale to influence the RFP. Separately, he said that a consultant might want to talk to people on the Group about issues in the community. He said that he did not want to sit down with a potential bidder prior to the RFP being developed. J. Lagowki said that everything that we do is public information and proposals and minutes are available on the website. D. Aloia said that consultants could access the information on the website. He said that consistency is important and he would recommend that staff be the spokespeople for the Group. He said that he would caution people against offering their private opinions with consultants because it does not give a consistent message. V. Coulter said that she felt that this was particularly important for those who might sit as members of the Selection Committee. D. Luciani said he still saw this as an issue of due diligence, but that perhaps this was an issue of clarity: Were we asking that all RFP issues be addressed to staff and the website or that all issues related to the study be confined to staff's comments? D. Aloia said that a one-page Working Paper could be developed that could list what was appropriate and inappropriate. He said that anything related to the RFP would be inappropriate as well as anything that would indicate that a single individual was speaking on behalf of the Group. D. Luciani said that his concerns were resolved. B. Otwell said that he would like to have a copy of the Guidelines. M. McCauley said that the intention was that this would come back to the group for review. There were no other unresolved concerns about the proposal. Consensus was reached.

- **Consultant Selection Committee proposal (A. Knott)**

A. Knott read the proposal. He asked people to let staff know by a week from today. The subcommittee will bring the recommendation back to the full Group for consensus and confirmation. V. Coulter asked how the representation of the Group would be addressed. D. Smith asked why there was an even number instead of odd. R. Rasch asked how TC-TALUS would be notified. D. Aloia said that the subcommittee had discussed some basic guides for membership. The commitment will be extensive. S. Erickson suggested going with an odd number in case there is a tie. M. McCauley said that the group consented to having either 6 or 8 members. V. Coulter said that there was an issue raised regarding whether MDOT would allow the consensus process to be used by the Consultant Selection Committee. R. Rasch indicated that each member of the Selection Committee would be using a numeric scoring system to rank proposals independently. R. Rasch again asked how TC-TALUS would go about approving the Selection Committee. J. Lagowski confirmed that TC-TALUS will approve the membership of the Selection Committee – at an undetermined date. No other concerns were raised; consensus was reached.

- **LUTS membership expansion report (D. Aloia)**

D. Aloia said that no appointments have been made as a result of the public posting or the MTA. M. Olds reviewed the letter that was in the Group's packet that was sent to Antrim, Benzie, Kalkaska, Leelanau, and Wexford County Board of Commission Chairs.

## 5. Funding Subcommittee

- **MSU Land Policy grant application report (M. Skeels)**

M. Skeels gave a summary of the MSU land Policy meeting. The Group did not receive a grant, but M. Skeels thanked H. Harris-Brady for her hard work putting the proposal together. He said that we should apply again next year. J. Wolf asked if the group received any feedback about their grant. M. Skeels said that we did not receive any feedback about our grant. M. McCauley said that staff had been in contact with the Land Policy group regarding review of the RFP, so we may be able to get their feedback.

- **Match funding report (M. Skeels / D. Aloia)**

M. Skeels referred to the handout. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that Homebuilders Association was not shown as donating \$1000. She said that she needs to know if the check had been received. D. Luciani said that he thinks that the Chamber received the check. M. Skeels that that he would confirm and modify the handout. D. Aloia commented that he is attempting to put together a consortium of the larger municipalities to try to come up with the bulk of the match for the study. He is looking for \$100,000 from the County and the Road Commission. After that, he will go to the City and Garfield Township for \$25,000 apiece.

## 6. RFP Subcommittee

- **RFP progress report (J. Lagowski)**

J. Lagowski thanked MDOT staff for reviewing the draft RFP and for providing specific, clarifying comments. The Subcommittee met on March 21<sup>st</sup> for about 2.5 hours and worked through the draft with the combined comments from MDOT. He said that there was a land use portion that will receive additional review. M. McCauley said that the revised draft was sent to the MSU Land Policy Division. He said that staff highlighted areas in the RFP where land use was mentioned and that comments are expected to be received this week.

- **RFP walkthrough & discussion (M. Skeels)**

M. Skeels referred to the “Reader’s Digest” version of the RFP in the agenda packet. He reviewed this handout, point by point. J. Nelson said that there were definitions that were included in the original draft as footnotes. M. Olds said that they were moved to a definitions and acronyms page – the last page of the RFP.

- **Process milestones report (M. McCauley)**

M. McCauley reviewed a graphic representation of the process milestones, which was displayed at the meeting. V. Coulter said that MDOT indicated that the RFP, as it stands, is fully fundable. She asked if there were substantive changes made by the MSU Land Policy group, would MDOT have to officially review those comments to ensure that funding can be received. M. McCauley said that staff could work with representatives from MDOT to mediate any potential conflicts. J. Lively asked if MDOT had followed up with the FHWA Land Use staff to receive their comments. R. Rasch B. Otwell said that he has concerns about the new draft, primarily the prescriptive nature of what is being asked for. He said that there is a lot of auto-oriented analysis in the RFP. He said that the time frame has also changed from 50 to 25 years. He said that the RFP also requires the use of the TC-TALUS model, which can also only handle auto modeling, not non-motorized. L. Smyka said that she felt it was very important that the Group connect with FHWA. J. Nelson said that he wanted to be able to continue to make comments about the draft. He indicated that the definition of “natural features” was not in the RFP. M. McCauley said that this definition’s omission was a staff error and that the RFP was still a draft and that comments are welcome and encouraged.

M. McCauley said that he will send a copy of the process milestone chart to Group members.

V. Coulter asked when the public process would begin. M. McCauley said that this would occur 4-6 months from now. J. Lagowski said that it would be important to get the RFP approved in May. M. Skeels said that the funding is more of a limiting factor than the development of an RFP at this phase. J. DeKoning asked about the state match. M. Skeels said that we will be confirming local money prior to approaching the state for match. S. Erickson Bornschein asked if the goal of the RFP Subcommittee was to have a final version of the RFP by their next meeting. J. Nelson asked what the response from MDOT had been at the RFP Subcommittee meeting in March in terms of thinking

broadly and looking outside of the box. V. Coulter said that she felt that MDOT retained the important land use and environmental components of the RFP. J. Lively said that MDOT was very open to discussing alternative funding options – citing page 7. D. Aloia said that there still may be parts of the study that are not reimbursable under federal highway. He said that another thing we might want to think about would be to raise additional resources - \$100,000 or \$200,000 – to help with activities that are not reimbursable under FHWA. J. Lively said that one opportunity is with Kellogg and MSU. He said that MLUI has a good relationship with Kellogg and MSU and that there may be an opportunity for the Group to partner to receive research assistance. V. Coulter said that she thinks it's important to think in the long-range about this, beyond the study, and toward implementation. J. Wolf said that the study will be expensive. She said that she hears comments about whether there will be funding for implementation. R. Rasch said that one other thing that Susan Richardson (MDOT) had offered was a budgeting and fundraising session for local communities regarding project implementation. K. Guy asked whether it was necessary to include a ballpark amount in the RFP. M. Skeels said that there were two schools of thought on this. So far, the Group has leaned toward putting it on the table; MDOT has also assisted with identifying this cost range.

## **7. Communications Subcommittee**

- Stakeholder report (J. Lively)

J. Lively said that the goal of the Stakeholder Group is to gain support for the process among community leaders. He said that so far, people from MLUI and the TC Chamber/New Designs for Growth, Bob Sutherland (local businessman), Elaine Wood (NWMCOG), Marsha Smith (Rotary), and Bob Otwell (TART), and others have been involved. He said that an event is planned for May 18<sup>th</sup> that will raise the profile within the community of the land use and transportation issue. He said that the session will feature a keynote speaker, John Parr, from the Alliance for Regional Stewardship. He said that highlighting progress that the Group has made will also be a component of the session. The Chamber and MLUI will facilitate the session. He asked the Group if it would select a spokesperson for the event. There will be two special guests at the event – Kurt Steudle (MDOT Director) and Dr. Soji Adelaja (Director, MSU Land Policy Program). He invited Group members to attend a meeting at 4:15 (following the LUTS meeting) to discuss the event's planning. He added that there was potential for there to be a breakfast meeting on the morning of May 19<sup>th</sup> with the special guest speakers. P. Sagala asked if there were questions. S. Erickson-Bornschein recommended that the Group develop a scripted, layered approach to presenting the Group's progress at the May 18<sup>th</sup> event. J. Lagowski said that L. Smyka, as the Vice-Chair of TC-TALUS and a Group member, would be a good speaker. L. Smyka said that the layered approach sounded effective. J. Lagowski asked if the Communications Subcommittee could work on the presentation. The Group consented. J. Wolf asked about the time of the event. J. Lively said that the reception would begin at 6:00PM, hosted by the Chamber, and then the program would run from 7:00-9:00PM at the Hagerty Center.

- Public engagement theme proposal (K. Kleinrichert)

K. Kleinrichert read the first proposal. V. Coulter said "let's do it." There was consensus. K. Kleinrichert read the second proposal. J. Lagowski asked if this was meant to replace the name of the Group. K. Kleinrichert said that this was more for marketing and that it would not replace the name of the Group. A. Knott asked the Group consider changing the name of LUTS. He said that the name is confusing already. J. Lively said that after meeting with the Stakeholder Group, he thinks that a more creative name could be developed – perhaps raising some money to hire a marketing firm. He said that we might not want to rush into a name, but that we would need it by the time that the consultant arrives. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that if we are asking five other counties to join, that they might not be represented by the proposed name. Both J. Wolf and L. Smyka said that the involvement of the Stakeholder Group should be welcomed and that we should look forward to

hearing the ideas that they come up with for the name. The Communications Subcommittee withdrew their proposal.

## **8. Review Decisions**

M. McCauley reviewed the items that were consented by the Group.

## **9. New Business**

J. Lagowski asked for an update regarding the Memorandum of Understanding and Resolution of Support. He said that there was a new version that he will be running through the TC-TALUS Board and the Group.

## **10. Announcements**

- Chicago ARS Forum (J. Lively)

J. Lively reminded the Group about the Forum in Chicago. He said that the cost is \$250 for registration. Hotels can be reserved for \$190/night. He said that MLUI would like to provide transportation and is also seeking less expensive lodging. D. Luciani is planning to attend. MLUI is also pursuing scholarships from the Grand Traverse Regional Community Foundation. (The draft agenda was provided in the agenda packet.)

- FHWA Scenario Planning: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/scenplan/practices.htm> (M. Olds)

M. Olds explained that this was a resource that she would invite members to review.

R. Rasch announced the MDOT State Long Range Plan meetings that are being held in northern Michigan. She indicated that follow-up meetings will be held this summer, perhaps in Traverse City.

## **11. Meeting Evaluation**

No comments were offered.

## **12. Set Subcommittee Meeting Times**

*RFP Subcommittee* – April 13<sup>th</sup>, 1:30 – 3:30PM at Garfield Township Hall (Joint meeting with TC-TALUS Technical Committee) and April 24<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 – 10:30AM at NWMCOG office

*Communications Subcommittee* – April 18<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 – 5:00PM at NWMCOG office

*Agenda Subcommittee* – April 25<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 – 11:00AM at NWMCOG office

*Full LUTS Committee meeting May 19<sup>th</sup> at 7:00PM at the Hagerty Center (6:00PM reception)*

## **13. Public Comment**

**Meeting was adjourned at 3:46 p.m.**

---

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by M. Olds (NWMCOG) on April 4, 2006.