

**MINUTES**

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council  
Transportation Division  
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING  
Wednesday, September 3, 2014  
Kent County Road Commission  
1500 Scribner NW      Grand Rapids, MI**

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

**I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS****Voting Members Present**

Chris Zull ( <i>Chair</i> )		City of Grand Rapids
Alex Arends		Alpine Township
Ron Carr		City of Grandville
Scott Conners		City of Walker
Rick DeVries		City of Grand Rapids
Jim Ferro		Ada Township
Wayne Harrall	<i>Proxy for</i>	Kent County
	<i>Mike DeVries</i>	Grand Rapids Township
	<i>Tim Haagsma</i>	Gaines Charter Township
Jan Hoekstra	<i>Proxy for</i>	ITP-The Rapid
	<i>Rod Ghearing</i>	ITP-The Rapid
Jim Holtrop		Ottawa County
Mark Howe		City of Lowell
Fred Keena	<i>Proxy for</i>	OCRC
	<i>Brett Laughlin</i>	OCRC
Dennis Kent	<i>Proxy for</i>	MDOT
	<i>Paul Lott</i>	MDOT
Steve Peterson		Cascade Charter Township
Terry Schweitzer ( <i>Vice Chair</i> )		City of Kentwood
Rick Sprague	<i>Proxy for</i>	KCRC
	<i>Steve Warren</i>	KCRC
Dan Strikwerda		City of Hudsonville
Roger Towsley		Village of Sand Lake

**Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present**

Mike Brameijer	GVMC
Danielle Coles	FHWA
Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Erick Kind	MDOT
Roger Marks	C2AE
Darrell Robinson	GVMC Staff
Suzann Schulz	City of Grand Rapids
Norm Sevensma	WMEAC-RWBC
Jim Snell	GVMC Staff
Rachael Tupica	FHWA

Steve Waalkes  
George Yang

Michigan Concrete Assn.  
GVMC Staff

**Voting Members Not Present**

Jerry Alkema  
Ken Bergwerff  
Dan Carlton  
Timothy Cochran  
Mike DeVries  
Bill Dooley  
Bill Fischer  
Rod Ghearing  
Tim Haagsma  
Roy Hawkins  
Dennis Hoemke  
Brett Laughlin  
Paul Lott  
Tim Nelson  
Audrey Nevins Weiss  
Chuck Porter  
Joe Slonecki  
Tom Stressman  
Toby VanEss  
Phil Vincent  
Steve Warren

Allendale Township  
Jamestown Township  
Georgetown Township  
City of Wyoming  
Grand Rapids Township  
City of Wyoming  
Plainfield Township  
ITP-The Rapid  
Gaines Charter Township  
KCDA/GRFIA  
Algoma Township  
OCRC  
MDOT-SPS  
Cannon Township  
Byron Township  
Courtland Township  
East Grand Rapids  
City of Cedar Springs  
Tallmadge Township  
City of Rockford  
KCRC

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Zull entertained a motion to approve the July 2, 2014 Technical Committee minutes.

**MOTION by Holtrop, SUPPORT by Schweitzer, to approve the July 2, 2014 Technical Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Sevensma noted that the bike rack that used to be in front of the KCRC was no longer there and asked if anyone knew what happened to it. No one knew its whereabouts.

**IV. 2040 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN TRANSPORTATION NEEDS**

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A**, Snell stated that he would be presenting the findings of all of the analyses completed for all of the various transportation elements contained in the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). He noted that this effort was the culmination of months and sometimes years of efforts to identify needs for all transportation resources in our community. He added that the Technical Committee would be asked to endorse the package of transportation needs so the work of developing a set of preferred alternatives and prioritization could begin. He clarified that preferred alternatives would not be selected at today’s meeting. They would only be looking at raw need. Preferred alternatives would be selected from these lists, with any remaining wants/needs becoming illustrative.

Snell further explained that there were eight unique elements that would be included in this discussion and that the TPSG Committee met earlier this week and reviewed and discussed the needs lists in great detail. Upon acceptance of the list of needs, the public will be invited to comment on the lists prior to any preferred alternatives being developed. The public comment period will last most of this month. He noted that the Committee may start to see notices in the press or on MLive, etc. as of today. He gave a brief overview of the remaining development process for the MTP, and then described all eight elements to the Committee.

**Capacity Deficiencies**—Snell stated that there were approximately 120 deficient corridors on the list and explained how these corridors were determined. He noted that the list may have changed since it was brought to the TPSG Committee based on feedback received.

Schulz asked if this list presumes that street infrastructure improvements are necessary or if it just identifies issues and potential solutions. She noted that potential solutions might not be road widening. They might involve mode shifts. Snell explained that GVMC has a congestion management process and that there are 25-30 different options to deal with roads that are over capacity. The last option they consider is widening. Discussion ensued.

Schulz also asked if the corresponding map has been overlaid with Non-Motorized projects and the transit map. She asked if it was possible to look at this from a multi-modal perspective. Snell replied that staff will look at per-person trips on various modes and that they do address potential for some alternate means of transportation. Discussion ensued.

Schulz further asked if transit was added to the East Beltline, what would the investment be in other modes to take extra vehicle trips out? Itani responded that it would depend on the deficiency. He reminded the Committee that any congestion improvement has air quality ramifications. He added that it's possible that the air quality model could show that adding a bike lane, for instance, might increase congestion and therefore decrease air quality. He noted that if a project has a detrimental impact on air quality, FHWA won't approve it. Itani added that he wouldn't emphasize widening facilities. He noted that the Tech and Policy Committees will need to make a decision about how they spend available money in the future, and that he believed preservation is a top priority. Discussion ensued.

**Intersections of Interest**—Snell stated that this list includes 103 intersections that the Committee may be interested in looking at further and noted that they will likely end up on the illustrative list because there probably won't be dollars associated with them. Snell noted that the jurisdictions responsible for these intersections are aware of them. Lastly, Snell noted that TPSG Committee members added a few more intersections to the list since the meeting.

Schweitzer asked if staff could highlight the intersections that are in the TIP already. Snell stated that staff can do that. Discussion ensued.

**Safety**—Snell stated that the MPO has a safety management system which shows trends. Yang updates this every year. There is also a separate safety plan that looks at different elements of safety and how we can address them, along with various opportunities for improvement. Itani added that the MPO's safety plan will ultimately look different than the one presented today because under MAP-21, there is a new safety program. The state will need to develop a safety plan, performance measures and targets. The state's policy will impact what the MPO will do. Itani noted that staff will have a year or year and a half to

bring GVMC's plan into compliance with the mandate once the plan is developed. Itani noted that most of the activities in the safety plan were for public information and education, and that he didn't expect to spend significant funding on these activities in the future. Discussion ensued.

**Freight**—Snell stated that the MPO has a freight network that staff has overlaid along with the major shippers in the area with the congestion map to see if there are facilities that need to be addressed to improve freight shipment to the area. He noted that there is also an outreach program with the Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce to identify hot spots areas that need to be improved. Robinson added that staff asked every area during the MTP jurisdictional meetings if there were any freight issue areas within their community. Some of the areas identified were railroad based; another finding was that the area could use a comprehensive freight facility.

**Non-Motorized**—Snell noted that there is a list of needs, corridors, etc. for Non-Motorized transportation in the Non-Motorized Plan. This document went to the Tech Committee for approval several months ago. He encouraged the Committee members to visit [gvmc.org](http://gvmc.org) for more information about the plan.

**Transit**—Snell stated that staff is working with ITP, and their transit plan is a 2030 plan, but many elements of it are still good. He noted that a lot of frequency improvements have been done because of millages that have passed. He noted that staff will be working with them to determine borderline corridors, including the East Beltline and the Laker Line.

**Pavement Condition**—Snell noted that pavement condition is a big issue and encouraged everyone to read through the Long Range Regional Pavement Needs Analysis Report on GVMC's website. He noted that the last page of the document contains an analysis on what will happen to the system at varying levels of resources. Discussion ensued.

Zull asked if Snell was asking for an endorsement now, or if he wanted to wait until Item V. Snell stated that he preferred for an endorsement now, and Zull entertained a motion to endorse the 2040 MTP needs list.

**MOTION by Conners, SUPPORT by DeVries, to recommend to the Policy Committee endorsement of the 2040 MTP transportation needs analysis authored by Snell. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

## **V. 2040 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN FINANCIAL OUTLOOK**

Referring to **Item V: Attachment A**, Robinson explained the draft financial plan to be included in the FY2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to the Committee, including the process through which the numbers were derived. He noted that the financial plan is the section of the MTP that documents the method used to calculate funds reasonably expected to be available and compares this amount to proposed projects to demonstrate that the MTP is financially constrained. The financial plan also identifies the costs of operating and maintaining the transportation system within GVMC.

The financial plan contains both the TIP and the MTP, and therefore covers a period of 26 years. The TIP and MTP are required to be fiscally constrained; that is, the cost of projects listed in the TIP and MTP cannot exceed the amount of funding "reasonably expected to be available" during that time.

This draft document is the first attempt at providing future estimates for funding of federal, state and local fund sources for highway and transit. Some of the financial estimates could be updated as more information comes in. Revenue forecasting relies on a combination of data and experience and represents a “best guess” of future trends. Robinson noted that the further out, the more of a guess the numbers become.

Staff will be looking for Technical Committee concurrence of the financial plan in order to continue moving forward with the programming of projects for the MTP. He noted that he hoped to have more final numbers before the Policy Committee meeting in two weeks, if possible.

Zull asked if the projected money available matched the area’s expected needs. Robinson responded that needs currently far outweigh revenue. Tupica added that every year, FHWA puts out planning emphasis areas, and one item they asked for this year was for MPOs to put together a funding/needs analysis to try to educate the public and Congress about what they have vs. what is needed to fix Michigan roads. Itani noted that this has been an issue for the last three plans, which is why the MPO maintains an illustrative list. Discussion ensued.

Itani clarified that the financial plan chapter of the MTP will be a standard chapter that all the MPOs are going to use. The format will be the same statewide and include all transportation funding, including millages, etc. It needs to be included in the analysis to make sure that the MTP is financially constrained. Discussion ensued.

Kent stated that the trunkline preservation revenue forecast table on page nine appears a little high. Robinson stated that this number was provided by MDOT staff in Lansing. Their numbers may have been high. Robinson stated that these numbers can be updated, but now, he is just looking for committee concurrence and acceptance of the format. Kent replied that he was fine with the format. Discussion ensued.

Zull stated that no action was required for this item.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Zull entertained a motion to adjourn the September 3, 2014 Technical Committee meeting.

**MOTION by Schweitzer, SUPPORT by Conners, to adjourn the September 3, 2014 Technical Committee meeting at 10:23 am. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**