

Grand Valley Metro Council  
**Blueprint Committee**  
Monday, December 1, 2003  
2:00 PM

GVMC Offices  
40 Pearl Street, Ste. 410  
Grand Rapids MI 49503

**Minutes**

**1. Call To Order**

Bowman called the meeting to order at 11:05 AM.

**Members Present:**

Tom Fehsenfeld	Crystal Flash
Doyle Hayes	Pyper Products Corp
Jack Horton	Kent County Commissioner
Tom McWhertor	Calvin College
Cy Moore	BDO Seidman
Sharon Steffens	Alpine Township
Bonnie Shupe	Cannon Township

**Members Absent:**

Glen Barkan	Aquinas College
Nyal Deems	Varnom Riddering
Eric DeLong	City of Grand Rapids
Ron Lemmon	
Mick McGraw	Eastbrook Builders
Marcia Rapp	Grand Rapids Community Foundation

**Others Present:**

Priscilla Babcock	GVMC Staff
Andy Bowman	GVMC Staff
Jay Hoekstra	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Don Stypula	GVMC Staff

**2. Staff Updates**

a) **REGIS**  
No Update

b) **Transportation – Abed Itani**

- Working on the Long Range Transportation Plan - March 4<sup>th</sup> deadline
- Forecasting revenue for the next 30 years
- Developed travel demand model to determine needs for the future in regards to deficient roads
- Air Quality Standards changing from 1 hour to 8 hour

- Bowman noted that the Metropolitan Framework was not used for the LRTP this time around because it had not officially been approved. Hope to use the framework in the future.

### **3. Work Session: Recommendation to GVMC on Interim Metropolitan Development Framework**

- Bowman stated that they were looking for a recommendation of the draft resolution. After approval from the Blueprint Committee it will go through the Executive Committee first before moving on to the Board on January 12<sup>th</sup>.
- Steffens questioned Horton on whether the resolution meets the needs of the PDR Committee. Horton replied that it appeared to, but assumes that the resolution could be amended if needed.
- Hoekstra stated that he is giving a copy to Rich Harlow tonight, who is a staff person on the Ag Preservation Fund Board.
- Steffens voiced that some might have difficulties understanding the intent of a regional metropolitan framework plan vs. local master plans. Steffens stated that hit might be helpful if GVMC made a presentation to the Ag Preservation Fund Board – Hoekstra to arrange.
- Fehsenfeld question whether the resolution obligated anyone to anything. Bowman replied that it was just for the PDR which obligates GVMC.
- Suggested changes for the resolution include:
  - McWhertor pointed out that the language of the third whereas statement was “difficult” – it presumes approval. He suggested using “approval will enable staff to...” or “Interim approval needed to enable staff to...” It was also suggested to use “staff requested guidance...” – Staff to rework.
  - Moore noted that the fourth whereas statement has raised concerns at the Executive Committee level.
  - Shupe suggested a “further resolved” statement clarifying that the current last sentence (...and to be used in meetings and discussions to further refine, clarify or reshape portions thereof) relates to local governments.
  - McWhertor suggested a couple of grammatical changes of which staff noted.

**MOTION by Shupe, SUPPORTED by Fehsenfeld to recommend the amended resolution to the Executive Committee and GVMC Board. MOTION CARRIED. Aays: All – Nays: None.**

### **4. General Administrative Issues: Where do we go from here?**

Bowman questioned those present where they thought they saw the Blueprint Committee fit in at GVMC. Currently have Transportation Technical and Policy Committees and would like to put together a Land Use committee consisting of Planning Commissioners and staff planners. Is the Blueprint Committee’s role to be the integrating body for transportation, land use and water and sewer?

- Fehsenfeld questioned what type of people were in the Transportation Technical and Policy committees. Itani stated that the Policy Committee consisted mostly of township supervisors and city staff where as the Technical Committee consisted of some township supervisors and city staff, but also Road Commissions, ITP and MDOT.
- Shupe commented that she had heard talk of combining the Technical and Policy Committees. Itani responded that that was true but due to resistance to change, in the end they decided to eliminate the TIP Committee instead.
- Itani commented that they want to avoid redundancy, or adding another layer, with the Blueprint Committee. He noted that the Blueprint Committee does not consist of Elected Officials and therefore could not make decisions. The Blueprint Committee could only give recommendations to the Executive Committee who would make all the final decisions.
- Fehsenfeld suggested combining the Transportation Policy Committee and the Land Use/Blueprint Committees. Itani stated that this had been suggested previous but the idea was seen as not interrelating well.
- Shupe voiced that there was a need for an integrating committee to look at the big picture that included transportation, land use, and water and sewer.
- Steffens suggeseted the idea of the Blueprint Committee making recommendations to the individual transportation, land use, and water & sewer committees.

- Fehsenfeld pointed out that there is a tradeoff between expertise and coordination and that we need to decide which one is more important. Itani stated that this has been discussed and that many different opinions came for these discussions. Coordination cannot be forced.
- Itani stated that he was in favor of merging the Policy and Blueprint Committee and calling it the GVMC Advisory Committee. This would eliminate the Policy Committee and give more involvement to the Blueprint Committee.
- Shupe suggested having a joint meeting between the Policy, Blueprint and Water and Sewer Committees to have discussions.
- Itani said the biggest problem with all of this is representation and voting. Current Policy Committee members see no benefits for the townships and cities to change the process.
- Bowman stated that he would pass all of this information onto Don Stypula for further consideration.

## **5. Other**

**a)** Bowman stated that they would be taking the Metropolitan Development Framework to the individual communities and regional entities looking for changes to the draft based on the communities input. Shupe suggested focusing in on that specific community and its surrounding area at each individual presentation.

### **b) Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 10, 2004 at 1:00 PM at the GVMC offices.

## **6. Adjournment**

With no further business before the committee Bowman adjourned the meeting at 12:30 PM.