

MINUTES

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, November 7, 2012
Kent County Road Commission
1500 Scribner NW Grand Rapids, MI**

Harrall, chair of the Technical Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:36 am. The Committee members, staff, and guests present introduced themselves. Harrall welcomed guests Smith and Armstrong from MDOT's Office of Economic Development (OED).

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

Wayne Harrall (<i>Chair</i>)		Kent County
Jerry Alkema		Allendale Township
Alex Arends		Alpine Township
Timothy Cochran		City of Wyoming
Scott Conners		City of Walker
Rick DeVries		City of Grand Rapids
Ken Feldt		City of East Grand Rapids
Jim Ferro		Ada Township
Tim Haagsma		Gaines Charter Township
Jan Hoekstra		ITP-The Rapid
Dennis Kent	<i>Proxy for</i>	MDOT
	<i>Mark Howe</i>	City of Lowell
Jack Klein	<i>Proxy for</i>	OCRC
	<i>Brett Laughlin</i>	OCRC
Ray Lenze		MDOT
Dave Pasquale		Grand Rapids Township
Steve Peterson		Cascade Charter Township
Terry Schweitzer		City of Kentwood
Dan Strikwerda		City of Hudsonville
Steve Warren		KCRC
Chris Zull		City of Grand Rapids

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Bryan Armstrong	MDOT OED
Fred Bunn	City of East Grand Rapids
Brian Donovan	City of East Grand Rapids
Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Erick Kind	MDOT
Roger Marks	C2AE
Steve Redmond	MDOT
Darrell Robinson	GVMC Staff
Suzanne Schulz	City of Grand Rapids
Norm Sevensma	WMEAC-RWBC
Mike Smith	MDOT OED

APPROVED

Jim Snell
Rick Sprague
George Yang
Mike Zonyk

Voting Members Not Present

Roger Belknap
Dan Carlton
Ron Carr
Dick Davies
Mike DeVries
Bill Dooley
Roy Hawkins
Dennis Hoemke
Jim Holtrop
Bob Homan
Mark Howe
Brett Laughlin
Jim Miedema
Audrey Nevins Weiss
Chuck Porter
Martin Super
Toby VanEss
Phil Vincent

APPROVED
Item II: Attachment A

GVMC Staff
KCRC
GVMC Staff
GVMC Staff

City of Cedar Springs
Georgetown Township
City of Grandville
Cannon Township
Grand Rapids Township
City of Wyoming
GRFIA
Algoma Township
Ottawa County
Plainfield Township
City of Lowell
OCRC
Jamestown Township
Byron Township
Courtland Township
Village of Sparta
Tallmadge Township
City of Rockford

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Harrall entertained a motion to approve the September 12, 2012 Technical Committee meeting minutes.

MOTION by Haagsma, SUPPORT by Conners, to approve the September 12, 2012 Technical Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Sevensma commented that he recently cycled the Pere Marquette Trail from Leroy to Cadillac and noted that it's completely paved. Discussion ensued.

IV. FY2011-2014 TIP AMENDMENTS/MODIFICATIONS

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A**, Robinson noted that several jurisdictions were requesting to amend/modify the FY2011-2014 TIP.

First, Robinson explained that the City of Grand Rapids was requesting to add an approved Safe Routes to School project to FY2013 of the TIP. The recipient of the project is Palmer Elementary School in Grand Rapids.

Second, the KCRC requested to add several approved Federal Safety projects as well as one High Risk Rural Roads project to FY2013 of the TIP.

Third, MDOT/FHWA have determined several CMAQ projects eligible for funding which need to be added to FY2013-2014 of the TIP. Lastly, MDOT requested to add funds to two FY2013 General Program accounts: Trunkline Pre-Construction-GPA and Trunkline Bridge CPM-GPA.

Harrall entertained a motion to amend/modify the FY2011-2013 TIP.

MOTION by Pasquale, SUPPORT by Warren, to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the amendments/modifications to the FY2011-2014 TIP requested by the City of Grand Rapids, the KCRC, and MDOT/FHWA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. PRESENTATION BY THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OED) OF THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (MDOT)

Itani informed the Committee that, with MAP-21, there is a new program—the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)—that is a conglomeration of several former SAFETEA-LU programs, including Enhancement, Safe Routes to School, and Recreational Trails. Itani noted that because TAP is new, a policy must be put in place that details how to administer it and how to allocate the funding. Itani further explained that Congress will allow the MPOs to receive 50% of the funding directly. For FY2013 and FY2014, GVMC is expected to receive \$668,000 each year, which is half the funding the MPO should be receiving based on the area's population as a TMA. The other half resides with the State. As for a project selection process, Itani proposed that Staff receive the applications from the Committee members directly before they go to the state to review them and make sure that they are eligible for funding. Itani also noted that the state has a project-selection process in place that they have been using and suggested that the Committee use this same criteria. He added that the program would likely be like the CMAQ program. Itani also recommended that Committee members vote on which projects to submit for funding, prioritize these projects, and develop an illustrative list to ensure that no funding is lost. All selected projects must meet the MPOs goals before approving them for funding.

For the four City of Grand Rapids projects currently in the pipeline, Itani stated that the State is committed to funding them. Therefore, this new program should not impact FY2013 and FY2014 projects and the money available will be for programming new projects. Smith and Armstrong reiterated that the Committee will have the ability to move forward projects in the pipeline and offered the Committee the use of their software system and a full collaborative process. Discussion ensued.

Warren asked if there is intent to get 100% funding allocation instead of the 50% and if it is true that all MPOs are receiving 50% of the funding. Itani confirmed that this is true for all MPOs. Armstrong added that funding has been reduced and the overall pot of funding is smaller. Discussion, comments and questions ensued.

Itani asked if there are set-asides for Enhancement and Safe Routes to School projects under TAP. (There is a set aside for Recreational Trails.) Armstrong replied that there are not, and that all of the funding could, for example, go toward Safe Routes to School projects. By the same token, the Committee would not be required to have any Safe Routes to School projects. Congress does not require all of the eligible activities to be

funded. Itani noted that GVMC may not have the staff to administer the Safe Routes to School Program. Discussion, comments and questions ensued.

Referring to a handout, Armstrong went through an overview of the TAP, eligible activities, and program requirements. Discussion, comments and questions ensued. Referring to the same handout, Smith discussed the online application software for TAP projects with the Committee. He noted that the old system is offline and closed, and that the new software offers many technological improvements over the old. He added that this system is not just for applications; everything cradle to grave with the grant will be in this system. Referencing various screen shots, he demonstrated how to use the software, including how to fill out a grant application. Discussion ensued.

Itani noted that projects for TAP grants must be submitted by the end of January. Armstrong recommended that, as the Committee comes up with projects for FY2013 and FY2014, that the members put the applications in for future years as well, up to FY2016. Itani added that the Committee will be developing a project list for current funding, as well as an illustrative list for future years. Discussion ensued.

Speaking again on the handout, Armstrong noted that the Safe Routes to School program will continue to be run as it has been. This program was formerly 100% federally funded, but there is currently a local match minimum requirement of 20%. Armstrong also pointed out ineligible infrastructure and infrastructure related items, as well as ineligible non-infrastructure programs, equipment and activities. Discussion ensued.

Itani said that Staff would call a meeting soon to determine how to prioritize TAP projects. Harrall agreed that this meeting would need to take place soon. Discussion ensued.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Robinson informed the Committee that Staff is planning on programming the new FY2014-2017 TIP ASAP, but they are currently waiting on information from MDOT. Itani added that there is a new funding mechanism with MAP-21, and there have been some funding changes, and there are various unknowns. However, STP funds did go down and the EDFC donor bonus minimum allocation will be shifted to the MPO under STP, which is good for the MPO since EDFC was very restrictive. He noted that he believed that MDOT has committed to funding all the projects in FY2013 of the TIP, but the Committee will likely have to readjust FY2014.

Harrall noted that there is some urgency for the TIP committee to reconvene to develop guidelines for TAP projects. Itani explained that, from Staff's perspective, the first hurdle will be to develop eligibility criteria. The second hurdle is how these projects relate to other projects in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program, and the 3rd hurdle is if the project meets all of the requirements or not, which will not be known until after the application is filed. Harrall added that projects will somehow need to be prioritized. Armstrong noted that MDOT welcomes prioritization of the entire applicant pool, but it doesn't mean that they will necessarily follow it. Itani added that Armstrong and Smith would be invited to the TIP meetings to discuss prioritization and project selection criteria for TAP projects and that the

APPROVED

APPROVED
Item II: Attachment A

Committee would be using a similar process to CMAQ projects for prioritization. Discussion ensued.

Itani stated that Staff would send out some possible dates for the next TPSG Committee meeting. He encouraged the Committee to contact himself or Robinson with questions.

DeVries announced that the City of Grand Rapids is working on a grant that would provide bicycle education as well as common standards for signs and symbols. The local match will hopefully be foundation dollars vs. City dollars. Smith noted that this wouldn't be eligible under the TAP, but that it may be possible to use existing old enhancement funds for this project. Discussion ensued.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Harrall adjourned the November 7, 2012 Technical Committee meeting at 11:24 am.