

**MINUTES**

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council  
Transportation Division  
POLICY COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, February 18, 2015  
Kent County Road Commission  
1500 Scribner NW      Grand Rapids, MI**

Krombeen, chair of the Policy Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:40 am.

Being that there were no new members or guests in attendance, no introductions were necessary.

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

Ken Krombeen, <i>Chair</i>		City of Grandville
Alex Arends		Alpine Township
Mark DeClercq		City of Grand Rapids
Rich Houtteman		City of Kentwood
Dennis Kent	<i>Proxy for Dal McBurrows Mark Howe</i>	MDOT-Grand Region
		MDOT
Chuck Porter		City of Lowell
Darrel Schmalzel		Courtland Township
Joe Slonecki		City of Walker
Rick Sprague	<i>Proxy for Steve Warren</i>	City of East Grand Rapids
		KCRC
Ben Swayze		KCRC
Peter Varga		Cascade Township
		ITP-The Rapid

**Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present**

Rod Ghearing		ITP-The Rapid
Abed Itani		GVMC Staff
Darrell Robinson		GVMC Staff
Norm Sevensma		WMEAC-RWBC
Jim Snell		GVMC Staff

**Voting Members Not Present**

Jerry Alkema		Allendale Township
Gail Altman		Jamestown Township
Henry Betten		Cannon Township
Dave Bulkowski		Kent County Commissioner
Dan Carlton		Georgetown Township
Jamie Davies		City of Rockford
Eric DeLong		City of Grand Rapids
Mike DeVries		Grand Rapids Township
George Haga		Ada Township
Bryan Harrison		Caledonia Charter Township
Don R. Hilton, Sr.		Gaines Township

Dennis Hoemke  
Jim Holtvluwer  
Mark Howe  
Dal McBurrows  
Jim Miedema  
Audrey Nevins-Weiss  
Richard Pastoor  
Jack Poll  
Brian Ryks  
Dan Strikwerda  
Thad Taylor  
Roger Towsley  
Cameron Van Wyngarden  
Toby VanEss  
Steve Warren, *Vice Chair*

Algoma Township  
Ottawa County  
City of Lowell  
MDOT  
OCRC  
Byron Township  
City of Wyoming  
City of Wyoming  
GRFIA  
City of Hudsonville  
City of Cedar Springs  
Village of Sand Lake  
Plainfield Township  
Tallmadge Township  
KCRC

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Krombeen entertained a motion to approve the January 21, 2015 Policy Committee minutes.

**MOTION by Varga, SUPPORT by Schmalzel, to approve of the January 21, 2015 Policy Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**IV. 2040 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Referring to **Item IV:** Krombeen queried the committee and any public attending the meeting if there was anyone who wished to comment on the Draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. No comments were offered.

**V. 2040 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN APPROVAL**

Referring to **Item V: Attachment A,** Snell provided the Committee with a slideshow depicting the steps that were necessary to develop the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. He noted that GVMC staff addressed extensive comments from MDOT and FHWA, as well as the public. Snell stated that staff received substantially more comments on this MTP than the previous one, and he encouraged the Committee members to read through them. Snell then guided the Policy Committee through the slide show.

Sprague inquired that in the Defined Goals/ Needs Analysis, for Non-Motorized, the analysis was for new construction and not maintenance... Snell confirmed this and noted that all funding sources, there are maintenance budgets built in but are accounted for elsewhere in the document.

Snell further detailed in the Defined Goals/ Needs Analysis that there is almost \$1 Billion

in Local Unfunded Needs.

Snell continued with the slideshow with details of the MTP Project list which has nearly \$5 Billion in projects with the first 4 years of the plan being the TIP.

DeClercq inquired about the US-131 corridor study being included in the list of projects. Kent responded that the corridor study wasn't included in the projects listed on the map. Itani noted that an EIS has not been completed. Kent noted that the corridor study hasn't even been completed and will hopefully be completed this year. Itani noted that US-131 is listed in the illustrative list. Discussion followed. Porter asked if 131 is a lower priority. Kent noted that it was only because it isn't funded. Discussion followed.

Next Snell detailed the 2040 MTP Projects with Capacity Deficiencies. DeClercq asked if the Downtown Development Inc. was solicited as a stakeholder for input in the plan. Snell noted that the Grand Rapids Planning department was solicited for input. Discussion followed.

Next Snell detailed the extensive Environmental Justice Analysis that was performed on the 2040 MTP. He noted that the findings showed no adverse effects on any areas within the MPO. Itani noted that ITP The Rapid pointed out that GVMC had not addressed Environmental Justice Transportation Accessibility. Itani made note that the MPO intends to address this at a later time in a joint effort with ITP The Rapid.

Snell then talked about Consultation that was performed on the plan. He noted that there was minimal potential for significant impacts.

The presentation continued on to Public comments received on the plan. The most notable comments that were received were to "Improve the condition of the roads."

Finally, Snell detailed the MTP next steps. He noted when the anticipated approval of the MTP will be. He also made note that the next TIP development will begin in the fall of 2015. Lastly, Snell noted that there will be ongoing activities related to the plan and when the development will begin with the next plan.

Schmalzel inquired if the MPO does any consultation with school districts. Snell noted that GVMC invited both County ISD's to participate.

Houtteman asked with regards to MAP-21, will the locals and ultimately GVMC committees need to pick projects that fit each of the performance measures. Snell made note that with GVMC's current policy and practices in place some of these performance measures are already being met.

Several other comments and questions were raised by the committee. Members of GVMC staff offered their suggestions and comments to address the committee's concerns and questions.

Varga had a specific comment with regards to page 51 of the plan with a word in a sentence. He requested that the sentence read like this, "Land development strategies should include limits on the amount of location development until certain service standards are met or policies that encourage development patterns be better served by public transportation and non-motorized modes." The word "should" replaces the word

“can.”

Itani responded that staff felt that the proposed change in the sentence would need further debate, but if the Policy Committee wanted it in the document, then staff would add it.

Kent offered an alternate sentence. “Local municipal units land development strategies should be encouraged to include limits...” The sentence change was accepted by the Policy Committee.

Krombeen asked the committee if they were ready to approve the 2040 MTP document.

**MOTION by Houtteman, support by Varga, to approve the 2040 MTP and recommend GVMC Board approval. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

Varga asked what the committee is hearing with regards to the May 8<sup>th</sup> ballot issue.

Many committee members offered their take on the ballot proposal and what they are hearing. Most committee members agreed that there was a lot of confusion and misinformation. Discussion ensued.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Krombeen adjourned the February 18, 2015 Policy Committee meeting at 10:40 am.