

MINUTES

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, March 2, 2011
Kent County Road Commission
1500 Scribner NW Grand Rapids, MI**

Conners, chair of the Technical Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. The Committee members, staff, and guests present introduced themselves.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present

Alex Arends		Alpine Township
Roger Belknap		City of Cedar Springs
Denny Bishop	<i>Proxy for Dan Carlton</i>	Georgetown Township
		Georgetown Township
Timothy Cochran		City of Wyoming
Scott Conners (<i>Chair</i>)		City of Walker
Rick DeVries		City of Grand Rapids
Wayne Harrall	<i>Proxy for Mike DeVries Tim Haagsma</i>	Kent County
		Grand Rapids Township
Roy Hawkins		Gaines Township
Jim Holtrop		GRFIA
Fred Keena	<i>Proxy for Brett Laughlin</i>	Ottawa County
		OCRC
Ray Lenze		OCRC
Steve Peterson		MDOT
Terry Schweitzer		Cascade Charter Township
Steve Warren		City of Kentwood
		KCRC

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Russ Bautch	HNTB
Jeff Dale	Kimley-Horn of Michigan
Andrea Dewey	GVMC Staff
Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Dennis Kent	MDOT
Suzette Peplinski	MDOT
Steve Redmond	MDOT
Darrell Robinson	GVMC Staff
Suzanne Schulz	City of Grand Rapids
Jim Snell	GVMC Staff
Rick Sprague	KCRC
Don Stypula	GVMC Staff
George Yang	GVMC Staff
Mike Zonyk	GVMC Staff

APPROVED

APPROVED
ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

Voting Members Not Present

Jerry Alkema
Dan Carlton
Ron Carr
Dick Davies
Jamie Davies
Sharon DeLange
Dan DesJarden
Mike DeVries
Bill Dooley
Ken Feldt
Jim Ferro
Tim Haagsma
Dennis Hoemke
Bob Homan
Taiwo Jaiyeoba
Brett Laughlin
Jim Miedema
Audrey Nevins
Chuck Porter
Dan Strikwerda
Toby VanEss
Chris Zull

Allendale Township
Georgetown Township
City of Grandville
Cannon Township
City of Rockford
Village of Sparta
City of Lowell
Grand Rapids Township
City of Wyoming
City of East Grand Rapids
Ada Township
Gaines Charter Township
Algoma Township
Plainfield Township
ITP-The Rapid
OCRC
Jamestown Township
Byron Township
Courtland Township
City of Hudsonville
Tallmadge Township
City of Grand Rapids

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Conners entertained a motion to approve the February 9, 2011 Technical Committee meeting minutes.

MOTION by Cochran, SUPPORT by Holtrop, to approve the February 9, 2011 Technical Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IV. POLICIES AND PRACTICES NON-MOTORIZED SECTION DISCUSSION

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A**, Dewey explained that Staff is presenting a revised version of the Non-Motorized Policies and Practices for the Committee's consideration. This revision would allow all non-motorized projects included in the LRTP or Non-Motorized Plan to be eligible for federal funding. Also, all non-motorized projects requesting federal funds would need to go through the MPO project selection process in order to receive federal funds.

The Non-Motorized Policies and Practices document had originally been brought to and approved by the Technical Committee in December. However, at the December Policy Committee meeting, some of the Committee members expressed concern over specific wording in the document and recommended returning it to the Technical Committee for further refinement. During the February Technical Committee meeting, the eligibility requirements continued to be discussed in detail and, again, the phrasing of the draft policy

was questioned. A final decision regarding the document was postponed until today's meeting. Discussion ensued.

Conners asked if there had been any additional talk at the staff level about how the revised Non-Motorized Policies and Practices would impact enhancement grant applications. Itani replied that the only potential change would be that MPO support for non-motorized projects would need to come from the Tech and Policy Committees. The locals, instead of submitting enhancement projects directly to MDOT, would need to send their projects through the TIP amendment process. Itani added that the issue at hand today is how to adopt the Non-Motorized Plan. He stated that if federal funds are being utilized, the MPO should be involved and projects should be prioritized, with priority given to projects in the plan itself.

Warren responded that he agreed that the MPO should be aware of enhancement grants, especially if they impact the nonmotorized or transportation system. He added that if projects clearly advance the Non-Motorized Plan, this could be pointed out in the endorsement letter. For non-motorized projects that don't hurt or advance the plan, the MPO could send a generic letter and let the state make the final decision about the project. DeVries agreed that rejecting an enhancement grant application at the Committee level did not feel appropriate.

Itani noted that the state's Enhancement Selection Committee may give more weight to projects that are included in the MPO's LRTP or Non-Motorized Plan. Redmond, who serves on the state's Enhancement Selection Committee, confirmed that projects that are part of an MPO's Plan do receive more credibility. If proposed projects are not part of the Plan, Redmond recommended that they be amended into it. Discussion ensued.

Itani stated that the Committee has two options as to how to handle the approval process for transportation enhancement applications. The Committee can decide to review all transportation enhancement grant applications before they are submitted, or they can delegate authority to the MPO Staff to write a letter of support for non-motorized enhancement grant applications, and then the Committee would act to add the projects to the TIP after they received approval.

DeVries recommended that there just be one approval process for all projects, but noted that there could be two distinct letters of support for enhancement grant applications. The first letter would be for projects that are already listed in the Non-Motorized Plan. The other would be a generic letter of support for projects that are not. Itani added that the project would still be brought to the Committee after it was approved so that it could be added to the TIP. Conners stated that this appeared to be the most reasonable approach. Discussion ensued.

Dewey clarified that the Committee was agreeable with the final wording in the Policies and Practices document that stated that (1) all non-motorized projects included in the GVMC Long Range Transportation Plan/Non-Motorized Transportation Plan are eligible for funding as allowed under applicable federal aid funding categories and (2) that all non-motorized projects requesting federal funds must go through the MPO project selection process to receive federal funds and be included in the MPO's TIP.

Warren noted that "project selection process" should read "endorsement process." Discussion ensued.

APPROVED

APPROVED
ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

Conners entertained a motion to approve the Non-Motorized Policies and Practices document.

MOTION by Schweitzer, SUPPORT by Cochran, to recommend approval of the Non-Motorized Policies and Practices Document dated February 23rd, 2011 to the Policy Committee, with the wording revision indicated by Warren. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. **REGIONAL INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (ITS)/TRAFFIC OPERATIONS UPDATE**

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, Bautch and Dale provided an update on the status of ITS implementation in the region. Bautch explained that MDOT is currently in the process of updating the Regional ITS Architecture and Deployment Plan for the GVMC area, which consists of the geographic area defined by the GVMC MPO modeled boundary. The most recent update to the GVMC Regional ITS Architecture was completed in 2005. The update, which started in June, 2010, will reflect changes, technically or operationally, experienced within the region since 2005. Dale reviewed user needs (which included expanded surveillance on the freeways, improved coordination with the media, improved coordination between 911 dispatch, etc.), described ITS architecture program areas (traffic management, emergency management, maintenance and construction management, and public transportation), and provided additional information. The project is now in its final steps.

Peplinski stated that the ITS architecture is a plan for individual communities and agencies to be able to build something that connects together in the end for regional connectivity.

Snell invited the Committee members to tour the West Michigan Traffic Operations Center after the meeting. Peplinski added that if Committee members are unable to attend the tour, they can go to Michigan.gov/its, and then click on West Michigan, for more information. Discussion ensued.

A copy of the presentation can be found at: <http://gvmc.org/transportation/ITS.shtml>.

VI. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Robinson announced that the deadline for TIP amendments for the April Tech and Policy meetings is Monday, March 28th.

Snell noted that there has been a lot of publicity about the 36th St. bridge in Wyoming. He asked if Clyde Park would be used as a detour route. Kent stated that he would look into this.

Cochran noted that the GM plant in Wyoming will start coming down in April, which will lead to additional traffic.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**

Conners adjourned the March 2, 2011 Technical Committee meeting at 10:38 am.