

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 11, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein
Virginia Coulter
Gary Derrigan
Kathleen Guy
Ken Kleinrichert
Bill Kurtz
Andy Knott
Jim Lagowski
Glen Lile
Jim Lively
Doug Luciani
Bob Otwell
Rise Rasch
Sheridon Rhoads
Mark Roper
Derith Smith
Linda Smyka
Warren Studley
Linda Forwerck
Robert Gattin
Jessi Sedlachek
Heather Harris-Brady
Doug Mansfield
Ken Smith
Mary Tonneberger
Amanda Schlagel

Members Absent

Joe DeKoning
Jay Hooper
Ron Kea
John Nelson
Patrick Pahl
Wayne Schmidt
Lee Wilson
Janet Wolf (excused- Speaker's Bureau)

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Dennis Aloia
Rick Gruber
Doug Christenson
Tom Kellogg

Facilitators Present

Paula Sagala
Tina Allen
Tom Shea

Staff Present

Matt McCauley
Megan Olds

1. Welcome & Facilitator Comments – 2:01 p.m.

P. Sagala welcomed everyone and introduced new members to the group. She also led a roundtable introduction of group members.

2. Review Proposed Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and no changes were suggested or made.

3. Review June 6th Meeting Minutes

The June meeting minutes were approved and no changes were suggested or made.

4. RFP Subcommittee

a. Presentation of revised RFP

M. Olds presented the revised RFP and stated some of the significant changes made since the last version was presented. She also discussed some of the reasoning behind the changes made, including direct comments to the RFP by MDOT. B. Otwell asked the reasoning behind stating a RFP cost range. M. Olds explained that MDOT requested that a range be given instead of a precise expectation of cost. K. Smith discussed a concern regarding knowing the relative amount of resources available to each task involved within the RFP. He discussed the usefulness of such information towards evaluating the RFP. M. Olds said she would request MDOT to provide such information.

b. Proposal to adopt revised RFP

J. Lagowski presented the proposal to adopt the revised RFP (vers. 4.3). Consensus.

5. Resolution of Support

a. Presentation of the current version of the Resolution of Support

M. Olds discussed the Resolution of Support structure and stated that once approved it would be the responsibility of the NGO group members to provide the request to their respective boards.

b. Proposal to adopt the Resolution of Support

It was determined that no proposal was necessary. The resolution of Support document was approved during the June LUTS meeting.

6. Report on Funding Status

M. Olds discussed the current state of the match funds available. She stated which funds have been obligated and which have been received. H. Brady asked if 20% or 25% of the total study cost is the match required. Staff replied that 20% is the target amount. S. Bornschein suggested sending the list to the Funding Comm. to discuss if additional match funders should be sought. J. Lively suggested that the group create a rationale to describe why certain entities are being asked to provide match, while others are not.

7. Report on MOU

Suggestion by the group to request a specific dollar amount from each township. Also suggested that a copy of the RFP be given to each township to better explain the purpose and scope of work involved with the study. J. Lively suggested that the new member counties and other GT County townships be asked to sign the MOU as well.

S. Rhoads asked for clarification on what level of support is being requested by the neighboring counties. He stated that Benzie County was under the impression that their involvement would be limited to participation on the LUTS Coordinating Group.

8. Communications Subcommittee

a. Report on Speaker's Bureau

M. McCauley discussed the activities of the Speaker's Bureau to date and asked for additional participation. He suggested that the Speaker's Bureau might soon be asked to visit are NGO's and neighboring counties to explain the role of the LUTS group and their activities.

A. Schlagel asked for clarification between the outreach activities of the LUTS group versus the Stakeholder Group. M. McCauley replied that many of the activities are the same, but the membership base of the Stakeholder Group is broader. He also stated that is was determined by members of the LUTS group at previous meeting to provide a public awareness, engagement, and education activities up to the point of hiring a consultant.

K. Kleinrichert reported briefly on the activities of the Communication subcommittee, including the relationship with Knorr Marketing to assist in the branding of the LUTS group and the study process.

b. Report on Stakeholder Group

J. Lively discussed the activities of the Stakeholder Group and discussed the relationship between the Communications Subcommittee and the Stakeholder Group. He also urged additional participation by LUTS members to the Communications Subcommittee to strengthen the communication efforts by both groups. J Lively distributed a communication by the Stakeholder Group that outlines the group's activities thus far and some of the anticipated activities in the future.

H. Voss (MLUI) discussed that collaborative coordination between the Stakeholder Group and the Communications Subcommittee in the past and he emphasized the importance of maintaining the support of the public. He also stated the collaborative efforts of the MLUI, TC Chamber of Commerce, and NWMCOG towards the creation and sustainability of the Stakeholder Group thus far.

M. Olds stated some of the specific opportunities that the Stakeholder Group might embark upon specifically, educational forums. She discussed the possible sponsorship of a Natural Features Inventory workshop in the near future.

H. Harris-Brady asked if the Stakeholder Group would meet prior to a consultant being hired. J. Livley stated that the Stakeholder Group is not a formal organization; however, there would be coordinated events highlighting their participation.

K. Smith commended the groups involved with the Stakeholder Group and stated the positive nature of it existence. He also suggested that other entities involved with the LUTS group also participate in the public awareness process by also co-sponsoring some workshops relating to the study process.

H. Harris-Brady suggested introducing additional language to the Stakeholder Group letter. J. Lively stated that he would be happy to accept language changes and anyone could e-mail suggestions directly to him.

9. LUTS as a Subcommittee of TALUS Proposal

J. Lagowski presented the proposal to organize the LUTS Group as a subcommittee of TC-TALUS. He asked that members who are also members of TALUS to identify themselves. J. Lagowski stated that because of some of the overlap in membership, efficiency might be better served by consolidating the two groups.

L. Smyka discussed the possible future role of TC-TALUS as a MPO and suggested that the group consider ways to work in cooperative manner with TALUS. K. Smith asked for clarification on the rationale to change the current relationship, citing that the current system works well and therefore shouldn't change. S. Bornshein stated that the LUTS Group essentially acts as a TALUS subcommittee now, as any decision made by the LUTS group must also be approved by TALUS. W. Studley asked about the measurement required for TALUS to become a MPO and expressed concern that TALUS might put limits on possible additional membership to the LUTS group. R. Rasch discussed the current role of TALUS and stated some of the other smaller transportation planning groups that have been operating in the area. She stated that they also might be best served to operate more closely with TALUS. J. Lagowski discussed that part of the rationale behind the proposal was to more accurately portray the responsibility and who's involved with the study process. He stated that there exists confusion regarding the distinction of the two groups involved: Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group (LUTS) and the Traverse City Transportation and Land Use Study (TALUS). V. Coulter discussed some of the activities of other MPOs in the country. She also discussed the possibility of LUTS as a Citizens Advocacy Comm. of TC-TALUS. S. Borschein asked for clarification what the proposed organization change would affect the activities of the LUTS group. J. Lagowski stated that specific changes would have to be defined, but that LUTS involvement in the study process would be maintained. V. Coulter stated that MDOT might offer more planning money if the consolidation occurred, but mentioned that there also might be a loss of control by the LUTS group.

K. Smith stated concern with the proposal in that there are no problems with the current structure and that the separation of the groups assists with trust building among many entities within the region. He suggested that the proposal be revisited in the future. He also praised TC-TALUS for continuing their outreach activities. J. Lagowski expressed that such a move needs to occur to strengthen the land use portion of TALUS's charge. H. Harris-Brady stated that the original charge of the group to be "guardians of the process" might be in jeopardy if their objectivity becomes more closely related to other groups in the region. J. Lively expressed concern that if the group became a subcommittee of TALUS the involvement of neighboring areas might be jeopardy.

S. Erickson-Bornschein asked for the Communications Subcommittee to draft a letter to TALUS the reasoning behind declining TALUS's offer.

W. Studley suggested that 9 months from now the group revisit this proposal.

10. Scenario Planning Workshop Discussion

J. Lively discussed the upcoming Scenario Planning Workshop on July 27th and the history behind it. He also mentioned that an abbreviated presentation will be available to those who cannot make the whole day.

11. Proposal to Cancel August 1 LUTS Meeting

V. Coulter presented the proposal to cancel the August LUTS meeting. She stated that because of the meeting's proximity to the July 27th Scenario Planning Workshop and the recent finalization of the RFP, the group might be better served to convene again in Sept.

Consensus.

12. Review Decisions

M. Olds reviewed the consented upon decision made by the group.

13. New Business

No new business was presented.

14. Announcements

No announcements.

15. Meeting Evaluation

MarkBenzie County suggested that an informational group present to the neighboring counties the history and progress of the group thus far.

V. Coulter asked if the name associations could be attached in the meeting minutes. Staff agreed.

K. Smith asked if the Speaker's Bureau would be available to speak to NGOs if invited.

V. Coulter suggested a press release announcing the RFP release. Staff agreed.

J. Lively stated concerns that the timeline was presented to the group in too quick of fashion and that it should have received more discussion. He stated that it would be his preference to shorten the timeline if possible. J. Lagowski suggested that suggested changes be communicated to M. Skeels by the next TALUS meeting.

K. Smith suggested that the group discuss the timeline now. P. Sagala offered the suggestion as a proposal. Consensus.

- **RFP / Consultant Hire Timeline Discussion**

M. Olds reviewed the significant dates within the RFP timeline. M. McCauley stated the reasoning behind choosing the dates and discussed the process in which he and M. Skeels created the timeline.

K. Smith suggested that the consultant selection portion of timeline be extended to provide more time for the Consultant Selection Committee.

R. Rasch suggested that it might be prudent to combine the "pre-proposal question due" date and the "pre-proposal Meeting" date in order to shorten the timeline.

K. Smith suggesting accepting Rise's proposal and added that the winning bidder is notified November 30th instead of Nov. 10th.

V. Coulter suggested that staff be allowed to insert the dates based on the conversation.

Staff agreed and suggested that if there were any other concerns or proposed changes, that they be received by July 18th before the TALUS Board meeting.

16. Set Subcommittee Meeting Times

Communications Subcommittee – July 24th, 4 p.m.

Funding Subcommittee – July 26th, 9 a.m.

Agenda Subcommittee – August 24th, 9 a.m.

17. Public Comment

L. Grant asked if the bidding consultants were required to be on MDOT's pre-qualified list. M. Old stated that based on previous conversations with MDOT North Region staff the bidding consultants were not required to be on the pre-qualified list.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by M. McCauley (NWMCOG) on July 11, 2006