## Corts, Carynne

From:

Lumm, Jane

Sent: To: Monday, June 18, 2012 10:20 PM Taylor, Christopher (Council)

Subject:

FW: Follow-up Q re: 4-Party Cte. decision re: BOC proposed amendments

From: Lumm, Jane

**Sent:** Mon 6/18/2012 10:15 PM **To:** Postema, Stephen; Powers, Steve

Cc: Fales, Mary Joan; Briere, Sabra; Hieftje, John

Subject: Follow-up Q re: 4-Party Cte. decision re: BOC proposed amendments

Stephen/Steve,

As a follow-up to Sabra's "council comments" comment re: today's 4-Party Cte. Mtg. where it was determined that the BOC proposed amendments will not be advanced/considered further, does this mean that the BOC will not formally vote on the amendments proposed by Commissioner Dan Smith, or consider any other potential BOC proposed amendments?

As you know, in addition to this protocol/process question, I think the "standing" provision is a reasonable protection that Ann Arbor and other municipalities/townships should have the opportunity to consider formally -- again, as proposed by Commissioner Dan Smith.

I equate this to the AATA staff and board's conversations and shared concerns about the loss of decision-making and financing authority should Washtenaw be absorbed by a four county RTA -- specifically that the RTA would have the authority to determine how local funds are invested and would be the recipient of state and federal transportation dollars. In the event that AATA/the new county-wide TA felt that local services were not, e.g., adequately funded/provided by the RTA, would the county-wide TA/196 Bd. want to ensure it had the ability/standing to challenge or address such a funding/service or other issue if it had no other recourse? I assume the new TA would want to ensure it had the ability/standing to address any concerns/issues.

Thanks, Jane