

## **Complete Streets Advisory Council Meeting Minutes**

*February 28, 2013  
2:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
Capitol Commons Building*

### **Present:**

Bill Shreck (for Kirk Steudle), Lt. Gary Megge, Gary Piotrowicz, Suzanne Schulz, Steve DeBrabander, James Tischler, Carolyn Grawi, Andrea Brown, Jenny Jensen (for Barbara Schmid)

**Not Present:** John Niemela, Kelli Kavanaugh, Karen Kafantaris, Rory Neuner, Megan Olds, Ken Fletcher, Rochelle Hurst, Christopher White

### **Welcome – Suzanne Schulz**

Chairwoman Suzanne Schulz welcomed everyone to the Complete Streets Advisory Council (CSAC) meeting. She informed the group that there would be a public comment period at the beginning as well as at the end of the meeting. Those wishing to speak were asked to fill out a public comment card and return it to a staff member. Suzanne also stated that there was a conference line available for those who would like to listen to the proceedings. Public comments can be received by email at [MDOT-CompletestreetsAC@michigan.gov](mailto:MDOT-CompletestreetsAC@michigan.gov).

### **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Schulz mentioned that the draft minutes from the October 25, 2012 meeting had not been approved. Steve DeBrabander then moved that the October minutes be approved and Gary Piotrowicz seconded the motion. Ms. Schulz noted that the final minutes replacing the draft minutes will be posted next week on MDOT's Complete Streets Advisory Council's website: [www.michigan.gov/completestreets](http://www.michigan.gov/completestreets).

### **Correspondence**

Andrea Brown brought to the council members' attention a letter from Chairman Jung of the State Transportation Commission, which thanked the council for its work on the annual report. Each council member received a copy in their packets.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment at this time.

### **Presentations**

Jim Tischler, from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) made a presentation on the Michigan (MiPlace) initiative, an effort directed by Governor Snyder.

Jim provided the council members a briefing on some of the other policy initiatives that are developing within State agencies and how they have been moving to be consistent with the Complete Streets effort. He also mentioned how Complete Streets has been identified as part of this larger interagency, integrated policy approach.

Shortly after taking office Governor Snyder presented the first of what became five special messages. The first special message had two focuses. One was State government while the other discussed the interlinkage between economic development and Placemaking or what the Governor refers to as “place-based economic development.” Placemaking is a strategy intended to create places where talented people want to live and work.

- The goal for Placemaking is to focus primarily on job creation and economic prosperity. However, along with that in a Placemaking approach there is also consideration given to social and ecological prosperity.
- Jim suggested the council take a look at the website ([www.MIplace.org](http://www.MIplace.org)) for more information.
- Jim stated that some of the council members might be familiar with Sense of Place Council, a group that started informally and held discussions about how to begin to develop Placemaking policy for Michigan.
- One of the formal Placemaking initiatives that have occurred is Governor Snyder’s creation of a structure in State government called the Intergovernmental Collaboration Committee (ICC), based on economic growth. Various departments in attendance today have a place on that subcommittee.
- The departments that are members of the Governor’s economic growth group include MSHDA, MEDC, DNR, DEQ, and MDOT, (in addition to the locals) all working under the guidance of the ICC subcommittee. The ICC’s goal is to help ensure that core agencies integrate their policies with other agencies, working in a cross-disciplinary approach.
- The group’s Placemaking strategy is regional economic development & strategic planning, with targeted Placemaking projects to attract & retain talented workers, raise education attainment and raise per capita income, all resulting in quality places, more jobs & greater economic competitiveness.
- Suzanne: This conversation seems more attraction than retention or is it both?  
Jim: It is both. It definitely is a retention and attraction effort.
- Talented people are looking for a mix of activity. They want options for transportation, housing, urban activity centers with lots to do and people around to interact with.
- The trends in residential choice indicate that 45% of boomers are looking to downsize, 80% plus of millennials want to live in places that have mixed types of environment. Both are driving changes in the market that want transportation options that support a Complete Streets environment.
- Jim mentioned that in his agency they have to change the model for how they provide affordable housing. There is a significant demand for rental opportunities. There needs to be a mixed use neighborhood based on a mixed environment.
- Placemaking should focus on centers and corridors, thereby targeting the best economic, social, and ecological concerns. A direct alignment with Complete Streets.
- Complete Streets is almost a complete fit with the other agencies that are in alignment with the development of Placemaking.
- Placemaking is a targeted process involving projects/activities in certain locations (defined areas) that result in: Quality, sustainable, human scale, pedestrian-

oriented, bicycle friendly, safe, mixed-use, broadband enabled, green places, with lots of recreation, arts and culture, multiple transportation and housing options, respect for historic buildings, public spaces, and broad civic engagement.

- The Placemaking toolkit will be a set of statutes, programs and initiatives available to local governments and private developers to assist with development of plans and properties.
- Steve DeBrabander: Were you going to mention the Placemaking grant workshops that the departments are hosting? Jim: In support of interagency work we will be organizing collectively to begin presentations to utilize tools that are available for use. They have been consolidated to be called toolkit workshops. The first will be in late March and we will be doing six in the year. This will be an ongoing effort that will take place every year. We will be going out to various regions in the state to educate people on the Placemaking initiative. Steve: Five departments got together last year to do the workshops. They were in Escanaba, Portland and Boyne City. There will be six this year, in Detroit, Lansing, Kalamazoo, Saginaw, Grayling and Marquette. They have been very well attended by citizens and local government officials.
- Suzanne Schulz: Why is the department not involving Community Health in the group? Jim: Community Health has been involved to a certain degree but they are not an official member of the subcommittee. I will take your concerns to the committee next week.
- Suzanne: Has climate resiliency come into play? Jim: Not into Placemaking, no.

## Updates

- Rob Balmes, from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), updated the council on three major State Transportation Revenue Proposals. He also informed the council that Aarne Frobom, State Policy Specialist, is in attendance to provide answers to some of the tough questions.
- Rob started by discussing Governor Snyder's Transportation Revenue Proposal of increasing transportation funding in Michigan by \$1.2 billion. This significant additional investment would be achieved through a combination of two changes. First, increase gasoline and diesel taxes to 33¢ per gallon (current gas tax 19¢ per gallon; diesel tax 15¢ per gallon). This would generate approximately \$700-\$730 million. The Governor is also proposing light vehicle (your typical SUV or automobile) registration fees increase by 60% generating approximately \$500 million and a heavy truck/trailer tax increase by 25%.
- The Governor laid out a proposal for a local option that could generate up to \$280 million for funding based on a local increase in vehicle registration fees, subject to voter approval.
- Suzanne: Is that a local unit or county? That would be county.
- What this means for the typical driver is an increase of approximately \$120 per year.
- The second and third proposals that we want to highlight are from Senator Roger Khan. Senator Khan has spearheaded the effort to look at two different approaches. One is the Statutory Tax Increase which would result in gasoline and diesel taxes rising to 37¢ per gallon and it could involve the wholesale tax or

retail tax, not certain where that is going at this point and registration fees for cars would increase by 80%. **OR**

- He's also laid out (a ballot measure for State election) a 2% increase in Sales and Use Tax. The 6% sales tax in Michigan would increase to 8% and that 2% increase would be allocated to transportation only. However, that would then eliminate the state fuel tax and it would in all likelihood maintain the traditional funding distribution. That is still open for discussion.
- These are the proposals briefly in a nutshell. We wanted to give you an idea of what is going on behind the scenes. I'd like to turn it over to Aarne to share his thoughts.
- Lt. Megge: When you say dedicated to transportation is that road construction repair, new roads or other items?
- Aarne: There has not been any serious discussion about heavy changes to the existing formula so far so it's hard to say how these new revenues will be distributed. The legislation is going to begin discussing how we divide that up but it is too soon to say. The Governor's proposal doesn't provide any new formula for the distribution of funds. The Kahn package doesn't make too much of a change to it. The share going to public transit is largely unchanged.
- Senator Kahn's proposal calls for about a \$170 million change, what the Senator calls the capital improvement fund. Currently 9% would be used for public transit and the rest for roads and various jurisdictions.
- Carolyn Grawi: When we have better public transit we have better economics for everybody because everybody is out there riding public transit. Just increasing dollars to the whole doesn't make transit better for the entire state.
- Suzanne: On the first proposal heavy trucks will not be included? Why not since they have a bigger impact? Aarne: The suggestions that have been made so far have been variably for a 50%, 60%, and 80% increase for light vehicles (everything under 1000 pounds) and 25% for trucks (anything over 10,000 pounds). The thinking behind that is the diesel tax is primarily a tax on trucks and the proposal is that tax raised on the two fuels, it should be at least 33¢ per gallon, so it's a proportionately larger tax increase on diesel fuel versus gasoline, from 15¢ versus 19¢. Suzanne: So that offsets the registration fees? Aarne: To some extent yes. There may be some thought given to some other figure other than the 25% increase on trucks. These suggestions that Rob described are just starting points. The discussion has started but we don't have all the answers yet.
- Gary Piotrowicz: You note that there may be construction this year. Everything that I've read says October 1, of this year. Is there something else going on? Aarne: Again, it depends on the effective date of the tax increases. Fuel tax could be phased in with less than one annual quarter's worth of notice. The registration tax increase would take a while for all vehicles to be re-registered under the new levels. All of the interstate trucks would begin paying the increased weight truck taxes.
- Suzanne: If there is money coming down to the locals which projects are we going to fund? What's the philosophy there? Is there some approach as to the use of the money as specially as it relates to locals? Aarne: No I haven't heard anyone proposing either any additional restrictions or liberalizations that will go toward the locals. At the levels of additional revenues it has been suggested that especially the Governor's proposal is not going to do too much more than enable

the road agencies to preserve the roads and the existing pavement and try to begin recovery from the decline of the existing pavement.

- Ms. Schulz informed the council that Darryl Harden stepped down as co-chair of Complete Streets Internal Team (CSIT) due to his workload. Vince Bevins is the new co-chair however, he was unable to attend today's meeting. Drew Buckner, Co-chair of CSIT, will provide an update to the council on the status of implementation of the Complete Streets Policy.
- Drew started by going over the team's past achievements. He reminded the council that the Complete Streets Internal Team has developed the Complete Streets FAQ and posted to the MDOT CSS website and also developed the Complete Streets FAQ Companion PowerPoint presentation.
- By December 31, 2013, MDOT will develop or revise procedures; the implementation of the guidance document. The internal team must also develop an exceptions process whereby they establish clear procedures for review and approval, define the conditions for granting exception and determine who may approve such exceptions.
- The internal team is developing a Complete Streets Exception Policy; a process document. The Exception Policy will be included as part of the Implementation Guidance document. A document survey will also be done to determine what MDOT documents, forms, or processes need to be modified.
- Suzanne: Is there documentation that the exceptions process be part of the dialogue too? Drew: We have been discussing in detail how we will track, how we will define what exceptions are about.
- Future tasks of the Internal Team include an implementation plan. We will be updating MDOT forms/documents to ensure Complete Streets implementation.
- We are beginning to implement Complete Streets at the project level. An example: Modifications to Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines.
- Suzanne: Can you provide an example of modifications to stakeholder engagement guidelines? Drew: The Stakeholder Engagement Process is already a part of our Project Development Process as is our Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) review process. Basically, we don't need to modify our current processes to review proposals for Complete Streets initiatives. The internal team already engages the public and reviews proposals for all kinds of CSS projects (such as ornamental lighting, decorative bridge railings, architectural renderings on bridge fascia's both formed and painted, brick paver street crosswalks, brick paver sidewalks and the like). A Complete Streets proposal is just another CSS proposal.
- Suzanne: What happens if you have an emergency project? The Complete Streets Internal Team sub-team has been working extensively on a fair, uniform and transparent, easily documented exceptions process. That way we can clearly explain why we cannot incorporate Complete Streets features on a specific project. If we have an emergency project such as a bridge hit, bridge fire, pavement buckling/ collapse or some other urgent event requiring quick remediation to restore mobility we will have to implement a rapid process including assessing the scope, programming, designing, advertising, letting and awarding the project. In those instances we will not have time for the customary

public meeting, public comment phase of the stakeholder engagement process as with a typical project.

- Suzanne: Let's say you have an MDOT road on a road diet and you have a pilot project that defines what you do in this case. How do you collect the input? Is there a similar process that you would use as the norm instead of the exception for community engagement? Drew: You spoke specifically about a road diet so I'll address that. We are currently working on one now in Macomb County, the City of Warren. We've been working with the city for a number of years and we are looking at it like a regular project. It's a learning process. I don't see it as an exception I see it as part of our context sensitive solutions.

### **Meeting Schedule**

The roster of dates was discussed, a continuation from the October meeting in 2012. Members discussed whether or not the council had successfully completed its charge and whether additional meetings were necessary. **The agreement reached included keeping the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting on the calendar. If nothing significant comes up then that meeting will be cancelled.** The council decided to meet September 26<sup>th</sup> as scheduled.

### **Public Comment:**

No public comments were made.

### **Wrap Up**

Ms. Schulz asked the council members and audience members to complete the Customer Satisfaction Survey found in their packets or passed out during registration. Completed forms can be left on the tables or turned into staff. Michelle Meyers informed the council that the tribal governments would like to present at the September 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 16, 2013, from 2:00 – 5:00 p.m. at the Capitol Commons Building.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.