

APPROVED

APPROVED
ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A

MINUTES

Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING STUDY GROUP
Thursday, August 10th, 2006
Kent County Road Commission 1500 Scribner NW

The meeting was called to order by Dooley, Chair of the Technical Committee at 8:35 a.m.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present

Bill Dooley (<i>Chair</i>)	City of Wyoming
Marta Brechting	Alpine Township
Patrick Bush	City of Grand Rapids
Rick DeVries	City of Grand Rapids
Ken Feldt	City of East Grand Rapids
Wayne Harrall	Kent County
Gerald Mears	City of Wyoming
Terry Schweitzer	City of Kentwood
Steve Warren (<i>Vice Chair</i>)	KCRC

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Roger Belknap	KCRC
Patti Brink	GVMC Staff
Chris Dingman	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Steve Redmond	MDOT-Grand Region
Conrad Venema	The Rapid

Voting Members Not Present

Sandy Ayers	Village of Caledonia
James Beelen	Allendale Township
Mike Berrevoets	City of Cedar Springs (FTCH)
Ron Carr	City of Grandville
Scott Conners	City of Walker
Bryan Chodkowski	Village of Sparta
Jim Fetzer	The Rapid
John Gorney	City of Hudsonville
Tim Haagsma	Gaines Township
Don Hilton, Sr.	Gaines Township

APPROVED

Dick Johnston
Ken Klomparens
Tom Palarz
Bob Rinck

**APPROVED
ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A**

City of Rockford
GRFIA
OCRC
Ottawa County

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dooley entertained a motion to approve the February 17th, 2006 Transportation Programming Study Group Meeting Minutes.

MOTION by Feldt, SUPPORT by Schweitzer to approve the February 17th, 2006 Transportation Programming Study Group Meeting Minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. FY2009 PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

Based on the discussions at the last Technical Committee meeting, Itani noted that the intent of today’s meeting is to put a list of projects together based on PCI’s to program FY2009 Resurfacing and Reconstruction projects only. He stated that with MDOT’s concurrence, the attached spreadsheets reflect what funds will be available in FY2009. He noted that STP-Rural projects are not included, and a meeting to determine funding will be scheduled at a later date. He explained the process/criteria for the ranking of these FY2009 priority projects as well. Itani stressed that in his opinion the most important criteria for ranking is PCI, but the decision is up to the committee. Discussion, comments and questions followed.

Warren clarified that the intent is to identify projects that can be obligated by next year according to the rules of the Local Jobs Today Program, and what additional projects can be identified from this list. Bush and others requested clarification on the rules of this program – that determination in this regard is needed as it will impact what is ultimately submitted. Discussion followed. Schweitzer noted a City of Kentwood project that was submitted for this program but declined as it did not meet the obligation deadline. Discussion followed. Itani addressed MDOT’s involvement in this process. He also inquired as to whether there are enough projects in this list to move forward, or wait for more reconstruction projects and come back later. Discussion followed. Warren suggested identifying additional projects from this area that can be obligated by next year to qualify for any additional Local Jobs Today money, and not to try to identify full project lists in the FY2009 TIP. Bush discussed time constraints.

APPROVED

APPROVED ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A

Dooley suggested identifying only those projects that can be obligated by the end of September, see how that alters the list, and those that did not qualify could potentially be approved on an alternate list for FY2009. The jurisdictions were asked to identify projects on the list that would be a problem to obligate by September, 2007. DeVries discussed obligation status of the City of Grand Rapids projects. Discussion followed. Feldt inquired, and Dingman clarified the tracking formula for project submittals.

Dooley, Warren and Bush discussed the possibility of having a project list ready should there be a second Call for Projects. Much discussion ensued regarding the development of the TIP with something less than the full amount. Itani and others believe that it should be programmed 100%. Warren noted that once we get through the Local Jobs Today Program we have the opportunity to revisit the FY2009 TIP for Reconstruction and Widen projects. Looking at the broader picture Itani identified funding categories and limits. Itani also clarified that the listed projects do not require a change to air quality. Warren suggested that each jurisdiction identify reconstruction project priorities. Schweitzer inquired as to funding for ITS. Discussion followed.

It was suggested that each committee member identify reconstruction project priorities. Discussion followed. Itani noted that it is a committee choice as to whether we want to program 100% of funds today for projects that could be obligated before September 2007, or leave part of that money for later on to be obligated in FY2009. Discussion followed.

Dingman commented that to date there is not a Call for Projects by MDOT, and that this MPO is proactive in the development of this list now. Schweitzer and others suggested a resurfacing only list of projects at this time for action. Discussion followed. Bush noted that if it is pure resurfacing a different criteria would be used, which impacts what the City and others submit. Harrall commented that there are other projects that could be submitted. Bush suggested dropping everything that cannot be obligated.

Bush commented that the committee needs a goal – and that goal may be to program the TIP now to meet to meet FY2007 Obligation to accommodate the Jobs Today Program. If that is the case, we should submit resurfacing and easy to obligate projects. Bush also stated that If we submit the full blown FY2009 TIP, we should submit projects that are our priorities, either Reconstruct or Resurface.

Dooley noted that the criteria should be that we need to identify projects that can be obligated by next September - either reconstruction or resurfacing, and should be the projects that are most important for your community. Dingman addressed an OCRC project which should be repackaged to meet eligibility of the MPO PCI requirement

The committee concurred that the list should reflect any project that can be obligated

APPROVED

APPROVED
ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A

next year, whether it be reconstruction or resurfacing. Dooley emphasized the importance of selecting the most important projects. Itani stressed that the highest priority should be PCI. DeVries suggested the formation of a Regional Asset Management System. Discussion followed. Warren/Itani noted that the submitted list is good, and explained the criteria used to determine priorities. Discussion followed. Dooley had concerns that it does not take in PCI's. Staff and some members discussed ways that the process could be improved. He emphasized the importance of submitting projects that will get funds. Discussion followed. The committee agreed to meet on Monday, August 14th at 8:30 a.m. at the KCRC. Dooley requested that each jurisdiction look at their list, and determine that all projects are priorities whether they are reconstruction or resurfacing. Discussion followed. Dingman will contact each jurisdiction to discuss the priority projects that will appear on the list.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Dooley adjourned the meeting at 9:45 a.m.