Krombeen, chair of the Policy Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:30 am.

Itani introduced Haviland to the Committee and stated that she is now working for all of GVMC in addition to REGIS.

Lanum announced that he is sitting in for McBurrows today.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS
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II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Varga noted one correction to the May 21, 2014 minutes, and Krombeen entertained a motion to approve them.

**MOTION by Ryks, SUPPORT by Schmalzel, to approve of the May 21, 2014 Policy Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. FY2014-2017 TIP AMENDMENTS/MODIFICATIONS

Referring to Item IV: Attachment A and an additional handout from MDOT, Robinson stated that the City of Walker, MDOT and staff were requesting to amend/modify the FY2014-2017 TIP.

The City of Walker requested an amendment to the FY2014-2017 TIP to move an illustrative project—M-45 Tunnel Project—to the project list of the TIP. The potential TAP funded project has received conditional commitment only at this time.

MDOT’s requests included the projects below, as well as adding the FY2015 General Program Account projects (GPAs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>JN</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Total Cost Est. ($000)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>112943</td>
<td>I-96</td>
<td>Under Cascade Road</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$9,068</td>
<td>Cost Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>113389</td>
<td>I-96</td>
<td>Under Cascade Road</td>
<td>RT &amp; LT lanes, N/M and related DDI elements</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$3,132</td>
<td>CMAQ Cost Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>113389</td>
<td>I-96</td>
<td>Under Cascade Road</td>
<td>RT &amp; LT lanes, N/M and related DDI</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>CMAQ New Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>110039</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>76th St. to M-11 Freeway Lighting                                 Const.</td>
<td>$852</td>
<td>Modifications (submitted earlier)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>112071</td>
<td>M-11</td>
<td>M-45 to Remembrance Rd. Resurface and minor widening of accel. lane Const.</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>Change year and cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>120146</td>
<td>M-37 NB</td>
<td>Patterson Ave. – 52nd St. Commercial Vehicle Enforcement pad Const.</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>120147</td>
<td>M-37 SB</td>
<td>7 Mile Rd – 8 Mile Rd. Commercial Vehicle Enforcement pad Const.</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>119013</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>10 Mile Rd. to M-46 Median Cross-overs (for future reconstruct. project in FY 17 &amp;18) Const.</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
<td>Cost Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>112567</td>
<td>M-21</td>
<td>Valley Vista Dr. to E. Kent County Line Mill and Resurface Const.</td>
<td>$1,355</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA Trunkline Traffic/Safety Const.</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA Trunkline Bridge CPM Const.</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA Trunkline Railroad/Safety Const.</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA Trunkline Road CPM Const.</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA Trunkline Pre-Const. Const.</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA Trunkline Scoping Const.</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GVMC Staff also recommended that the Michigan Legislative selected Priority Roads Investment Program Project List (PRIP) be added to the FY2014-2017 TIP Illustrative list of projects. These projects are 100% State funded with the exception of M-11, M-45 north to Remembrance Road (currently listed in FY2015 and moving to FY2014). This project has had Federal dollars used to do preliminary engineering and will be listed within the main project list.

Kent discussed the GPA projects listed on MDOT’s TIP amendment/modification request memo. He noted that MDOT and FHWA have reached an agreement on revising the GPA concept for both MDOT and the state agencies, and the handout he distributed was a reordering of the General Program Accounts (GPAs) from the memo included in the agenda packet based on the new format. The goal of the new format is to further streamline the amendment process. Itani asked if bringing a new project into the GPA account constitutes a TIP amendment. Lanum explained that it’s an addition to the TIP, but it doesn’t have to be formally adopted and acted upon by the Committee. Kent further clarified that, as long as it’s within the GPA, it’s at the MPO’s discretion whether the Committees act on it, and it doesn’t have to be acted upon by MDOT and FHWA. Itani stated that he did request that MDOT give a presentation on this to the TPSG and Technical committees in the future. DeClercq stated the importance of developing a formal process to handle GPA changes so that everyone is clear on how they will work. Discussion ensued.

Krombeen entertained a motion to approve the requested amendments/modifications to the TIP.
MOTION by DeClercq, SUPPORT by Schmalzel, to approve the amendments/modifications to the FY2014-2017 TIP requested by the City of Walker, MDOT, and Staff. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. 2040 SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROJECTIONS

Referring to Item V: Attachment A, Snell informed the Committee that he was requesting adoption of the final set of future socio-economic data for use in the GVMC 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). He noted that socio-economic data is comprised of population, housing, auto availability, and many types of employment forecasts through the year 2040. This data is a primary input of GVMC’s travel demand modeling process and is used to predict future travel demand so that the MPO can plan the region’s transportation systems accordingly. The Technical Committee approved this data at their meeting earlier this month.

Snell reminded the Committee that, earlier this year, Staff met with each member jurisdiction individually to discuss many topics that will help shape the development of the MTP. Base SE data was one of those topics. Using the information collected during these meetings, staff developed projections for each TAZ within each jurisdiction for all of the items listed above. Earlier this month, Snell sent a draft version of the SE data to the members for review. The deadline for that review has now expired. Snell further explained that once this data is adopted, staff can go ahead and determine deficiencies.

Krombeen entertained a motion to adopt the 2040 Socio-Economic Projections.

MOTION by Holtrop, SUPPORT by Carlton, to adopt the 2040 Socio-Economic projections as presented by Snell. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Snell added that there are links on GVMC’s website to corresponding maps and data if there are questions about where growth will occur.

VI. 2040 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP) UPDATE

Referring to Item VI: Attachment A, Snell noted that the MTP document will need to be completed in the next six months, and that staff is on track to meet this deadline. He anticipated that a draft document would be available in December. He added that there won’t likely be a Tech or Policy Committee meeting in August, but the Transportation Programming Study Group will be meeting to discuss needs. He noted that freight is a newer area that will be covered in the MTP. Staff will bring the needs list to the Tech and Policy Committee in September for approval. In October, staff will bring the MTP Steering Committee back together, and they will prioritize the pool of projects. He stressed the importance of the Committee members staying involved in the MTP development process so that they are not surprised about anything that happens. Discussion ensued.

Itani added that the MTP that we’re developing right now doesn’t really adhere to the new MAP-21 regulations. Regulations regarding performance-based planning are currently undergoing a 90-day comment period, after which time they will be finalized. Staff will have two years to get the MTP and the TIP in compliance with the new regulations. There will be particular emphasis on NHS conditions and safety. If goals are not met, funding could be restricted until they are. He said that staff may ask the MTP
Steering Committee to discuss measures of effectiveness and performance-based planning and reflect the outcome of these discussions in the MTP without assigning goals. He noted that this would make it easier to reflect performance-based planning within the document later on. He added that the Policy Committee will be very involved in determining how the MPO meets MAP-21 standards, especially in regard to setting targets and performance measures. He also noted that the state is currently meeting internally to discuss MAP-21 performance measures. He asked the Committee members to stay tuned for further developments.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Itani stated that the MPO underwent FHWA certification in June. He thanked Krombeen, Warren, DeClercq, and Scott Conners (Walker) for coming to the Policy Committee discussion portion of the certification review. He stated that certification was very extensive, but that overall, it went very well, and he didn’t anticipate receiving any corrective actions. However, there may be some recommendations. FHWA has 90 days to write the final report.

Itani also added that the house passed a $10 billion dollar extension for funding the trust fund. This will allow the states to continue to receive construction funding until May 25, 2015.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Krombeen adjourned the July 16, 2014 Policy Committee meeting at 10:04 am.