APPROVED **APPROVED**

ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

MINUTES

Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division

TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING STUDY GROUP

Friday, January 30, 2009
City of Wyoming Township Hall 1155 28th Street SW

Conners, Chair of the TPSG Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:40 am.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present

Scott Conners	*(Chair)*	City of Walker
Roger Belknap		KCRC
Patrick Bush		City of Grand Rapids
Ron Carr		City of Grandville
Tim Cochran		City of Wyoming
Sandra M. Cornell-Howe		MDOT
Mike DeVries		Grand Rapids Township
Rick DeVries		City of Grand Rapids
Bill Dooley		City of Wyoming
Ken Feldt		City of East Grand Rapids
Wayne Harrall	*Proxy for*	Kent County Road Commission
	Steve Warren	Kent County Road Commission
Roy Hawkins		GRFIA
Jan Hoekstra		The Rapid
Brett Laughlin		OCRC
Terry Schweitzer		City of Kentwood

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Russ Henckel	City of Wyoming
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Sarah Koepke	FHWA
Steve Redmond	MDOT
Darrell Robinson	GVMC Staff

Voting Members Not Present

Sandy Ayers	Village of Caledonia
Mike Berrevoets	City of Cedar Springs (FTCH)
Mike Bouwkamp	City of Rockford

Christine Burns	City of Cedar Springs
Sharon DeLange	Village of Sparta
Dan DesJarden	City of Lowell
Jerry Hall	City of Cedar Springs
D. Dale Mohr	Georgetown Township
Steve Peterson	Cascade Township
Jared Rodriguez	GR Chamber
Dan Strikwerda	City of Hudsonville
Steve Warren	KCRC
Vicki Weerstra	MDOT

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Conners entertained a motion to approve of the January 9, 2009 Transportation Programming Study Group Meeting Minutes.

MOTION by Laughlin, SUPPORT by Belknap, to approve the January 9, 2009 Transportation Programming Study Group Meeting Minutes.

Harrall stated that he was listed as a voting member when he should have been listed as a guest. He asked that this change be amended into the motion. Conners returned the amended motion to the floor.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. PRIORITIZATION OF ILLUSTRATIVE/ECONOMIC STIMULUS PROJECTS

Conners began the discussion on prioritizing the illustrative/economic stimulus projects by clarifying that the objective of the meeting was not to necessarily prioritize the projects, but rather to discuss a strategy for selecting projects at the next meeting.

Referencing a handout and **Item IV: Attachment A**, Itani updated the Committee on the latest news regarding the economic stimulus package. He stated that he is expecting to receive 13 million in urban economic stimulus funding, plus an additional $891,000 in rural funding. Therefore, Itani continued, the list of submitted stimulus projects would need to be cut down from 157 million to 13 million dollars. A supplemental illustrative list of approximately 12 million dollars would also need to be created in case additional stimulus money becomes available next year.

Referring to the discussion on jurisdictional equity from the last meeting, Itani stated that Grand Valley Metro Council will not support suballocating funding percentages

to certain jurisdictions. He stated that for future TIPs, a system needs to be developed that's equitable to the system, not the entity, as that is the best way to service all of the MPO's traveling members. All projects selected for the TIP must be in the federal aid system and be deficient. There will be two funding sources: urban and rural. Rural projects still qualify for urban funding. Therefore, Itani explained, the committee will need to decide whether to include rural projects under the "urban" funding umbrella.

Itani clarified that there are many unknowns at this point, such as what the timeline will look like to receive the economic stimulus funding and the total amount of money that will be received. However, he stated that there are certain things that the Committee can do to expedite the process. He recommended that the Committee just complete resurfacing or preservation projects that are ready to go, at least for the first 50% of the funding. Those projects will only require a 30-45 day public involvement process. Any projects that require an air quality analysis would mean that the MPO will be tied in with Holland and Muskegon, which could cause delays. Comments, questions and discussion ensued.

Koepke provided an update on where the Economic Stimulus Bill is in the legislative process and stated that the President is expected to sign the bill on President's Day, which is Monday, February 16. Koepke stated that as the bill currently stands, there will be an ultimate timeline that states that all projects must be completed within 3 years. She has heard anything from 75 to 120 days for the timeline for project obligation. Transit is expected to receive its own pot of funding. She recommended that the committee go to Federal Highways' economic recovery web page for updates.

Itani added that, as of 4:45 pm on January 29, the Senate was proposing 27 billion for highway investment and mandating that no less than 5% of the economic stimulus money be spent on CMAQ projects. He stated that there would also be 5.5 billion set aside for a discretionary program that would mandate that there be geographic equity in the distribution of funds. Projects on I-196 or the East Beltline could qualify to receive funding from the discretionary program.

In light of this discussion, Itani asked the Committee if, knowing the time constraints, they wanted to proceed by moving FY2010 and FY2011 projects in the TIP and then working to redevelop the FY2010 and FY2011 TIP through the regular process. Discussion ensued. Koepke stated that the second half of the stimulus money will need to be obligated by the locals by June 1, 2010 and by the state by August 1, 2010. Koepke added that if the President signs the stimulus bill on February 16th, they will have seven days to get the money out to the states. The deadlines start kicking in after the seven days have passed. If the deadline is 90 days, the date will be May 25. If the deadline is 180 days, the date will be July 12.

Itani asked the Committee if it was agreeable to look at the existing TIP and move projects forward. Dooley disagreed with this idea, stating that if this approach were

to be taken, the City of Wyoming wouldn't get a shot at receiving any stimulus money. Bush said that whether the project was in the TIP or not was irrelevant, as long as the project deadlines can be met. Dooley stated that everyone should identify projects that they can commit to obligating by May 25.

Itani recommended that the Committee use all 13 million of stimulus funding in the first phase, and stated that the list can include enhancement projects. Itani said that GVMC would develop a list by the time of the next meeting on Friday, February 6. After the list is developed, it will be taken to the Tech Committee, the Policy Committee, and then on to Metro Council. Itani reiterated that any projects selected must meet PCI requirements and be in the Long Range Plan. Discussion ensued.

Itani stated that the TIP needs to be completed by the end of April. After that point, all projects in the TIP will be able to move forward to MDOT for obligation. Cornell-Howe stated that the Committee should think of things happening concurrently, not consecutively. Discussion ensued.

Itani returned the discussion to the idea of jurisdictional equity and reiterated the position of Metro Council. He stated that a better process needs to be put in place to distribute the funds, based on system needs, and asked the Committee members for ideas. Conners stated that jurisdictional equity should be kept in mind, but that it shouldn't be the only basis for distributing funds. Itani responded that money needs to be circulated within the MPO so that the system is taken care of as a whole. He suggested that they provide every community with a 75% minimum guarantee, and spend the remaining 25% on needed projects within certain rotating communities. This would achieve two goals: every community would get their fair share, and over the long term, the money would be available for larger projects in a system-wide basis. DeVries added that years ago, the City of Grand Rapids used to make sure that money was spent equally by wards. Eventually they moved towards an asset management plan where they rotated projects between the wards. He asked if other MPOs had developed models for fund distribution that we could model after. Dooley responded that DeVries's method only works when looking objectively at an entire area. The way the system had been working was to give everybody their 1st and 2nd priorities, and since some areas have bigger systems, this makes objectivity break down. Itani responded that he agreed with Dooley but wouldn't take the position of telling the members what to do, as long as projects were picked from the deficiency list. He continued that if the Committee needs to move to Dooley's model, he can develop a formula and recommend it to the Committee for approval. Bush commented that the old system worked in the past, and there was always "horse-trading" going on. He stated that there were always years when the funding seemed imbalanced, but it always evened out over time. Therefore, it seemed like the Committee was attempting to fix something that wasn't broken. Discussion ensued.

Conners stated that the Committee needed to have a gentleman's agreement to go use the previous system. Bush stated that before the committee argued about who received how much, they should see what stimulus projects could meet the

deadline. He continued that the projects that get selected should be the ones that are ready to go first, irregardless of the community they are in.

Conners asked the Committee to submit the Phase One projects they could have ready to go by May 25, as well as the Phase Two projects that would meet the July 12 deadline, to Robinson by 5 pm on Wednesday, February 4.

DeVries asked if construction engineering or design and construction engineering costs would be covered through the stimulus package. Itani stated that that would go against the policies of the MPO.

Harrall asked if the TPSG Committee could request that Metro Council give their blessing to amend the TIP to the Tech or Policy Committee to expedite the process. M. DeVries stated that he would bring this up at the next Metro Council Meeting. Discussion ensued.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Conners adjourned the January 30, 2009 TPSG meeting at 11:38 am.