

Land Use and Transportation Coordinating Group

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 5, 2006

Traverse Area District Library

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present

Sally Erickson Bornschein
Virginia Coulter
Joe DeKoning
Linda Forwerck
Andy Knott
Jim Lagowski
Glen Lile
Jim Lively
Doug Luciani
John Nelson
Patrick Pahl
Rise Rasch
Mark Roper
Wayne Schmidt
Derith Smith
Mary Tonneberger
Janet Wolf
Lee Wilson

Members Absent

Gary Derrigan
Robert Gattin
Kathleen Guy
Heather Harris-Brady
Jay Hooper
Ron Kea
Ken Kleinrichert
Bill Kurtz
Bob Otwell
Sheridan Rhoads
Amanda Schlagel
Jessi Sedlachek
Ken Smith
Linda Smyka
Warren Studley

Public Present (per sign-in sheet)

Dennis Aloia
Gerry Sell
Richard Lewis
Matt Skeels
Bob Carstens
Chris Maxbauer

Facilitators Present

Tina Allen
Tom Shea

Staff Present

Matt McCauley
Megan Olds

1. Welcome & Facilitator Comments – 2:06 p.m.

T. Shea welcomed everyone and introduced new members to the group. He shared his observations of the group's progress using the consensus decision-making process.

2. Review Proposed Agenda

The agenda was reviewed. V. Coulter asked if the TC-TALUS memo would be added to the agenda. T. Shea indicated that this item would be addressed under New Business. The agenda was accepted by consensus.

3. Review July 11th Meeting Minutes

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

4. Communications Subcommittee

A. J. Lively reported that the group has been working on the development of a logo/slogan for the planning process. He reported that a pro-bono offer was received by Knorr Marketing. Knorr drafted some ideas, but the subcommittee has not developed a recommendation yet regarding a logo or slogan. He said that the subcommittee will be meeting again in order to review ideas and form a recommendation to bring back to the Group. J. Wolf said that a lot of the work will be done once the consultant is on board.

The Group reviewed the proposal regarding meeting with the Record-Eagle editorial board.
Proposal: *It is proposed that selected members of the Land Use & Transportation Coordinating Group meet with the Record Eagle Editorial Board to discuss newspaper coverage of the land use and transportation study process.*

J. Lively gave some background including conversation that he had with a Record-Eagle reporter and the editor. He said that he was frustrated with the lack of coverage of the group's achievements and process. He explained that the process is to have a small group from the LUTS Group get together with the newspaper's editorial board to share information about the LUTS Group's activities and goals.

Discussion: V. Coulter said that she is more comfortable with writing a forum piece, rather than meeting with the editorial board. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that she said that the message to the press needed to be uniform. She said the message needed to be concise and on target. J. Lagowski said that TC-TALUS is also involved and should be involved in communications about the process, as the fiscal agent and project manager. J. Wolf said that timing is everything – a forum piece could be prepared now and then look at the timing of when to meet with the editorial board, perhaps when the consultant is on board. J. Nelson said that he liked J. Wolf's idea. He supported both a forum piece and a meeting with the editorial board.

V. Coulter said that her concerns were satisfied. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that the press should be at this meeting, but that her concerns were satisfied.

D. Smith said that she still had concerns. She felt that the consultant needed to guide the group through the communications process. She also said that conversations with the press needed to happen in coordination with TC-TALUS.

T. Shea asked if J. Wolf had approval to create a forum piece. There was consensus that this should occur.

The remainder of the original proposal was not consented to.

B. A. Knott updated the group about the Speaker's Bureau process. He said that the counties who now had membership had not yet been approached. He read the proposal. **Proposal: *It is proposed that the Speakers Bureau of the Land Use & Transportation Coordinating Group***

attend county board meetings in Antrim, Benzie, Leelanau, Kalkaska, and Wexford Counties to discuss the activities of the group and the study process.

V. Coulter asked if there were materials for the Group to use as part of the speaker's bureau presentations. She said that she did not want the Michigan Land Use Institute presentation to be part of the presentations. J. Lagowski said that it was important for speakers to communicate about TC-TALUS's role in the process. Staff will prepare additional materials for the speakers to use. **The proposal was consented to.**

5. RFP Update

A. M. Skeels gave an update regarding the pre-bid meeting with consultants. He said that the transcript from the meeting will be posted on the LUTS Group's website.

B. M. Skeels reported that the Consultant Selection Committee met with Sheryl Holcomb, MDOT Contract Administrator, to review the consultant selection process under federal and state guidelines. M. Skeels reported that S. Holcomb recommended that the consultant selection interviews be closed. He said that he does not think that is possible and that TC-TALUS will keep the interviews open to the public. Public members, however, will not be able to make comments. He proposes that the public should be encouraged to attend the Consultant Selection Committee meetings so that the questions that will be asked equally of all consultants can be developed with public input. J. Wolf asked if consultant would then be able to attend each others' interviews. He said that TC-TALUS can request that consultants not attend each others' interviews.

M. Skeels reviewed the consultant selection/proposal review process. The timeline will be posted on the Group's website. M. Skeels read the names of those serving on the consultant selection committee. M. Tonneberger asked if any of the members of the committee would have had previous relationships with any of the potential consultants. M. Skeels said that this was not out of the question. He said that any working relationship would need to be disclosed. R. Rasch said that MDOT recommended that committee members' research references submitted in proposals to learn more about what kind of work they have done in the past. J. Wolf asked if disclosures were required. M. Skeels said that he would get clarification of this issue.

C. A. Knott read the proposal regarding the interview proposal process and provided background information. **Proposal: It is proposed that the Consultant Selection Committee meet to further clarify which portions of the RFP consultant selection process will be open or closed to the public and/or competing consultants.**

He said that M. Skeels' discussion and subsequent recommendations and advice from the County's Prosecuting Attorney take care of these concerns and that the question and proposal is moot. He recommended withdrawing the proposal. There were no concerns. The proposal was withdrawn.

D. J. Lively reviewed the proposal. **Proposal: It is proposed that the Consultant Selection Committee operate under consensus model guidelines during its deliberations.**

He said this proposal was made to ensure that Consultant Selection Committee review process would be facilitated. R. Rasch said that when the Selection Committee met, she said that she did not think that the intent was to have a facilitator, other than staff. She asked if others, including staff had that perspective. M. Olds said that she thought it was the sense of the group to have a facilitator that was not staff. V. Coulter said that she was concerned about the word "consensus" in the proposal review – that it was a points-based process. R. Rasch said that this decision-making process would still be done by consensus.

There was discussion about how the public would be involved in the consultant selection process through open public meetings. D. Aloia said that there could be a public comment portion, separate from the interviews, during the meetings. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that people who chose to speak could be asked to sign in. There were no concerns about having a facilitator. **The proposal was consented to.**

6. Funding Update

M. Skeels gave a funding/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) update. He said that all local governments who have been asked have signed the MOU. The required match has been secured for the project.

7. Facilitator led discussion

T. Shea explained the exercise, encouraging people to speak briefly and also to listen. T. Allen wrote a few guiding questions on the board:

- Role of LUTS in oversight of consultant as guardians of process.
- Role of LUTS outside constraints of a federal contract.

Participants gave overviews of their perspectives:

D. Luciani: The consensus process was a model to see what the public wanted in terms of transportation and land use. The RFP has been developed. Would like to see if there was willingness to let go of this process and let the public and the consultant guide the process, with the LUTS Group having a limited role, and the outside Stakeholder Group having a more active role.

J. Lagowski: Took close to a year to develop an RFP in a team-spirited way. Consultant Selection Committee includes members ½ from LUTS, ½ from TC-TALUS. Next phase is for the public. Wants to see LUTS take a leadership role as a stakeholder group, working with the consultant and TC-TALUS. In terms of project management, TC-TALUS is that agent, and will have oversight. This does not mean that LUTS does not have a role in oversight, but a shift will occur.

J. Wolf: Would like for LUTS to fold into a stakeholder group. Would like to ensure accountability. This is a public process and there needs to be accountability to the public in a formal way. Does not want to attend monthly/bi-monthly meetings for LUTS – saw an end to this group.

J. Lively: Sees group as guardians overseeing the consultant. Concerned that there is not consensus among the Group as to what the “process” really is. Sees the LUTS Group’s role as beyond the \$3.3 million federal dollars – to look at land use and transportation needs throughout the region. Concerned that if the LUTS Group steps away from that role, that the focus will be on the fiduciary and geographic constraints of an agency, such as TC-TALUS. Concerned that the focus will be on a “small” transportation study, not a bigger picture process.

R. Rasch: Represents MDOT locally, but serves larger regional community. Feels that the public currently sees a lot of different groups around area and would support opportunity to streamline groups, consolidate groups to be involved in visioning process. Described opportunity to have a concentrated Metropolitan Planning Organization, like an expanded TC-TALUS, which could address other issues such as housing, etc. – to address same issues around one table.

V. Coulter: Representing Homestretch. Feels that LUTS Group is a guardian of the process, not an entity that will carry on long-term. This Group has “set the table and now needs to let the guests come”. TC-TALUS as now invited members from LUTS to join a committee that will help manage the process.

Biggest challenge will be getting people to join in the process. Agrees that thinking and acting regionally is something that needs to happen, but hoping that the process will cultivate new leaders.

Discussion: J. Wolf agrees with principles J. Lively raised, but wants to move responsibility to a different group. Felt that leadership (such as J. Lively's) could transfer. Wants everyone to participate and "sell" project by turning into participants. Liked idea of stakeholder group. J. Lagowski said that he understood J. Lively's point about TC-TALUS's geographic limitations. He said that the RFP addresses an area that is much broader. J. Lively said that as a county resident in Leelanau, wonders how he would "rally" residents for a process that really focuses on Grand Traverse County. He said that the scope of the project needed to be broadened. Sees an opportunity for more that could slip through our fingers. J. Nelson said that he signed on for visioning, planning, and implementation – not to just develop on RFP. He said that the Group is broadly based and is working together collaboratively. He said that to turn over project management to TC-TALUS is a gross error. He said that in the past, part of the problem was TC-TALUS. He said that TC-TALUS is evolving, but has not yet reached a collaborative process. He sees the role as maintaining a community project/process, rather than a TC-TALUS process. D. Luciani said that he sees the group providing an oversight role in the public process, not providing project management.

J. Lively talked about the role of LUTS outside of the constraints of the federal contract. He said that there are several initiatives – school planning and affordable housing are a few – which the Group needs to add value to and influence in terms of land use. He sees the LUTS Group as broadening the study to address these issues.

J. Wolf said that there seemed to be agreement in principle, but how structurally to do it seems to be the issue. She said that there needs to be discussion about merging the interests of multiple agencies and groups who are addressing inter-related issues.

S. Erickson-Borschein said that the Group has operated "outside" of the typical federal contract since the beginning. She said that the LUTS Group seems to be moving toward a stewardship capacity, which would lead toward becoming more like a stakeholder group, with the end in mind that there must be implementation. She said that the LUTS Group is a group of citizen decision-makers, not government decision-makers and that this is a positive role.

J. Lagowski said that the RFP addresses not just transportation, but the public's – everyone's – opinions about the future of the region. He said that there is an opportunity for LUTS to act as a steward and as representative stakeholders.

M. Roper said that as the group organized it seemed to want to incorporate other counties into the effort. He said that in order to get their support, the Group needs to go to their area and demonstrate how the process can affect them. He said that those counties need an invitation to join the process. He said there's nothing like that yet.

A. Knott said that there appears to be consensus and that the Group needs to be the guardian of the process. He said that the Group's role could change. He said that engagement with stakeholders will be important. He said that it is really important to have a citizen's group that is part of the process through – and beyond- the end of the study.

M. Olds suggested a joint meeting of the LUTS Group and the TC-TALUS Board to discuss ideas and perhaps come up with a plan to move forward.

T. Shea said that the Agenda Committee would review these comments and suggest a way to address concerns and viewpoints. J. Lively said that long-term membership has not been addressed.

V. Coulter said that she was concerned about where the funding for facilitation and staff support might come from. G. Sell said that the City of Traverse City and Grand Traverse County pay for facilitation. M. Olds indicated that NWMCOG staff support is currently paid out of a contract with TC-TALUS, with funding from the federal grant.

8. Review Decisions

M. McCauley reviewed the Group's consented on decisions.

Per A. Knott's request, the Group revisited the proposal and discussion about meeting with the editorial board. **Proposal: *It is proposed that selected members of the Land Use & Transportation Coordinating Group meet with the Record Eagle Editorial Board to discuss newspaper coverage of the land use and transportation study process.***

J. DeKoning said that he felt that a meeting would be worthwhile and a good chance to share the Group's message. A. Knot felt that a frank discussion with the Record-Eagle editorial board would be helpful. V. Coulter said that the group that goes should have good information. J. Lively said that who goes is important. V. Coulter said that TC-TALUS should be involved. J. DeKoning suggested that only three people should go. **The proposal was consented to and sent back to the Communications Subcommittee to develop details- such as who, what, where, when.** The Group consented to allow the Communications Subcommittee to move forward to arrange for and meet with the editorial board. M. McCauley will contact D. Smith to let her know that this issue was re-addressed, as a courtesy.

9. New Business

J. Lagowski reviewed a memo – distributed at the meeting by staff – from TC-TALUS regarding a decision that was made on August 15th regarding the creation of a Steering Committee. J. Wolf said that interested LUTS Group members could send their names to the Agenda Committee and that the Agenda Committee could then form a proposal to bring back to the LUTS Group.

J. Nelson asked if this was a directive or a request. J. Lagowski said that the Group was being asked to recommend four people. J. Nelson said that he had another idea about composition (TC-TALUS/LUTS membership). J. Wolf said that the Agenda Committee could suggest any change. J. Lagowski said that comments regarding composition are welcome.

10. Announcements

M. Olds distributed Open Meetings Act reference materials. She will send copies to those who were not in attendance.

J. Wolf congratulated BATA on their transfer station and their federal award nomination.

J. Lively congratulated Benzie County on passing their bus millage.

11. Meeting Evaluation

J. Nelson liked the roundtable discussion.

V. Coulter said that the amount of empty chairs was amazing. S. Erickson-Bornschein said that the date – first day of school, etc. – might have been an issue.

V. Coulter said that she would have appreciated having more material – such as material related to the Agenda Subcommittee’s use during their meeting – for the full Group’s reference.

V. Coulter also expressed concern about subcommittee attendance – there were only three people at the Agenda Subcommittee meeting.

12. Set subcommittee meeting times

Agenda Subcommittee: September 21st at 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Communications Subcommittee: September 13th at 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Consultant Selection Committee dates will be determined and the full group will be notified.

The next meeting of the full Land Use and Transportation Study Group is October 3, 2006.

13. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

14. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:50pm.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by M. Olds (NWMCOG) on September 5, 2006