

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 3, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein

Virginia Coulter

Gary Derrigan

Linda Forwerck

Kathleen Guy

Heather Harris-Brady

Ken Kleinrichert

Andy Knott

Jim Lagowski

Glen Lile

Jim Lively

Doug Luciani

John Nelson

Bob Otwell

Patrick Pahl

Mark Roper

Wayne Schmidt

Derith Smith

Linda Smyka

Warren Studley

Robert Gattin

Doug Mansfield

Ken Smith

Amanda Schlagel

Janet Wolf

Members Absent

Joe DeKoning

Jay Hooper

Ron Kea

Bill Kurtz

Rise Rasch

Sheridon Rhoads

Jessi Sedlachek

Mary Tonneberger

Lee Wilson

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Dennis Aloia

Lee Grant

Bob Carstens

Tom Emling

Facilitators Present

Wanda Joseph

Tina Allen

Gerry Sell

Staff Present

Matt McCauley

Megan Olds

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

W. Joseph welcomed everyone and explained the meeting agenda. She stated that videotape of the last meeting is available for further review.

2. Review Proposed Agenda

The proposed agenda was reviewed and consented to as is.

3. Review September 5th, 2006 Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were reviewed, no changes were suggested.

4. Natural Features Inventory Workshop (J. Nelson)

J. Nelson discussed that M. Olds is working with H. Edwards on a Natural Features Inventory on Dec. 5 from 6-8 p.m. at the Traverse Area District Library. He requested that all LUTS members attend.

5. Communications Subcommittee Report

a. LUTS meeting with Record Eagle Editorial Board (J. Nelson)

J. Nelson stated that the LUTS group met to discuss talking points with the Record Eagle. He also D. Smith questioned the timing of the submitting a forum article. J. Wolf stated that most of the meeting time will be spent answering questions from the Editorial Board. D. Smith expressed concern with the consensus process regarding this agenda item and the time proximity between writing a forum article and hiring a consultant. W. Joseph clarified the consensus process. L. Smyka asked for clarification on the reasoning behind meeting with the Record Eagle Editorial Board. J. Nelson replied that the purpose was to reiterate the group's purpose and future steps. D. Smith also expressed concern that TC-TALUS be well represented in any discussion with the Record Eagle Editorial Board.

S. Bornschein discussed the letter composed by H. Brady stating the possible timeline of the project. V. Coulter also stated concern with the timeline of communication activities. J. Wolf discussed the timing and what would be discussed with the Record Eagle. J. Nelson also reiterated that the meeting would be between LUTS and the Editorial Board, not with an individual reporter to give a basis for future articles. L. Smyka agreed and suggested that such a meeting occur on a regular basis. J. Lively gave background on where the request to meet with the Record Eagle came from. D. Smith expressed her continued reservations about the timing of the meeting. K. Smith discussed that the group takes on a high risk if constant and clear communication isn't engaged with local media. A. Knott stated the importance of being proactive with the media. W. Studley stated that the media is a stakeholder with the group and the study. K. Guy encouraged the group to inform all media outlets – IPR, Business News, etc. – including the Record Eagle. This recommendation was referred to the Communications Subcommittee.

b. Record Eagle Forum Report (J. Wolf)

J. Wolf stated the forum piece has been tentatively scheduled for December. She stressed that depending on the progress towards hiring a consultant and their recommendations.

c. LUTS Marketing Plan Report (J. Lively)

J. Lively stated the Communications Subcommittee has paused towards the creation of a LUTS Marketing Plan. He further stated that it was recommended by the subcommittee to wait with the development of a LUTS marketing plan until a consultant was hired.

d. Speaker's Bureau to Member County Boards (Staff)

M. McCauley reviewed the Speaker's Bureau sign-up sheet. Staff have scheduled five County Board of Commission meeting agenda appearances: one each for Antrim, Benzie, Kalkaska, Leelanau, and Wexford Counties. Members should contact Matt to schedule participation and presentation at these meetings on behalf of the study process.

6. RFP Update

a. Consultant Selection Committee Report (M. Skeels)

M. Skeels reported that the Consultant Selection Committee met yesterday. The committee reviewed and scored and numerically ranked the five proposals that were received. Two firms were selected for interviews: Mead & Hunt and CDM. All five firms have been contacted with this news. Interviews are scheduled for the 25th and 26th of October. The committee will be meeting again tomorrow to discuss the details of the interview and the questions that will be asked of the consultants.

H. Harris-Brady discussed her concerns about the proposal process. She said that we did not, as a group, provide ourselves with a mechanism to confirm that the firms that responded to the RFP were what the group was looking for. She said that she would like for the final recommendation for consultant selection to come before LUTS to review the recommendation in-depth, prior to the recommendation being submitted to TC-TALUS. A. Knott said that he appreciates H. Harris-Brady's concern but said that he felt that there were world class elements of the proposals that were submitted. V. Coulter said that the selection committee can still reserve the right to not select any of the proposals that were submitted. K. Smith said that he has been apprehensive about the "world class" issue since the beginning, but that he had a sense of relief and excitement about the proposals that the group received and that he has reviewed as a consultant selection committee member. He said that the proposals are very good.

b. Project Administration Team Proposal (J. Lagowski)

J. Lagowski gave some background for the proposal and explained the proposal (insert). M. Skeels explained that the purpose of the team is to help him manage the contract process – without burdening the full LUTS group with day-to-day administration. J. Wolf said that she hoped that volunteers from the group who have experience managing grants and contracts would step forward. K. Guy asked if this was then the group who was authorized to make expenditures. J. Lagowski clarified that this was an advisory group. K. Smith asked what the scope of the group's authority would be – what is "helping Matt"? J. Lagowski said that the function was administrative; it was not a progress review group. The contractor would still be meeting with LUTS and the TC-TALUS Board for progress meetings. M. Skeels said that tasks could include reviewing invoices and ensuring that the consultant would be reviewing progress reports for compliance with the contract. LUTS and TC-TALUS would be responsible for directional change issues and contract

amendments, and final review of work products developed by the consultant. The Project Administration Team would have a “first review” of deliverables. G. Lile asked if M. Skeels were comfortable signing checks on the advice of others. He said that the fiscal responsibility was M. Skeels’ and TC-TALUS. M. Skeels said that the Project Administration Team would be making a recommendation to the TC-TALUS Board regarding invoice payment. He said that he would prefer to have a Team looking at work products and progress and bill payment. L. Forwerck said that she understood, as a project manager for other projects, where this request for a Project Administration Team was coming from. She said that a team would be beneficial. V. Coulter said that she understood sharing the responsibility of approving invoices and having multiple sets of eyes. She asked about the number of people proposed and recommended five as opposed to seven. K. Smith about the composition and the need to have some LUTS members, some TC-TALUS members, etc. He asked why not just make this a committee composed of just LUTS members. J. Lagowski said that the TC-TALUS Board would be the fiduciary and would be responsible for paying the bills. He said that the objective was to have a team that included members from both LUTS and TC-TALUS. K. Smith asked what decision-making process would be used by the Project Administration Team. He said that the LUTS group has been using the consensus process; he asked if the Team would use the same process. J. Lagowski said that this had not been discussed. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that if the Team is just about invoice administration that she is not concerned; but she is concerned if this team would function as a first round review group of consultant products. K. Smith said that he was concerned that the decision-making process was not specified. He requested an amendment to the proposal: that the decisions of the Project Administration Team would be made by consensus. He also expressed concern about the Team’s review of the consultant products, because the team would straddle the boundaries between TC-TALUS and LUTS. He said he would not have a problem if the membership were half and half between TC-TALUS and LUTS. K. Guy recommended that the Team review work products with an eye toward whether or not the consultant met the letter of the contract, rather than a broader review. This discussion was left open, as it played into the discussion of future roles which was next on the agenda.

Proposal (original w/ consented revisions struck through and underlined):

It is proposed that in response to TC-TALUS’s request to the Land Use and Transportation Committee on 9/5/06 to form a Steering Committee for the purpose of project management that a “Project Administration Team” be formed comprised of at least 3 individuals, ~~with LUTS and TALUS membership, 2 sole LUTS members, and 2 sole TALUS members~~ but not to exceed 4, and to include Derith Smith, Wayne Schmidt, and Ken Smith. The Project Administration Team will provide oversight to the day-to-day operations of the project study and will allow for project management decisions by a small group of people rather than one individual.

It was the wish of the Agenda Subcommittee that initial membership to the Project Administration Team be on a volunteer basis; however, it was discussed that Consultant Selection Committee members might be appropriate for membership to the Project Administration Team.

7. Land Use & Transportation Coordinating Group Operations

a. Future Role of LUTS Proposal (A. Knott)

A. Knott explained how the Agenda Committee developed the proposal by consensus. He read the proposal. Discussion: H. Harris-Brady felt that the organization of the joint meeting would be very important, and felt that it should be facilitated, and that there should be an agenda to follow. J. Nelson asked if there were an existing subcommittee who could work on those issues. K. Smith proposed that the Agenda Committee organize this meeting. V. Coulter said that she thought that a consultant could make a presentation to the joint group at this meeting. A. Knott said that he saw this meeting as a first public meeting to get together with the consultant to talk about the study. V. Coulter saw it as an opportunity for both groups to get together with the consultant to offer the groups' connection to the community. D. Smith asked if the agenda could be written jointly with TC-TALUS and the selected consultant. The group reached consensus that the agenda could be formed by the Agenda Subcommittee with input from TC-TALUS.

It was clarified that the intent was that the consultant would attend the bi-monthly meetings of the LUTS Group. K. Smith commented that the bi-monthly meetings could be joint meetings with TC-TALUS. J. Lagowski said that the intent of the proposal was to make the monthly progress meetings open to anyone who wanted to participate – that it is a progress report to the whole community. The language was changed in section #5 of the proposal to “work with local units of government to assist them in implementing” the study results. Additional changes included: referring the development of the agenda and the process of the meeting to the Agenda Committee in section #1, and that the bi-monthly meetings would be with the consultant in section #2 of the proposal.

Proposal (original w/ consented revisions struck through and underlined):

- 1. TC-TALUS and LUTS jointly meet with the hired consultant to clarify the scope of work for the Grand Traverse Area Land Use & Transportation Study. The meeting will be organized by the LUTS Agenda Subcommittee.*
- 2. Beginning in November 2006, the LUTS group meet bi-monthly with the consultant to review and discuss study progress and provide any necessary recommendations to the TC-TALUS Board.*

3. *LUTS partners with the consultant to identify and engage project stakeholders during the study process.*
4. *LUTS continue to look beyond the scope of the current study to identify additional projects and to acquire the funding necessary to implement such projects*
5. ~~*LUTS will hold local government officials accountable for the implementation of the study results.*~~ *LUTS will work with local government officials to assist towards the implementation of the study results.*

b. LUTS Membership Orientation, Retention, and Turnover Discussion (J. Lively)

J. Lively said that his proposal came out of last month's discussion. He said that the Agenda Committee discussed orientation, on-going membership, and other issues and invited others to participate in a future discussion about this issue at the next Agenda Committee meeting.

8. Review Decisions

M. McCauley reviewed the consensus decisions of the group (insert).

The group revisited the proposal regarding the development of a Project Administration Team. V. Coulter said that she would propose a three-person team (one LUTS, one TC-TALUS, one "swing") work on bill payment and contract review, that the group work by consensus, without facilitation. K. Smith proposed a four-person team, all LUTS members (2 of which are TC-TALUS members). V. Coulter said that she would prefer to "swing" towards TC-TALUS since they are ultimately responsible for the contract and this is a bill payment committee. S. Erickson-Bornschein asked who would like to volunteer, based on their qualifications and interest, and that this could drive the membership. W. Schmidt said that he would volunteer to serve. M. Skeels said that accounting expertise is not required, but that experience with grants might be helpful. J. Nelson said that project management decisions need to be very clearly defined for this Team, and that it is simply management and administration, not scope of work changes or inferences. J. Wolf asked about the administration of the entire grant. M. Skeels said that the Team was more of an oversight group and that the contract management compliance is not an issue and that he has the support he needs. J. Lagowski said that the charge to LUTS – not the Project Administration Team – is to manage the consultant's progress. L. Forwerck said that her experience with grant projects is that staff is a funnel for the invoices, and that her perspective is that the Team proposed is an advisory group to help M.Skeels get through the paperwork submitted by the consultant. She saw the progress meetings as separate.

W. Joseph asked if there were concerns about having three members on the group. K. Smith and D. Smith volunteered. A three member group was formed: W. Schmidt, K. Smith, and D. Smith. There were no

concerns about this proposal. The proposal was accepted by consensus. S. Erickson-Bornchein said that anyone could attend any meeting of this Team and that the meetings would be transparent. V. Coulter recommended that LUTS forward these names to TC-TALUS. K. Smith said that he did not think that TC-TALUS could add another person to the list. A. Knott recommended that the proposal read: “the Project Administration Team not exceed four individuals”. The group consented to this change. The proposal was accepted as changed (insert).

9. New Business

The group wished J. Lagowski a happy birthday.

10. Announcements

There were no announcements.

11. Meeting Evaluation

J. Lagowski asked that the room be configured differently to move people closer together for the next meeting.

12. Set Subcommittee Meeting Times

Communications Subcommittee - 3:30PM on October 16th at NWMCOG’s office, 2194 Dendrin Drive
J. Lagowski asked that stakeholders be identified in preparation for the consultant’s activities at this meeting.

The subcommittee will also discuss communicating with all area media outlets.

Agenda Subcommittee – 9:00AM – 11:00AM on October 23rd at NWMCOG’s office, 2194 Dendrin Drive

The subcommittee will be addressing the agenda of the joint TC-TALUS and LUTS meeting with the consultant, as well as discussion items from this meeting and the previous Agenda Subcommittee.

13. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

The meeting adjourned at 3:53PM.

These meeting minutes are respectfully submitted by M. Olds, Oct.3, 2006.