

MINUTES

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
POLICY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, December 15, 2010
Kent County Road Commission
1500 Scribner NW Grand Rapids, MI**

Varga, Vice Chair of the Policy Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:31 am.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present

Peter Varga	(Vice Chair)	Proxy for	The Rapid
		Jim Koslosky	GRFIA
Dan Carlton			Georgetown Township
Mark DeClercq			City of Grand Rapids
Eric DeLong			City of Grand Rapids
Mike DeVries			Grand Rapids Township
Jim Holtrop		Proxy for	Ottawa County
		Larry Bruursema	OCRC
Rich Houtteman			City of Kentwood
Dennis Kent		Proxy for	MDOT
		Dave Pasquale	City of Lowell
Dal McBurrows			MDOT
Jon Rice		Proxy for	KCRC
		Dick Bulkowski	Kent County Commissioner
Darrel Schmalzel			City of Walker
Don VanDoeselaar			City of Hudsonville

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Andrea Dewey	GVMC Staff
Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Erick Kind	MDOT
Darrell Robinson	GVMC Staff
Jim Snell	GVMC Staff
Don Stypula	GVMC Staff
Sarah Van Buren	FHWA
Mike Zonyk	GVMC Staff

Voting Members Not Present

Jerry Alkema	Allendale Township
Alex Arends	Alpine Township
Larry Bruursema	OCRC
Dick Bulkowski	Kent County Commissioner
Christine Burns	City of Cedar Springs
Dick Davies	Cannon Township
Sharon DeLange	Village of Sparta
Jeff Dood	City of Rockford

APPROVED

Ken Feldt
 George Haga
 Bryan Harrison
 Don R. Hilton, Sr.
 Dennis Hoemke
 Bob Homan
 Jim Koslosky (*Chair*)
 Ken Krombeen
 Jim Miedema
 Audrey Nevins
 David Pasquale
 Richard Pastoor
 Steve Peterson
 Jack Poll
 Chuck Porter
 Toby VanEss

APPROVED

ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

City of East Grand Rapids
 Ada Township
 Caledonia Charter Township
 Gaines Township
 Algoma Township
 Plainfield Township
 GRFIA
 City of Grandville
 Jamestown Township
 Byron Township
 City of Lowell
 City of Wyoming
 Cascade Township
 City of Wyoming
 Courtland Township
 Tallmadge Township

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Varga entertained a motion to approve the October 20, 2010 minutes.

MOTION by Rice, SUPPORT by DeVries, to approve of the October 20, 2010 Policy Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. FY2011-2014 TIP AMENDMENTS

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A**, Robinson explained several TIP amendment requests to the Committee from the KCRC, the City of Hudsonville, and ITP-The Rapid.

The Kent County Road Commission requested to add two trail projects to the FY2011-2014 TIP. The first trail project is the “Fred Meijer Kenowa Trail” at a total cost of \$4,021,919. The second trail is West Michigan Regional Trail Network Connection “Musketawa Trail to White Pine Trail Connector” at a total cost of \$2,400,000. Van Buren explained that only the portion of the Fred Meijer Kenowa Trail project in GVMC’s MPO area belonged in the TIP. The Holland portion of the project would need to be listed in the MACC’s TIP. Robinson clarified that the Committee would only be acting on the part of the Fred Meijer Kenowa Trail that fell in GVMC’s MPO area.

The City of Hudsonville requested to advance construct a FY2012 project, 32nd Avenue from M-121 to Highland Dr., in FY2011.

ITP-The Rapid requested the following TIP amendments:

	<u>Original Budget</u>	<u>Amendment Requested</u>
Section 5307		
Paratransit Replacement Vehicles (up to 3)	163,508	215,076

Paratransit Expansion Vehicles (up to 2)	0	133,879
Replacement 40' Buses (up to 7)	4,351,770	2,800,000
Expansion 40' Buses (up to 3)	0	1,200,000
Associated Capital Maintenance Items	586,885	691,817
Preventive Maintenance	1,625,000	1,250
A&E	50,000	100,000
Wealthy Facility Renovation	938,120	1,012,253
Security Surveillance	88,382	99,340
ADA Vehicle Equipment	150,000	0
ITS	1,250	0
Terminals	0	900,000
Planning	793,150	985,187
Section 5309		
DABRT	19,303,000	1,434,000
Expansion 40' Buses (up to 2)	768,900	0
Wealthy Operation Center	862,632	0
Terminal	750,000	0
Amtrak Rail Relocation	750,000	0
ITS	2,800,000	0

Section 5339		
Streetcar Study	125,000	0
Feasibility Study	0	3,125,000

Robinson noted that the original amount for the Streetcar Study was \$3,125,000, and that only the name of the study was changing.

ITP-The Rapid also requested an amendment to the TIP for FY2011, FY2012, FY2013, and FY2014 section 5309 Very Small Starts funding for the Division Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (DABRT) project.

Lastly, Robinson explained that ITP-The Rapid was requesting to amend the FY2011 UPWP. However, since this UPWP amendment was already approved by GVMC's Board, no action was needed.

Amended FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program Projects

Description	Total Costs
Section 5307	
ADA Planning/Compliance	\$ 69,400
Community Information & Education	\$175,000
Human Resource Planning	\$ 62,500
Long Range Planning	\$578,287
REGIS/GVMC	\$ 40,000

Website Development	\$ 60,000
Total	\$985,187

CMAQ

Ridesharing	\$154,822
Total	\$154,822

Section 5339

Feasibility Study	\$3,125,000
Total	\$3,125,000

Varga entertained a motion to amend the FY2011-2014 TIP.

MOTION by Rice, SUPPORT by Schmalzel, to recommend to the Metro Council Board approval of the amendments to the FY2011-2014 TIP requested by the KCRC, the City of Hudsonville, and ITP-The Rapid. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. POLICIES AND PRACTICES NONMOTORIZED SECTION UPDATE

Referring to **Item V: Attachment A**, Dewey stated that the current nonmotorized Policies and Practices do not correspond with recent MPO practice. She explained that federal surface transportation funding is, for the most part, very flexible and may be spent on non-motorized transportation investments. According to the current Policies and Practices for Programming Projects, it is the local practice/policy of the MPO to restrict federal funds for non-motorized transportation. Transportation Enhancement funds are listed as the only source for nonmotorized transportation project funding by the MPO. However, Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds have already been dedicated in 2011 for nonmotorized projects. Dewey presented to the Committee a revised nonmotorized section that could replace the current nonmotorized and sidewalk sections of the Policies and Practices document and bring the document up-to-date with current MPO practices. The revised section suggests permitting the use of federal funds for nonmotorized improvements. In addition to statewide competitive Transportation Enhancement grants, CMAQ funds would be a likely fund source for future nonmotorized improvements.

Dewey added that the revised nonmotorized section was brought to the Technical Committee earlier in December as an informational item. However, the Technical Committee decided to act on and approve this revision. The draft presented to the Policy Committee is a more complete version than what was presented to the Technical Committee and it includes several revisions.

Rice asked Dewey to expand on the meaning of the first of the nonmotorized project eligibility requirements: "Projects must demonstrate potential modal shift from the automobile and are not purely recreational in nature." Rice was specifically interested in knowing whether the recreational trail projects funded through federal enhancement grants in the past would be eligible in the future, and who would make this determination. Dewey responded that project approval will be at the discretion of the Committee. Itani commented that the MPO, in the past, had simply approved projects that utilized TE funds. However, Itani added that the MPO may need to go back and reassess how it has been handling TE projects. Rice noted that if this policy is interpreted literally, trails will not be eligible. Kent

noted that all trails have some recreational component to them, but the Committee will need to identify trails that have connectivity and are not purely recreational. Van Buren added that CMAQ funds cannot be spent on reconstruction and maintenance, or on trails with recreational components. However, enhancement funding can be spent on trails with recreational components. Discussion ensued.

DeLong asked if there was a policy in place about using funds for acquisition. Itani responded that the only exception is that if there is a regional corridor that is important to the Committee, such as 44th Street.

DeLong also asked if federal funds could be used on a complete streets project that includes sidewalks, etc. Dewey responded that, because the MPO has chosen to disallow STP from being spent on nonmotorized projects, complete streets projects would not be eligible. DeLong commented that he was not comfortable approving this revision if a major funding source cannot fund complete streets projects.

Rice stated that he still has a problem with project eligibility requirements, and after hearing some of the concerns brought up by the Committee, he doesn't believe that the Technical Committee has seen this revision as it's being presented today. Therefore, he also recommended sending this item back to the Technical Committee. Discussion ensued.

Varga entertained a motion to return this item to the Technical Committee.

MOTION by DeLong, SUPPORT by Houtteman, to remand the revision of the nonmotorized section of the Policies and Practices document back to the Technical Committee, with the Technical Committee to review the discussion captured in these minutes, paying particular attention to complete streets projects and Rice's comments on eligibility for nonmotorized facilities.

Houtteman asked for guided principles for budgeting/identifying ways for maintaining the nonmotorized system in the future. Itani responded that there is no limitation to using STP funding. Kent noted that routine maintenance is not eligible for federal aid. Discussion ensued.

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

VI. FY2035 LRTP DRAFT DOCUMENT AND PROJECT LIST

Referring to **Item VI: Attachment A**, Dewey explained that, as part of the Long Range Transportation Planning process, GVMC has developed a Rough Draft Long Range Transportation Plan project list. The projects in this list were grouped by years and funding source. Unlike previous project lists, the list includes funding for competitive programs and projects that don't have guaranteed funding. Dewey added that results from the air quality analysis should be available soon.

Dewey continued, stating that the LRTP update is nearly complete. The draft document, as well as the project list, can be downloaded from gvmc.org. She encouraged the Committee to submit comments/changes by Monday, Dec. 20th. The LRTP project list and document are also available to select agencies for consultation purposes during the month of December. The final draft copy will be finalized the end of December. The public comment period for the draft LRTP is January 1-30, and from January 17-20, Staff will be holding a series of eight public meetings to encourage public comment. Dewey anticipated that she

would bring the public comments received so far to the January Policy Meeting, and in February, the Committees would be asked to approve the final LRTP document so that in March it can go on to Metro Council and eventually FHWA.

VII. CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Van Buren explained the certification review process to the Committee and informed the members about the results of GVMC's certification review, which took place last June. She noted that GVMC was certified subject to certain corrective actions, which included updating planning agreements and including transit projects in the Annual Listing of obligated projects. The MPO also received 24 recommendations, 8 of which are "strong" recommendations, and one commendation for nonmotorized planning. Discussion ensued.

Itani noted that both of the corrective actions have been, or are being, addressed. The posting of annual projects is already done, and MDOT is working on a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

DeLong asked Van Buren to discuss the 8 strong recommendations, which she explained in detail to the Committee. Van Buren added that GVMC could add a link to the final certification review report on their website, or that the document could be sent to the Committee members electronically, if necessary.

Itani noted that, during the previous Certification Review, GVMC received 3 commendations, no corrective actions and 16 recommendations, and GVMC addressed every recommendation. He also stated that the MPO strongly disagrees with FHWA on some of the recommendations that the MPO received. Discussion, comments and questions ensued.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- **FY2011-2015 MDOT 5-YEAR PROGRAM UPDATE**

Referring to a handout, Kent provided the Committee with a brief overview of MDOT's 5-year program. Discussion ensued.

- **SAFETEA-LU UPDATE**

Van Buren added that, as of Friday, the continuing resolution for SAFETEA-LU expires. Last week, the House took action on a continuing resolution for governmental budgets that would go through September 30 of 2011. Part of this bill included an extension of SAFETEA-LU until the same date. However, the Senate has yet to act on this. Discussion ensued.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Varga adjourned the December 15, 2010 Policy Committee meeting at 10:39 am.