

Meeting Summary

Michigan Land Use Leadership Council
July 7, 2003
Senate Committee Hearing Room, Boji Tower
Lansing, Michigan

Council Members Present

William Milliken, Co-chair; Jim Barrett, Patty Birkholz, Liz Brater, Jim Brooks, Keith Charters, Steve Chester, Dan Gilmartin, Gordon Guyer, David Hollister, Colin Hubbell, Gloria Jeff, Ruth Johnson, Robert Jones, Dan Kildee, Chris Kolb, Chris MacInnes, Mick McGraw, Larry Merrill, James Okraszewski, Lana Pollack, Helen Taylor, Hans Voss, Brian Warner, Gil White, Wayne Wood, Dan Wyant

Council Members Absent

Frank Kelley, Co-chair; Kevin Turman, Heaster Wheeler

Designees for State Agencies

George Bourgoyne, Department of Natural Resources

The meeting was convened at 9:00 AM, Monday, July 7, 2003.

Welcome from the Co-Chair and Introduction to the Day and Agenda

Co-chair William Milliken

Co-chair Milliken thanked the council members for their attendance and participation in the meetings of the Michigan Land Use Leadership Council (MLULC) and welcomed the group to the fifth meeting of the council.

Milliken oriented the council to the day's activities, thanked the Michigan Farm Bureau for the breakfast it sponsored earlier in the morning and the Michigan Townships Association for the lunch for council members to be provided later in the day. Milliken then turned the meeting over to Keith Charters, who was selected by the co-chairs to facilitate the discussion of council recommendations.

Recommendations

Charters reviewed the *Reaching Consensus* document that was distributed to the council prior to the July meeting and developed by co-chairs and council staff to establish a process for reviewing recommendations during the course of the meeting.

An amendment was offered to the council's [Protocol for Operations of the Michigan Land Use Leadership Council](#), which was approved by council members at the March meeting. The proposed amendment modified the voting procedures for finalizing recommendations and called for allowing minority reports. After lengthy council discussion, it was determined that there was no support for the amendment.

Charters resumed the discussion of recommendations, beginning with the land resource-based industries issue category. Helen Taylor, who facilitated the land resource-based industries workgroup at the June retreat, lead the discussion by reviewing each recommendation as listed in

the [Principles and Recommendations for Land Resource-based Industries](#) document and asking for input on items that had been changed since the last meeting. Major discussion items included:

- **Agricultural Security Areas:** An “opt-out” for participants coupled with a recapture provision should be added. Proceeds from recapture would be used for agricultural land preservation.
- **Commercial Forest Program:** Discussion centered on whether there should be penalty payments for withdrawing land from the commercial forest program, proceeds from which would be deposited into a fund to purchase working forest easements.
- **Capitalizing on matching fund opportunities:** Council members directed staff to develop a recommendation for building a “nest egg” of funds that are readily available so that matching-fund opportunities are maximized.
- **Protecting Michigan’s scenic resources:** A council member offered a new recommendation that would prohibit new construction of billboards, and offered to meet with interested council members to develop the recommendation and bring it to the August meeting for full council consideration.
- **Land Division Act:** A council member expressed concern about the current language included in the Land Division Act recommendation.
- **Simplifying government permitting programs:** Council member are going to develop a recommendation pertaining to simplifying government permitting programs.
- **Building in headwater areas:** Council members were conflicted about whether building/development should be halted in headwater areas.

Council staff will work with council members to resolve these issues prior to the August meeting.

The next issue category discussed by the council was urban revitalization. This discussion was lead by Dan Kildee, who served as the moderator for this workgroup at the June retreat. The council reviewed each recommendation, as listed in the [Principles and Recommendations for Urban Revitalization](#) document, and made the following significant comments:

- **Public facilities in urban areas:** Many council members were concerned about several aspects of the recommendation that would require the state to support locating public offices and facilities in urbanized areas, including how “urbanized area” is defined, convenience of locations to customers, effects on schools, and others.
- **Urban investment and reinvestment:** Council members were interested in improving upon and citing examples of redevelopment readiness standards.
- **Controlling urban blight:** Council members discussed the need to encourage local units of government to have rental inspection programs.
- **Affordable housing:** Council members were not satisfied with the recommendations regarding affordable housing and felt they needed to be expanded.
- **“Creative class”:** Council members requested a re-write of the section on attracting the “creative class.” They would like to expand this section to attract not just the “creative class,” but all people, focusing on immigrant populations and the “creative class” (defined as skilled workers, artists, entrepreneurs, highly educated and trained 25 to 40 year-olds and others who seek to live and work in diverse, vibrant urban communities). There was also some recognition that, in order to attract and retain people in Michigan

cities, there is a need to address urban schools, crime control, and race-related issues in this section. New introductory language, principles, and/or recommendations may be drafted.

- **Commerce centers:** The concept of commerce centers needed to be developed in much more detail.

Council staff will work with council members to resolve these issues prior to the August meeting.

The third issue category discussed by the council was infrastructure and community services. This discussion was lead by Jim Brooks, who served as the moderator for this workgroup at the June retreat. The council reviewed each recommendation, following the [*Principles and Recommendations for Infrastructure and Community Services*](#). Major discussion focused on:

- **Definition of multijurisdictional:** Some confusion was expressed regarding the difference between the term “regional” and “multijurisdictional,” when it is appropriate to use either, and whether recommendations that include multijurisdictional planning require a new regulatory entity. Council members determined that the term “multijurisdictional” is a more appropriate term to use when talking about planning that involves more than one jurisdiction, and usually all jurisdictions contiguous to a single jurisdiction. Regional is appropriate when discussing activities and actions of Michigan’s existing Regional Planning Commissions. Neither term implies the creation of a new regulatory entity. The council agreed that the term “multijurisdictional should be better defined in the report.
- **Green infrastructure:** The definition of green infrastructure needs to be improved, and incentives for green infrastructure need to be incorporated into the recommendation related to guiding state infrastructure expenditures.

The council temporarily adjourned at 4:00 PM for the public comment period.

Comment Period

Chaired by Council Member Keith Charters

The public comment began at 4:00 PM. It was taped and will be transcribed and summarized by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality for council review and consideration.

Continuation of Discussion of Recommendations

Staff and All

The council reconvened at 5:15 PM and continued its discussion on infrastructure and community services. The following substantive comments were made:

- **Local infrastructure decisions:** More discussion is needed regarding the state only issuing construction permits for new sewers and treatment facilities when they comply with local land use plans and whether or not local jurisdictions should have the authority to require utility service providers to share supporting infrastructure (e.g., cell phone towers, utility poles, etc).
- **Natural environment:** Additional recommendations were suggested regarding wildlife corridors and conservation banking. More detail and discussion is needed.

Council staff will work with council members to resolve these issues prior to the August meeting.

The final issue category discussed by the council was planning and development regulations. This discussion was lead by Keith Charters and Mark Wyckoff, who served as the moderator and facilitator (respectively) for this workgroup at the June retreat. The council reviewed each recommendation, as listed in the [Principles and Recommendations for Planning and Development Regulations](#) document, and made the following significant comments:

- **Training for planners:** The council was conflicted about whether training should be required for local planning officials and, if so, in what manner.
- **Land use educational curriculum:** The council had concerns about supporting the development and distribution of a K–12 land use planning curriculum.

Council staff will work with council members to resolve these issues prior to the August meeting.

Due to time constraints, the council adjourned without completing the review of the planning and development regulations recommendations.

Next Steps

Staff and All

Bill Rustem explained that the council had not completed the day's agenda items (i.e., reviewing the Planning and Development Regulations recommendations), so an additional meeting would be necessary before the regularly scheduled and final August 4 council meeting. Council members discussed several options, including holding another meeting sometime in July, a two-day meeting either August 3–4 or August 4–5, and an additional meeting August 11. All options were determined to conflict with too many council members' schedules except holding a two-day meeting Sunday, August 3 through Monday, August 4. The council expressed concern about having such a short time to process the results from the review of the Planning and Development Regulations recommendations, but agreed that it was the only feasible solution.

Rustem explained that staff would contact those council members who volunteered to serve on subcommittees to address unresolved issues from today's meeting throughout the next two weeks. The edited draft reports will be mailed to council members prior to the August meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM.