

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

May 2nd, 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
Jay Hooper
Bill Kurtz
Andy Knott
Jim Lagowski
Glen Lile
Jim Lively
Doug Mansfield
John Nelson
Bob Otwell
Patrick Pahl
Rise Rasch
Wayne Schmidt
Derith Smith
Ken Smith
Linda Smyka
Warren Studley

Members Absent

Robert Gattin
Kathleen Guy
Ken Kleinrichert
Doug Luciani
Janet Wolf
Lee Wilson

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Matt Skeels
Carl Johnson
Dennis Aloia
Bill Ballard
Doug Christensen
Sharon Wise

Facilitators Present

Wanda Joseph
Gerry Sell

Staff Present

Megan Olds
Matt McCauley

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

W. Joseph welcomed everyone and led roundtable introductions. She also introduced new LUTS member, Amanda Schlagel. W. Joseph briefly explained the consensus process and stated the guiding principles of the group.

2. Review Proposed Agenda

No changes were suggested to the proposed agenda.

3. Review April 4th Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were not included in the mailed packet. This agenda item was deferred to the June meeting.

4. Report from RFP Subcommittee

- *Presentation of RFP as revised during 4-24-06 RFP Subcommittee meeting and proposal to approve and forward to TC-TALUS (V. Coulter)*

V. Coulter presented the final revision of the LUTS RFP. She commended those involved and discussed some of the latest revisions. J. Lively stated the omission of some of the dates and deliverables. M. Olds stated that staff will fill in those areas when appropriate.

L. Smyka asked if FHWA ever made comments to the current version. M. Skeels stated that FHWA had yet to contact him regarding the RFP. K. Smith asked if the RFP includes a percentage breakdown of the consultant's time per task. B. Otwell asked if the group would be comfortable with a project cost estimate provided by MDOT. J. Lively discussed what portions MDOT might assign cost estimates to. K. Smith stated that the consultants will be asked to provide a detailed cost estimate assigned to each deliverable in their price proposal. H. Harris-Brady made the distinction between an overly high or low cost estimate provided by MDOT and an overly high or low price proposal by the prospective consultant. R. Rasch suggested a formal submission of the RFP be provided by TALUS first before proceeding too far in the discussion. J. Nelson suggested that the suggested amount be left at \$1M. J. Lively expressed concern that the dollar amount be too low and suggested that MDOT review the RFP again to provide a more detailed cost estimate. J. Nelson stated that a cost estimate might not be necessary within the RFP, so as to not preclude potential bidders or processes. K. Smith discussed an approach to address some of the following concerns. He suggested that MDOT be allowed to provide a cost estimate to the RFP and further stated anything beyond that cost could be evaluated for inclusion in the study, whether supported by federal or local funds. G. Lile stated some of the possible disadvantages of attaching a cost estimate in the RFP. S. Bornschein agreed and suggested omitting the RFP value. A. Knott asked for further clarification on when the price proposal would be known by the consultant selection committee. R. Rasch confirmed that the submitted price proposals would be opened after the consultant is selected. K. Smith stated that a target number is reasonable, so that proposal are not too far apart.

The group reached consensus to adopt the proposal as presented.

- *Proposal to select Consultant Selection Committee members (M. Olds)*

M. Olds discussed the proposal and presented it for approval by the group.

J. Lively asked how many TALUS members is to be part of the committee. J. Lagowski stated that MDOT has asked TALUS to approve the Consultant Selection Committee. J. Nelson suggested that the committee present some operational guidelines prior to meeting. M. Olds stated that MDOT will meet with the committee prior to discuss some of the operational guidelines. B. Otwell stated that staff should have continued involvement through the selection process. J. Lively discussed some of the similarities between this process and others throughout the country.

The group reached consensus to adopt the proposal as presented.

5. Discussion of Memorandum of Understanding/Resolutions of Support (M. Skeels)

M. Skeels discussed the MOU and the Resolution of Support. He further discussed the process to have the appropriate bodies sign. V. Coulter asked if each of the TALUS members should be included as supporting agencies within the RFP. J. Lagowski agreed. J. Lively agreed and also suggested that the neighboring counties be asked to sign as well. D. Aloia expressed that the Resolution of Support be more supportive of the process, rather than any financial obligations. J. Lively stated that those concerns were addressed in the Resolution of Support. J. Nelson suggested that the Agenda Subcommittee, rather than the RFP Subcommittee. V. Coulter suggested that the Resolution of Support be expanded any group who would wish to sign. J. Nelson agreed. J. Lively suggested that the items be further discussed in the RFP Subcommittee. J. Lively suggested that draft copies of the MOU and Resolution of Support be exposed to Boards immediately.

6. Report from Communications Committee (D. Luciani / J. Lively)

J. Lively discussed the Stakeholder event to occur on May 18th. He further stressed the importance of broadening participation throughout the area. J. Lively distributed a brochure that described the meeting. He discussed the agenda for the meeting and stated the role of the LUTS group during the presentation.

J. Lagowski suggested that L. Smyka be included as a speaker and expressed concern about the omission of TALUS from the agenda. J. Hooper stated a meeting conflict with that night that might affect others. S. Borschein suggested adding a trailer to the televised meeting announcing the meeting..

7. Update on local match progress (D. Aloia)

D. Aloia discussed that the Road Commission and GT County has obligated \$100,000 towards local match. He also stated that \$25,000 request have been submitted to Traverse City and Garfield Township. He also stated that if Tribe money is sought that the deadline is approaching- suggested allowing the Agenda Subcommittee to submit a 2% revenue sharing grant application.

8. Update on LUT membership expansion

D. Aloia again announced the new youth representative, Amanda Schlagel. He also stated that a new township representative will be joining the group in June.

M. Olds announced the new appointments from Benzie and Kalkaska Counties.

J. Lively suggested an orientation packet created for new members.

9. Report on TC-TALUS Board activities

J. Lagowski stated that at the last TALUS meeting their by-laws were amended to invite BATA, TART, and the GTB to be voting members of TALUS. He discussed the reasoning and the process involved to include those organizations/agencies. J. Nelson suggested that TALUS host a forum regarding a natural features inventory and green infrastructure as part of the planning process.

10. Review decisions

M. McCauley reviewed each of the consented upon proposals by the group.

11. New Business

D. Aloia suggested that a 2% Grant application be pursued by the Agenda Subcommittee. He suggested that the application be on behalf of TALUS. B. Otwell suggested that the group decide on a dollar amount. D. Aloia suggested that \$50,000 be requested. H. Harris-Brady asked staff to seek comments from the Planning for Prosperity team to improve future grant applications.

The group reached consensus to pursue D. Aloia's suggestions as presented.

12. Announcements

J. Lively announced MLUI's newest publication, *Going to Town*.

M. Olds announced the upcoming form-based zoning workshop in Traverse City.

M. McCauley announced a May 19th meeting of the LUTS group from 8-9:30 a.m.

13. Meeting Evaluation

J. Lagowski reflected on that the group has been meeting for one year.

J. Nelson stated that while there is a sense that of finality, there's much yet to be done in the process.

K. Smith commended the RFP and the work that has been involved in that process.

L. Forwerck thanked the RFP Subcommittee for their hard work and time involved.

14. Set Subcommittee meeting times

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

- RFP: May 15th, 9-10:30 a.m.
- Communications: May 9th, 4-5:00 p.m.
- Agenda: May 15th, 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

15. Public Comment

D. Aloia suggested that LUTS and TALUS members be present during the transportation appropriations meeting. He also commended J. Nelson for his role as an alternate on the Consultant Selection Committee. B. Carstens expressed his satisfaction with the group's progress.

This meeting was adjourned at 3:31.