

Citizen's Advisory Committee  
Draft Minutes of the Meeting  
March 20, 2008

Present:

Linda Atkinson	Kari Hughston	Steward Sandstrom
Mickey Blashfield	James Klette	Kirk Steudle
Gloria Combe	James Koslosky	Robert Struck
Dan DeGraaf	Keith Ledbetter	Dennis Gillow (TF2)
Gretchen Driskell	William McFarlane	Richard Studley (TF2)
Mike Fikes	John Niemela	
Russell Gronevelt	Sylvester Payne	

Absent: Bill Gehman

Meeting began at about 2:40

Tim Hoeffner, MDOT, opened the meeting. CAC members present introduced themselves. TF2 co-chairs Dennis Gillow and Rich Studley also introduced themselves.

Mr. Hoeffner offered an opportunity for public comment; none was forthcoming.

Mr. Hoeffner reviewed the outcomes of the March TF2 meeting, including the election of co-chairs of that group, TF2 meeting schedule and locations, work program. He emphasized the primary focus of the TF2 per the legislation, to identify alternative funding mechanisms for transportation to support economic activity and personal mobility. He also reviewed the requirements of open meetings act, which apply to the CAC meetings and subcommittee meetings.

Rich Studley, co-chair of the TF2, addressed the group, and stressed the need to

- identify ways of maximizing return on transportation investment
- identify existing and alternative user fees
- consider what other states are doing
- consider the cost of doing nothing
- focus on the phrase “to support economic activity and personal mobility”
- quantify what we’ll get for the investment

Mr. Studley reviewed legal requirements of PA 221 for the CAC:

- to create subcommittees
- to make recommendations to TF2
- to designate a chair who is responsible for scheduling meetings and making reports
- to allow minority and individual reports. In this area he encouraged the group to seek consensus, but not to require it, and discouraged any approach that would mean falling to the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Studley also expressed his desire for the final report to be an action oriented report that will result in major positive changes to the transportation system.

Dennis Gillow assisted the group with their first official act, election of a chairperson. Gretchen Driskell was nominated and seconded. A vote was taken and Ms. Driskell was elected unanimously.

Mr. Gillow continued to assist the group as they worked to identify appropriate subcommittees. The group agreed that individuals could serve on more than one subcommittee. There was much discussion about which subcommittees would be best. The important discussion that followed helped to set direction for the group. Some of the points raised are highlighted here:

- Need broad categories for subcommittees
- Follow the footprints of Act 51 or do something different?
- Outcome should suggest what subcommittees are needed.
- Subcommittees should suggest their own funding mechanisms.
- Look at each conveyance: modes and needs.
- Remember ferries are public transportation
- Should rail carry both freight and passengers? Passenger operating on freight lines make for significant delays. Group needs to weigh these against each other.
- See the AASHTO bottomline freight report for more information on freight needs. (MDOT will put link to report on website.)
- Concern that road, bridge, highways think of needs based on how we do it today, precluding something better.
- Can't build our way out of congestion, cooperation among modes necessary to achieve results.
- CAC can decide how best to meet the needs in an intermodal framework.
- Consider the role of CAC and TF2. CAC identifies needs and TF2 has to figure out how to make them work together.
- Subcommittee reports should show needs relative to capacity, anticipated revenue, include an executive summary.
- Conveyances/infrastructure already have needs defined. End result is how to pay for it.
- Menu looks good, it's "who is going to pick up the check" that is the final question.
- Funding silos define the needs framework. Once you have needs, you can look at how things move among or provide suggestions from an intermodal perspective.
- What is the cost of doing nothing? We need solid justification for why doing nothing is not an option.
- Not the TF intent to abdicate the needs to CAC and let TF deal with funding or financing in a vacuum.
- Need to expand the discussion to find efficiencies as well
- The enormity of the job is the reason the TF asked the CAC to focus on needs
- Stratify the needs as good/better/best.

- Need to understand cost of doing nothing and incremental costs of moving forward.

After this discussion, the group identified the following subcommittees:

- Aviation
- Highway, Road and Bridge
- Intermodal Freight
- Intermodal Passenger

The group also identified a fifth subcommittee, Intermodal, that will review reports of the other subcommittees, looking for cross-cutting issues, or gaps that have not been addressed by the work of the other groups. It will include the chairs of the subcommittees and any others who wish to be involved.

It was suggested that all subcommittees could meet on the same day, so folks could participate in more than one.

CAC Members signed up for subcommittees and were asked to put an asterisk by their name if they would be willing to chair the subcommittee. Four of the five lists had at least one volunteer offer to chair the subcommittee.

The group agreed to meet again on Friday, April 4, in subcommittees schedule throughout the day.