

# Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

## DRAFT Meeting Minutes

January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

### Members Present

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

### Members Absent

Jennifer Cohoon

### Members Absent (cont.)

Heather Harris-Brady  
Robert Gattin  
Jay Hooper  
Ken Kleinrichert  
Doug Mansfield  
Warren Studley  
Lee Wilson

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

Tom Kellogg  
Dennis Aloia  
Bob Carstens  
Richard Lewis  
Matt Skeels  
Gerry Harsch  
Kelly Thayer  
Ann Rogers

### Facilitators Present

Linda Racine  
Gerry Selle

### Staff Present

Matt McCauley

---

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

L. Racine welcomed everybody and explained the meeting structure for the day.

### **2. Review Proposed Agenda – 2:10**

L. Racine reviewed the proposed agenda with the group and asked if there was any questions or concerns.

J. Wolf suggested that the break be removed. There was consensus to remove the break from the agenda.

### **3. Review December 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes – 2:15**

L. Racine asked if there should be any modifications made to the December meeting minutes. None requested.

#### **4. Report on Stakeholder Meeting (J. Lively / D. Luciani) – 2:03**

J. Lively discussed the Chamber's Winter Retreat and the benefits of that meeting as a means to bring in a large group of individuals. He expressed that such a forum can be used as a model for the group to organize an event in Spring 2006 to raise awareness of the group's activities. The event would be coordinated by the Chamber and MLUI. D. Luciani expressed that it would be useful to create a stakeholder group to keep the community abreast of the group's activities. He also suggested that such a forum could provide further insight into expanding the group's membership. D. Luciani asked the group for its endorsement of such an event.

J. Wolf asked why the group couldn't wait until Mr. Grow would be available. J. Lively agreed and suggested that his entry into the process may coincide with such an event.

S. Bornschein expressed that there are some groups that should be included and added that the group should look more closely at the area's major employers.

G. Coulter expressed concern that the process would be slowed by including more individuals and suggested that Robert Grow could offer assistance.

J. Wolf expressed her concerns that public perception of this process is negative and suggested that the group should seek ways to speed up the process.

G. Lile suggested that negative publicity is a result of the public not understanding the purpose of the group.

K. Guy suggested that there are other ways to inform the public that might be more useful for the speed of the process.

L. Smyka discussed that the group cannot afford to fail and suggested that such measures that were discussed by D. Luciani and J. Lively would be perceived as positive.

L. Forwerck suggested that a timeline be accepted so the group's image be improved.

J. Nelson suggested that each Coordinating Group member has a responsibility to inform their specific stakeholders.

D. Luciani added that it is important to the Chamber to add the public to process as soon as possible.

K. Smith endorsed the idea and discussed that no matter the actions of the group there will be perception issues and he mentioned that it's the group's responsibility to manage the public's perception.

S. Bornschein expressed that Doug Henton suggested not to wait to the end to involve the public and suggested that media outlets be involved with the group at a greater level. She also discussed that learning the consensus decision-making process slowed the group, too.

R. Rasch asked if it was possible for any outreach activities to be channeled through the communications subcommittee.

J. Nelson expressed that outreach shouldn't be slowed by the group's decision-making process.

L. Smyka expressed that stakeholder events shouldn't always be the event of the group; rather the suggestion was to compliment the group's activities, not recreate them.

**5. Report on Agenda Subcommittee Role (D. Luciani) – 2:35**

D. Luciani discussed some of the shared concerns within the group regarding the speed of process. He explained that there might be opportunity to improve the process and expedite decision-making by relinquishing process-based decisions to the Agenda Subcommittee.

J. Wolf suggested not worrying about the name and that if more of the work is done at the subcommittee level and the larger group may not have to meet as often.

J. Lagowski suggested the group try it.

V. Coulter asked for clarification on the role of the subcommittee and asked if the Agenda Subcommittee would meet more often. D. Luciani stated that meeting frequency would probably be the result of what was required of the subcommittee at the time.

**6. Report on Funding Subcommittee Activities (B. Otwell) – 2:45**

B. Otwell discussed the activities of the Funding Subcommittee and the progress of the nonprofit match letter. He also stated that members should direct updates on their match requests to staff before February's meeting.

**7. No break was exercised.**

**8. Report on RFP Subcommittee Activities (A. Knott) – 2:48**

A. Knott discussed the activities of the RFP Subcommittee and the scope of services created in response to the group's agreement to approach Mr. Grow as a sole source contractor to:

- Review and report on similarities between past experiences and the current activities of the Land Use & Transportation Study Coordinating Group
- Review and provide feedback on the Land Use & Transportation Study Coordinating Group organizational and decision-making structure
- Outline a goals and strategies process to be used by the consultant during the Land Use & Transportation Study
- Outline a public participation strategy used by the consultant during the Land Use & Transportation Study
- Review and comment on the current project work plan and project consultant RFP

J. Lively expressed concern that Robert Grow would not be eligible as the general consultant for the project if used for such purposes. G. Coulter agreed.

J. Lagowski suggested that as soon as the next synthesized Work Plan is completed that it go to TC-TALUS Board, so as to expedite the process.

L. Forwerck expressed that the group might want forgo Robert Grow's services as the general consultant.

K. Smith discussed the pro and cons between having Grow's services now or later.

J. Lagowski suggested that the next synthesized version be shared with the larger group.

K. Smith expressed that the RFP committee is very close to a final product.

A. Knott discussed the positives of a “pre-bidders” meeting so all applicants understand clearly what would be the expectations of the process.

L. Smyka expressed concern that much of the conversation is based w/o speaking with Mr. Grow.

S. Bornschein suggested that the group move forward as quickly as possible with Mr. Grow.

P. Pahl suggested having another RFP meeting before the next Coordinating Group meeting.

K. Smith proposed that the group continue its current path because detailed conversations regarding the level of Mr. Grow’s desired involvement have not yet occurred.

### **9. Review Decisions (Staff) – 3:25**

No proposals or decisions were consented upon by the group.

### **10. New Business – 3:30**

V. Coulter suggested that the group look at how much the study would cost and expressed that Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) be pursued and suggested staff provides examples.

R. Rasch further explained the purpose of MOUs.

### **11. Announcements – 3:40**

No announcements were made.

### **12. Meeting Evaluation – 3:45**

L. Forwerck discussed that the meeting was very positive and that a two-hour meeting works better than a three-hour meeting. P. Pahl agreed.

K. Smith expressed that the group is working well together and that experience with each other has helped streamline the meeting times.

### **13. Set Subcommittee Meeting Times (Staff) – 3:50**

### **14. Public Comment – 3:55**

B. Carstens expressed concern that the meeting was not being taped for TC-TV2. Staff informed that the upcoming meetings would be taped.

M. Skeels announced TC-TALUS funds to tape the LUTS meeting. Also, he discussed the need to begin to raise match funds. He announced that contact have been made with area transportation agencies

S. Wise (representing Rep. Dave Camp) introduced herself to the group.

**This meeting was adjourned at 3:52.**