

MINUTES

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
POLICY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, March 19, 2014
Kent County Road Commission
1500 Scribner NW Grand Rapids, MI**

Krombeen, chair of the Policy Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:35 am. Everyone present introduced themselves.

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

Ken Krombeen, <i>Chair</i>		City of Grandville
Gail Altman		Jamestown Township
Dave Bulkowski		Kent County Commissioner
Dan Carlton		Georgetown Township
Scott Conners	<i>Proxy for Darrel Schmalzel</i>	City of Walker
		City of Walker
Mark DeClercq		City of Grand Rapids
Don R. Hilton, Sr.		Gaines Township
Jim Holtrop	<i>Proxy for Dan Strikwerda</i>	Ottawa County
		City of Hudsonville
Dennis Kent	<i>Proxy for Mark Howe</i>	MDOT-Grand Region
		City of Lowell
Dal McBurrows		MDOT
Jim Miedema		OCRC
Joe Slonecki		City of East Grand Rapids
Ben Swayze		Cascade Township
Peter Varga, <i>Vice Chair</i>		ITP-The Rapid
Steve Warren		KCRC

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Josh Lungert	GR Chamber
Darrell Robinson	GVMC Staff
Jim Snell	GVMC Staff
Rachael Tupica	FHWA
Vicki Weerstra	MDOT
John Weiss	GVMC Staff
George Yang	GVMC Staff
Mike Zonyk	GVMC Staff

Voting Members Not Present

Jerry Alkema	Allendale Township
Alex Arends	Alpine Township
Jamie Davies	City of Rockford
Eric DeLong	City of Grand Rapids

Mike DeVries
 George Haga
 Bryan Harrison
 Dennis Hoemke
 Rich Houtteman
 Mark Howe
 Tim Nelson
 Audrey Nevins-Weiss
 Richard Pastoor
 Jack Poll
 Chuck Porter
 Brian Ryks
 Darrel Schmalzel
 Dan Strikwerda
 Thad Taylor
 Toby VanEss
 Member Awaiting Appointment

Grand Rapids Township
 Ada Township
 Caledonia Charter Township
 Algoma Township
 City of Kentwood
 City of Lowell
 Cannon Township
 Byron Township
 City of Wyoming
 City of Wyoming
 Courtland Township
 GRFIA
 City of Walker
 City of Hudsonville
 City of Cedar Springs
 Tallmadge Township
 Plainfield Township

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Krombeen entertained a motion to approve the January 15, 2014 minutes.

MOTION by Warren, SUPPORT by Miedema, to approve of the January 15, 2014 Policy Committee meeting minutes.

DeClercq asked if the following sentence from the January 15, 2014 minutes—"Snell noted that one new goal/objective was added to meet the federal guidelines, which involved getting projects done quickly and efficiently"—was going to spark any discussions on making the approval process for projects more efficient. He emphasized the importance of speeding up this process to reduce time and cost. Itani explained that everything that can be done to expedite the process at the MPO level has already been completed. He added that the approval process at MDOT and FHWA can only be addressed and modified within their organizations. Discussion ensued.

Krombeen called the motion to question. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. **OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Bulkowski announced that Disability Advocates is one of the sponsors of the annual "Kent County Legislative Lunch on Transit." The luncheon will be held on April 14, 2014 from 11:30 am – 1:00 pm at New Hope Baptist Church. He distributed a flyer with additional information about the event.

IV. **FY2014-2017 TIP AMENDMENTS/MODIFICATIONS**

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A**, Robinson stated that several jurisdictions were requesting to amend/modify the FY2014-2017 TIP. The TIP amendment/modification requests were as follows:

- The American Red Cross, Senior Neighbors, and Hope Network requested to add vehicles and computer equipment to the FY2014-2017 TIP utilizing 5310 funds.

(These projects are all minor in scope and significance and do not impact any other projects in the TIP.)

- ITP-The Rapid requested to amend/modify the FY2014-2017 TIP to update FY2014 project costs and to move two unobligated FY2013 projects (Section 5310: Elderly and Disabled and FY2013 FTA flexed CMAQ funds for the Park and Ride project) to FY2014. ITP-The Rapid also requested to modify the FY2015 TIP to reflect cost changes to several Section 5307 projects and to add in one Section 5339 project—Replacement 40' Low Floor Bus (3), one Section 5310 project—Elderly and Disabled FY2014, one Specialized Services 100% State project—Specialized Services Operating Assist, and one Section 5307 project—Paratransit Vehicle Replacement (6).
- The KCRC requested to amend/modify the FY2014-2017 TIP to delete a project – Patterson Ave. reconstruction—now funded with the Roads and Risks Reserve (RRR) funded projects. The KCRC also requested to move their Hudson St. bridge PM Project from 2015 to 2014 (it would be obligated with 2014 funds and constructed in 2015), to move ITP-The Rapid's three paratransit buses from 2015 to 2014, and to move their Division Avenue reconstruction project from 2016 to 2015.

Robinson noted that the KCRC's requests, if approved, would leave additional STP-rural funding in FY2016, and that the rural TPSG Committee may need to meet in the future to reprogram these funds.

Kent noted that MDOT has two RRRF projects that need to be in the TIP. Both projects need to move from the illustrative list into FY2014 of the TIP. The two projects were I—196 Eastbound over 22nd Avenue (bridge rehabilitation) and M-37 from 3 Mile to Alpenhorn (resurfacing). Both projects are primarily state funded. Itani clarified an administrative modification would be required to move both projects into the TIP.

Krombeen entertained a motion to amend/modify the FY2014-2017 TIP.

MOTION by Varga, SUPPORT by Holtrop, to approve of the amendments/modifications to the FY2014-2017 TIP requested by the American Red Cross, Senior Neighbors, Hope Network, ITP-The Rapid, the KCRC, and MDOT, as presented.

Hilton asked for clarification on what was happening with the Patterson Avenue reconstruction project. Robinson stated that it was funded under the RRRF program, and Warren provided additional information about the project.

Krombeen called the motion to question. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

V. 2014 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Referring to **Item V: Attachment A**, Snell explained that, prior to the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for the region, staff are required to review the strategies employed within the congestion element of the planning process to ensure that the methods used to analyze alternatives are timely and have the ability to be implemented if chosen through the process. This analysis is called the Congestion Management Process (CMP), and it is used by MPOs across the country to determine the best solutions to congested corridors and intersections.

GVMC has employed this process for a number of years. A draft copy of GVMC's CMP was included in the agenda, which included several updates that Yang made to reflect current trends and updated information on the means used to manage congestion in this area. Snell noted that the alternatives included within the CMP will be used to determine solutions to congestion-related deficiencies identified through the modeling process and requested that the Policy Committee endorse this document.

Yang explained the CMP process to the Committee, as well as his work on the document. Snell noted that Yang also added the BRT to the CMP. Discussion ensued.

Krombeen entertained a motion to endorse the 2014 Congestion Management Process.

MOTION by Hilton, SUPPORT by Holtrop, to endorse the 2014 Congestion Management Process.

Kent stated that he was looking over the travel time index study, and US-131 was listed in the "non-congested" category. Because MDOT is doing a study of the existing system, he asked to have an opportunity to review how this finding was determined and to use the outcome of the study to modify this label, if needed. Itani explained the methodology staff used to make this determination, noting that Yang drove the entire network during morning, noon, and afternoon peak travel times. Based on the speed Yang was traveling, US 131 did not meet the criteria for "congested." Yang added that morning peak hour is from 7-9 am and afternoon peak is from 4-6 pm. While it might be congested for a short period, once that is averaged over two hours, it doesn't show severe congestion. DeClercq supported Kent's comments, adding that he drives from Kalamazoo to Grand Rapids every day and that US-131 is very congested. He requested that staff make sure that the data and the CMP report are in sync and reflect reality. DeClercq suggested that staff, at the very least, add a notation that there are periods of peak congestion on 131. Itani agreed to make a notation about this, and further explained that congestion isn't showing in the model because staff uses a daily analysis, not time of day, for congestion. However, staff has an upcoming meeting with MDOT to review the model. Discussion ensued.

Warren questioned why Patterson was not listed on the "corridors of significance" map and asked what the objective of this map was. Snell explained that this map was developed and approved years ago as part of the 44th St. corridor improvements. The corridors listed were ones that the TPSG Committee wished to monitor for congestion and would be given priority to use federal funding to purchase right-of-way. Itani further explained that there is a difference between "corridors of significance" and significant corridors to the MPO. Lastly, Itani added that the only way that additional roads can be added to the "corridors of significance" map is if the Committee agrees to do so in the future. Discussion ensued.

Varga noted that a couple of maps in the CMP were missing and asked if they were significant. Snell stated that those maps are currently being developed.

Bulkowski asked if the reference to the new ITP master plan in the "Transit Projects" section on pg. 16 was a reference to the 2010 master plan. Additional comments on this section included the following:

- The Kent County Transit Needs Assessment should be noted in the document.

- The ongoing BRT project is in Grand Rapids, Kentwood, and Wyoming, in addition to the BRT Lakerline study.
- The statement that “These projects will tend to reduce system wide VMT in relatively small increments” appears to “dog” transit. He noted that the area lacks vision and ability to really invest in these projects, and that transit projects can significantly reduce VMT. He also added that buses are packed during rush hour.

Lastly, Bulkowski added that Downtown Grand Rapids Inc. and the DDA are focused on how people are coming in and out of Grand Rapids, knowing that the area won't increase road capacity in the near future. He stated that their work should be included in the CMP as well. Itani noted that these suggestions fit better in the MTP than the CMP, and staff would include them there. He also added that Staff is working on an RFP to look at traffic accessibility through downtown. Varga stated that the master plan referred to in the CMP is the Rapid's existing transit master plan. Discussion ensued.

Krombeen asked if staff preferred to approve the CMP as amended today or to bring it back later for approval. Snell stated that he preferred to approve the plan today with the changes noted from the Committee and from Tupica. Tupica said that once FHWA receives more information on congestion performance measures, staff will need to make sure that the CMP adheres to them. She also suggested adding targets. Krombeen asked if the Committee members who requested changes were comfortable approving the plan today as amended. Varga confirmed that he was, as long as the Committee members received the revised plan in the future. Warren asked staff to clarify what corridors of significance are, along with the process used to identify them, as they proceed. He noted that this may be an opportunity to develop visions for corridors. Itani also stated that he was comfortable with the Committee preliminarily approving the document pending comments and changes. Varga asked when the CMP would come back as a final document. Snell stated that the CMP needs to be in place before GVMC's recertification in June. Itani stated that staff is currently meeting with jurisdictions to develop SE data, and by the end of the summer, staff should have more data on congested facilities. Discussion ensued.

Hilton stated that he was willing to amend his motion.

Krombeen recommended that the motion be revised to preliminarily approve the CMP subject to modification from the Committee with the final document to be presented in the future. Hilton and Holtrop agreed to the revised motion, and Krombeen entertained it.

MOTION by Hilton, SUPPORT by Holtrop, to preliminarily approve of the CMP subject to modification from the Committee with the final document to be presented back to the Policy Committee at a future meeting.

Varga asked if there were going to be any changes to the corridors of significance. Krombeen stated that that will be reviewed by the Committee at a later date.

Krombeen called the revised motion to question. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VI. MOBILITY 2040 UPDATE/GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Snell stated that the latest copy of the revised GVMC 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Goals and Objectives were included in the agenda as **Item VI: Attachment**

A. The goals and objectives of the MTP will contribute strongly to the selection and evaluation of alternatives for improvements to the region's transportation system. They will also be used to set performance measures for the MPO and form the direction the MPO takes as it makes decisions on funding priorities and improvements to the overall transportation system in the region. He noted that the Technical Committee and the newly formed MTP Steering Committee have reviewed and modified the goals and objectives. He asked for the Committee's approval of the goals and objectives document at today's meeting in order to maintain the MTP development schedule. Itani provided additional information about how the goals and objectives were developed, noting that it was important to ensure that they are achievable.

Krombeen entertained a motion to approve the goals and objectives for the 2040 MTP.

MOTION by Varga, SUPPORT by Altman, to approve the goals and objectives for the 2040 MTP.

Varga asked if it would be possible to add "and promote modal shift" to goal 4. Snell asked if it would make more sense to add this to objective 1M. Varga stated that he was comfortable with staff adding this language to the goal/objective staff saw fit. Itani agreed to include this. Varga also asked if there are actions that GVMC could take to encourage development in existing transit corridors that could be included in objective 4B.

Bulkowski asked if, while objective 1B alludes to Complete Streets, if it would be possible to use that specific term. Snell stated that this decision would be up to the committee, but cautioned them that anything they add will need to be answered for down the road. Warren added that he's comfortable with the current phrasing because the "Complete Streets" process is implied in the wording. Itani noted that, at some point in the document, staff will mention Complete Streets. He also agreed that the concepts listed in the objectives reflect Complete Streets. Discussion ensued.

Krombeen called the motion to question. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VII. 2013 PAVEMENT CONDITION REPORT

Referring to **Item VII: Attachment A**, Snell stated that GVMC Staff, in conjunction with the staffs of the local jurisdictions, surveys pavement condition of the entire federal aid system each year. Along with this survey, GVMC releases a technical report on the general pavement conditions on major streets and highways in the region.

Snell noted that GVMC has completed the report for 2013 and has sought endorsement by the GVMC Technical Committee at its March meeting. The report is very similar to reports of the past with a few modifications that are intended to improve the reporting mechanisms of past reports and make the data easier to understand. Snell stated that this report was being presented to the Policy Committee for informational purposes only and explained highlights from the report. Discussion ensued.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- *Announcement:* 2013 Draft Nonmotorized Plan Available for Comment
Itani announced that the 2013 Draft Nonmotorized Plan was available for public comment. It will be brought back to the Committee for approval in the future.

Weiss updated the Committee about the latest developments on transportation funding and a second Street Summit that GVMC is planning with the Chamber of Commerce.

Warren announced that the KCRC, along with several partnering organizations, is launching an awareness campaign about how local roads matter. He described this campaign as well as the ways those who are interested can stay informed.

Itani stated that President Obama proposed a new four-year transportation budget, which includes a funding increase, and described several of the budget's highlights. He also stated that there are several upcoming webinars about TIGER grants. He noted that April 28th is the deadline for submitting an application. Discussion ensued.

McBurrows announced that the time MDOT spends processing TIP amendments has been cut in half due to a new electronic form. They are also expanding the use of GPAs to reduce the number of amendments. Discussion ensued.

Tupica announced that the US DOT issued a notice of proposed rulemaking on March 11 for performance measures for the safety program. Public comment is open through June 9. She asked the Committee members to review the performance measures and comment on them, noting that the state and the MPO will need to set targets to meet the performance measures. She added that there will be funding implications if the performance measures are not met. Discussion ensued.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Krombeen adjourned the March 19, 2014 Policy Committee meeting at 11:02 am.