

MINUTES

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
POLICY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, June 16, 2010
Kent County Road Commission
1500 Scribner NW Grand Rapids, MI**

Varga, Vice Chair of the Policy Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:32 am. Carol Scholma from Georgetown Township introduced herself to the committee as the proxy for Dan Carlton.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present

Peter Varga (<i>Vice Chair</i>)		The Rapid
Jerry Alkema		Allendale Township
Alex Arends		Alpine Township
Mark DeClercq		City of Grand Rapids
Eric DeLong		City of Grand Rapids
Mike DeVries		Grand Rapids Township
Jeff Dood		City of Rockford
Ken Feldt		City of East Grand Rapids
George Haga		Ada Township
Don R. Hilton, Sr.		Gaines Township
Rich Houtteman		City of Kentwood
Ken Krombeen		City of Grandville
Dal McBurrows		MDOT
David Pasquale		City of Lowell
Richard Pastoor		City of Wyoming
Steve Peterson		Cascade Township
Jon Rice	<i>Proxy for Dick Bulkowski</i>	KCRC
		Kent County Commissioner
Darrel Schmalzel		City of Walker
Carol Scholma	<i>Proxy for Dan Carlton</i>	Georgetown Township
		Georgetown Township
Don VanDoeselaar		City of Hudsonville

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Andrea Dewey	GVMC Staff
Andrea Faber	GVMC Staff
Abed Itani	GVMC Staff
Dennis Kent	MDOT
Erick Kind	MDOT
Steve Redmond	MDOT
Norm Sevensma	WMEAC-RWBC
Jim Snell	GVMC Staff
Don Stypula	GVMC Staff

George Yang
Mike Zonyk

GVMC Staff
GVMC Staff

Voting Members Not Present

Larry Bruursema
Dick Bulkowski
Christine Burns
Dan Carlton
Dick Davies
Sharon DeLange
Bryan Harrison
Dennis Hoemke
Jim Holtrop
Bob Homan
Jim Koslosky (*Chair*)
Jim Miedema
Audrey Nevins
Jack Poll
Chuck Porter
Toby VanEss

OCRC
Kent County Commissioner
City of Cedar Springs
Georgetown Township
Cannon Township
Village of Sparta
Caledonia Charter Township
Algoma Township
Ottawa County
Plainfield Township
GRFIA
Jamestown Township
Byron Township
City of Wyoming
Courtland Township
Tallmadge Township

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Rice noted a correction to the minutes. Varga entertained a motion to approve of the May 19, 2010 Policy Committee minutes with Rice’s correction.

MOTION by Hilton, SUPPORT by Pastoor, to approve of the May 19, 2010 Policy Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Sevensma asked the Committee for an update on the Kent County Transit Needs Assessment and the prospect of bringing transit to rural areas. Dewey explained that the study is currently in the data collection phase and is expected to be completed in February of 2011. She added that four stakeholder meetings are taking place this week. Discussion ensued.

IV. FINAL APPROVAL OF FY2011-2014 TIP

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A**, Itani explained that, every four years, GVMC develops a new Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Since the existing TIP expires in 2011, the new TIP needs to be approved before the end of the current fiscal year. The proposed TIP is financially constrained and includes local projects, Interurban Transit Partnership (ITP) projects, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) projects, and illustrative projects. Staff has performed an Environmental Justice Review of the FY2011-2014 TIP projects as well as an air quality analysis. The TIP also went through the public involvement process. The FY2011-2014 TIP was approved by the Technical Committee on June 2nd, and Itani requested the Policy Committee’s approval as well.

Peterson suggested that a public involvement process be completed for the area of MDOT's illustrative 2013 28th Street at Patterson project and that further study be done on this intersection before moving forward with the project. Itani added that this will be done as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) development process. Discussion, comments, and questions ensued.

McBurrows discussed what needed to be included with the TIP document and stated that the consultation and prioritization processes for the TIP need to be documented.

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

MOTION by Rice, SUPPORT by DeVries, to recommend to the Metro Council Board approval of the FY2011-2014 TIP, including the illustrative project lists. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. FY2010-2011 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

Speaking on **Item V: Attachment A**, Itani explained that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for GVMC includes the budget for all federally assisted transportation planning activities that the GVMC Transportation Division, the Interurban Transit Partnership (ITP), and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) will undertake. GVMC must submit the UPWP annually to the sponsoring federal agencies, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration before October 1st.

Itani explained, in detail, the activities included in the UPWP. He added that, in addition to these activities, FHWA is continually requiring more from the MPO. Itani also updated the Committee about the new bimonthly TIP amendment schedule. McBurrows explained why FHWA and MDOT wanted to try this new TIP amendment schedule and suggested that it would be beneficial for a FHWA representative to attend more MPO meetings. Rice suggested that a FHWA representative attend six meetings a year to match the new bimonthly TIP amendment schedule. Discussion, comments, and questions ensued.

Itani addressed the issue of transportation staffing and stated that, since 2004, transportation staff levels have remained the same. This year, Itani proposed to make the transportation planner/IT director a transportation employee, which resulted in the addition of a ½ time position to the transportation department. This position is responsible for maintaining the server and website and helping with data collection. Discussion ensued.

Itani explained that the cost of funding the UPWP has been there all along. However, Metro Council was providing the match. He added that the MPO has always worked with a tight budget and has a history of spending less than what is budgeted.

Itani requested preliminary approval from the Committee of the proposed activities listed in the UPWP so that he can move forward with the final document. He stated that he is still waiting on a final component for the UPWP from ITP before the UPWP is complete.

Varga entertained a motion to approve the activities listed in the UPWP.

MOTION by Pastoor, SUPPORT by Arends, to approve the proposed activities listed in the UPWP, as presented by Staff.

Schmalzel questioned if the activities should be approved before there was a discussion on how to pay for them. Rice suggested prioritizing the list of activities and funding the activities in the order of funding availability. Itani advised against prioritizing or cutting any of the activities listed in the UPWP, stating that doing so would result in FHWA withholding transportation funding, since the activities presented are already close to the bare minimum. Kent stated that, at some point, a statement needs to be made to FHWA or a legislator regarding the financial burden of funding all of these federal mandates. DeLong requested to see funding alternatives. Stypula suggested that a subgroup of the Policy Committee convene at the GVMC offices to discuss funding the activities listed in the UPWP. Itani agreed to sitting down with a subgroup in order to determine which activities are crucial and develop a fair, sustainable funding process. Discussion, comments and questions ensued.

Varga entertained a motion to table the previous motion and bring this discussion to a Subcommittee of the Policy Committee.

MOTION by DeLong, SUPPORT by Schmalzel, to table the motion to approve the activities listed in the UPWP, subject to bringing the UPWP activity and budget discussion to a subcommittee of the Policy Committee. The subcommittee would be responsible for returning to the Policy Committee in July with recommendations on funding and activity prioritization.

Arends asked if every activity listed in the UPWP is what is required to not jeopardize federal funding. Itani confirmed that this was the case. Based on this, Arends commented that he preferred not to withdraw the original motion to approve the activities listed in the UPWP. Discussion ensued.

Hilton questioned how the subcommittee would be established and who would be a part of it. Itani stated that the townships, cities, and road commissions should be involved. Varga appointed Pastoor, Arends, DeLong, Schmalzel, DeVries, and Krombeen to serve on this subcommittee, along with a representative from the KCRC, the OCRC, ITP, and MDOT. Varga also asked that notice of the meeting be available to the entire Policy Committee.

DeLong called to question the motion on the floor. **MOTION CARRIED.** Hilton and Arends opposed the motion.

VI. POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR PROGRAMMING PROJECTS

Speaking on **Item VI: Attachment A**, Dewey stated that, following the development of goals and objectives for the plan, the next step is updating the *Policies and Practices for Programming Projects* as a guide for the ad hoc subcommittees as they work to identify transportation need by mode. Dewey explained that, of the six ad hoc subcommittees, four are charged with developing, as appropriate, their section of the *Policies and Practices for Programming Projects* document, which would then be submitted to the Technical Committee for refinement, rejection, or approval. The exceptions are the Intermodal, Freight, Rail & Air subcommittee and the Transit & Passenger Rail subcommittee. The *Policies and Practices for Programming Projects* document does not currently contain separated methodologies for identifying needs for these modes because they are already addressed by currently established processes, including Segment Capacity Deficiencies. Additionally, the MPO has a limited capacity to measure the quality of transit or passenger rail projects in order to develop a unique *Policies and Practices for*

Programming Projects section for these modes.

Dewey also added that the six subcommittees will be meeting primarily in the month of June to develop their needs lists by mode.

DeClercq expressed his concern that this process is being rushed, explaining that it will take time for the stakeholders to meet and come up with ideas. Dewey responded that there is some flexibility in the development of the LRTP. Discussion ensued.

VII. CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS CAFETERIA LIST

Referring to **Item VII: Attachment A**, Snell explained that, as GVMC moves forward with the development of the 2035 LRTP update, one of the core aspects of the plan comes from the identification of capacity related deficiencies (congestion) on the roadway system. As an MPO, GVMC is required to maintain a process that outlines a methodology for determining how capacity deficiencies are addressed. For GVMC this process is the "GVMC Congestion Management Process" (CMP). The GVMC CMP, which is currently being revised, depicts all of the alternatives considered prior to the selection of a preferred treatment for currently congested or projected congested facilities. The specific alternatives are listed in the CMP under an Appendix titled "Cafeteria Plan Alternatives."

Snell stated that the CMP cafeteria list was approved by the Technical Committee during their June 2nd meeting. Snell explained that he was not looking for formal approval from the Policy Committee, and that this item was presented for information only. Discussion, comments and questions ensued.

VIII. FY2010 CLEAN AIR ACTION CAMPAIGN

Speaking on **Item VIII: Attachment A**, Faber informed the Committee about the FY2010 Clean Air Action Campaign. She stated that, since the last meeting, the program funding has come in, which allowed her to develop the summer radio campaign and order new promotional materials. Faber also stated that she plans to begin rotating the display to interested jurisdictions soon and on participating in various events throughout the summer and fall. She asked that Committee members let her know of events in their communities so that she can participate and represent the Clean Air Action program.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Dewey noted that there is a Kent County Transit Needs Assessment stakeholder meeting taking place in Cedar Springs tonight.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Varga adjourned the June 16, 2010 Policy Committee meeting at 11:12 am.