

APPROVED

APPROVED  
ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A

MINUTES

Grand Valley Metropolitan Council  
Transportation Division  
**TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING STUDY GROUP**  
Monday, August 14<sup>th</sup>, 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
Patrick Bush	City of Grand Rapids
Rick DeVries	City of Grand Rapids
Ken Feldt	City of East Grand Rapids
Russ Henckel <i>Proxy for Jerry Mears</i>	City of Wyoming
Wayne Harrall	Kent County
Sandra Cornell-Howe	MDOT
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

**Voting Members Not Present**

Sandy Ayers	Village of Caledonia
James Beelen	Allendale Township
Mike Berrevoets	City of Cedar Springs (FTCH)
Marta Brechting	Alpine Township
Ron Carr	City of Grandville
Scott Connors	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
Dick Johnston	City of Rockford

**APPROVED**

Ken Klomparens  
Gerald Mears  
Tom Palarz  
Bob Rinck

**APPROVED**

**ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A**

GRFIA  
City of Wyoming  
OCRC  
Ottawa County

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Dooley entertained a motion to approve the August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Transportation Programming Study Group Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION by Bush, SUPPORT by Warren, to approve the August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Transportation Programming Study Group Meeting Minutes.**

Discussion followed. Warren commented positively on Brink's accuracy in recording/drafting the Minutes.

Dooley called to question the motion on the floor. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**IV. FY2009 PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT**

Dooley gave the committee a recap of the last Transportation Planning Study Group meeting, and also stated the purpose of today's meeting. As he discussed the guidelines that were established he stressed that the selected projects must be obligated by September, 2007. He clarified that these are projects will be included in the FY2009 TIP for our area. The goal of this exercise is to identify projects to be submitted to CRAM and MML as projects that we would like to have considered in FY2009 for Advance Construct as a way to use up the Jobs Today Program dollars that still have not been allocated. The projects on this revised list are air quality neutral.

Itani requested clarification of the process on the CRAM level, and inquired as to whether the projects need to be listed in the TIP prior to acceptance. If required to be in the TIP, a time problem for approval could be a challenge due to the lengthy process that is in place. He will keep the committee apprised on the process as more information surfaces. Discussion followed. Warren gave his suggestions as to how to move forward until we receive clarification. Cornell-Howe stated that the projects have to be the TIP to be funded. She also clarified that the process is the same for the Illustrative list.

Dooley commented that this region should be as prepared as possible to take full

**APPROVED**

**APPROVED**  
**ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A**

advantage of this funding opportunity. Discussion followed.

As Bush outlined the issues before the committee, he also suggested a funding strategy for programming the FY2007, 2008, and 2009 projects. Cornell-Howe stated that FY2009 projects can't be added just because we would want to. Bush responded that the intent is to identify a list of projects that have been supported by the MPO and members as the accepted list of projects for the FY2009 year that fits the federal dollars available, so at the next round of MML and CRAM funding they will have our MPO supported TIP. If and when MDOT & FHWA call for an FY2009 TIP – this is what it looks like. Itani discussed some challenges with the State Process. Discussion, comments and questions followed. Dooley requested clarification of dollar amounts for each year.

Referring to the list which was handed out to the members, Dingman outlined some of the changes and gave an explanation as to why the change occurred. He also noted that one of the traffic counts for a Kentwood project was misreported, and an Ottawa County project did not qualify and is ineligible due to PCI. Discussion followed.

Bush identified easy to program projects for FY2008. Discussion and comments followed. Warren and Schweitzer had questions on amending projects into the existing TIP. Dingman clarified which projects were agreed upon as well as the funding amounts. The committee concurred that these projects are considered for FY2008. (Attached is the entire FY2008 STP Urban list – projects that were added are noted as new.) Dingman clarified the process for internal tracking and project submittal.

As programming for FY2009 was addressed, Bush commented that the pool is much bigger than what is identified on the list. He noted projects of interest for the City of Grand Rapids. Warren commented that the West River Drive project is the KCRC's first priority. Itani noted that according to PCI and the Policy that is in place, the West River Drive project does not qualify for reconstruct. Discussion followed. Warren gave reasons why this project could qualify, noting the timing of when the last measurements were taken. Bush asked Staff if there is recent data available to confirm or dispel Warren's assessment of PCI.

As Itani clarified the current process that is in place, he stated that some measurements could be more current than others. Changing the policy would necessitate GVMC Board approval to waive the current policy. As discussion continued, Itani agreed to run analysis on Northland Drive and West River.

Warren suggested developing a preliminary list showing that West River Drive is the priority for KCRC. Dooley concurred, and stated to include on the list that the project is subject to PCI, and that a substitute project(s) is ready so it meets criteria in the event a project does not qualify.

Warren clarified that West River is the top priority, and named 3 resurfacing projects

## APPROVED

## APPROVED ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A

as alternatives (second priority)

Discussion continued. Warren suggested that the committees meet to discuss how PCI is used and the TIP. Dingman noted that as the Pavement Management Van is utilized, this is the last year that this will be an issue.

Schweitzer had questions as to how we will compete on a State level. Warren and Cornell-Howe noted that local comments and geographic equity are the factors with this issue.

Cornell-Howe distributed the Local Agency Programs (LAP) FY2007 Project Planning Guide. As discussion continued and questions were asked, she reiterated that projects get obligated at the time of advertising, if obligation is available. Discussion followed.

Dooley clarified for the committee the project selection and funding amounts that were agreed upon today for FY2009.

Dooley entertained a motion to recommend to the Technical Committee the list of projects that were agreed upon in today's meeting, with the understanding that if projects do not qualify the substitutions/alternatives agreed upon earlier will be programmed in their place.

**MOTION by Bush, SUPPORT by Warren to recommend to the Technical Committee approval of the list of FY2009 preservation projects (attached) that are subject to current PCI, and with the understanding that if projects do not qualify the substitutions/alternatives agreed upon today will be programmed in their place. This list of projects will be forwarded for the local Jobs Today consideration. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

## V. **OTHER BUSINESS**

With regard to CMAQ projects, Itani gave the committee an overview on what MDOT and Staff are working on to have a clear Project Call. He also reminded the members that any CMAQ projects submitted should mitigate congestion and reduce emissions. Discussion followed.

He noted some changes that are in the process of being made with regard to Advance Construct. Programming CMAQ projects based on Obligation Authority will be replaced with programming on Appropriation. He gave reasons for this change, and noted that with this process funds will be used to the fullest. Itani stated that Set Asides will be replaced with the dollars coming back to us, resulting in more project funding. He clarified that we are still committed to the 50/50 split. Bush is concerned that Set Asides funded ITS, and cautioned that we should not lose sight of this funding commitment. Itani noted that the funding process will take care of this issue by allowing us to over program by 20%. We can still go forward without a TIP Amendment. Bush inquired as

**APPROVED**

**APPROVED**  
**ITEM III: ATTACHMENT A**

to when the project list is due, and when the next ITS Sub Committee would be scheduled. Discussion followed.

Itani stated with everything in one pot for CMAQ, the committee can decide on how to move forward. Discussion, comments and questions followed. Warren inquired as to the date for the next Rural Committee meeting. Dingman will work with Warren to schedule the meeting.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

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