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

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
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 8th 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.