DeVries, chair of the Technical Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. Those present introduced themselves to the Committee. Kent introduced Susan Rozema, the new Associate Region Engineer who is replacing Vicki Weerstra.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present
Rick DeVries (Chair) City of Grand Rapids
Sue Becker Alpine Township
Tim Bradshaw City of Kentwood/Caledonia Twp.
Terry Brod Cannon Township
Mike Burns City of Lowell
Scott Conners City of Walker
Tom Doyle MDOT
Tim Haagsma Gaines Charter Township
Wayne Harrall Kent County
Proxy for Mike DeVries Grand Rapids Township
Tom Hooker Byron Township
Proxy for Mike DeVries City of East Grand Rapids
Dave Johnson City of East Grand Rapids
Proxy for Doug LaFave
Dennis Kent MDOT
Brett Laughlin Ottawa County Road Commission
Liz Schelling ITP-The Rapid
Dan Strikwerda City of Hudsonville
Rick Sprague Kent County Road Commission
Julius Suchy Village of Sparta
Charlie Sundblad City of Grandville
Steve Warren Kent County Road Commission
Rod Weersing Georgetown Township
Chris Zull City of Grand Rapids

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present
Mallory Avis MDOT-OPT
Pam Blazo MDOT – LAP
Michael Brameijer GVMC Staff
Andrea Dewey FHWA
Andrea Faber GVMC Staff
Art Green GRYSC/MDOT
Laurel Joseph GVMC Staff
Tyler Kent MDOT
Roger Marks C2AE
Darrell Robinson GVMC Staff
II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DeVries entertained a motion to approve the March 7, 2018 Technical Committee minutes.

MOTION by Warren, SUPPORT by Suchy, to approve the March 7, 2018 Technical Committee meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Waalkes, from MCA, shared the 2018 Report Card for Michigan’s Infrastructure brochure.

IV. FY2017-2020 TIP AMENDMENTS/MODIFICATIONS

Referring to Item IV: Attachment A, Robinson noted that MDOT was requesting to amend/modify the FY2017-2020 TIP and that they had a substantial list with mostly GPA
line item changes. They are adding 19 GPA projects for the TIP, which is standard. This will cause a TIP amendment because they are all rolled into one cost per GPA line item. Robinson suggested that Kent go through and highlight the major changes and also mentioned that an additional line item needed to be added.

Kent began by addressing a typo in the TIP that needed to be adjusted. The wrong-way vehicle detectors total cost is currently listed at $66 million; however, it should be $66 thousand.

Kent began to list the changes, most are minor changes in the scope, and added that the 131 at 68th carpool lot project has a pricing increase from $200,000 to $270,000.

### FY 2018/19/20 – Trunkline Project Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FY</strong></th>
<th><strong>JN</strong></th>
<th><strong>Route</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Work Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Cost Est. ($000)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Change</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>@ 54th Street &amp; I-196</td>
<td>Emergency Beam Repairs</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>New Trunkline Bridge Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>@ Indian Lakes Road</td>
<td>Emergency Beam Repairs</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>New Trunkline Bridge Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>202922</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>@ Hall Street</td>
<td>Wrong-Way Vehicle Detectors</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>New Trunkline T/S GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Highway Preservation</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>GPA Line Item Budget-Cost Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Bridge Rehab &amp; Replacement</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$3,500*</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Bridge Preservation</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Highway Rehab and Reconstruct</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$1,000*</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide – GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Highway Preservation</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide - GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Traffic Operations &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$6,000*</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide - GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Roadside</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide - GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Scoping and Studies</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Areawide - GPA</td>
<td>Trunkline Livability and Sustainability</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>$100*</td>
<td>New GPA Line Item Category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on projects identified in GPA list and historical spending patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FY</strong></th>
<th><strong>JN</strong></th>
<th><strong>Route</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Work Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Cost Est. ($000)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Change</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>202386</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>N.O. 10 Mile Rd. (Rest Area)</td>
<td>Sanitary Drain Field Rehab.</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$274</td>
<td>Change Year Trunkline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Year</td>
<td>Project No.</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Cost ($)</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>19</td>
<td>201965</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>10 Mile Road Carpool Lot</td>
<td>Mill and Resurface</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>New Trunkline Roadside GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>201965</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>10 Mile Road Carpool Lot</td>
<td>Mill and Resurface</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>New Trunkline Roadside GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>201942</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>36th Street to I-96</td>
<td>Queue Detection and Control Devices</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>New TOS GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>@ 54th Street &amp; I-196</td>
<td>Emergency Beam Repairs</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>New Trunkline Bridge Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>US-131</td>
<td>@ Indian Lakes Road</td>
<td>Emergency Beam Repairs</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>New Trunkline Bridge Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>124631</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>ITS Control Room Operations</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>New TOS GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>124632</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>ITS Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>New TOS GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>129341</td>
<td>I-196</td>
<td>32nd Avenue to 44th Street</td>
<td>ITS Cameras and Related Equipment</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>New TOS GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200162</td>
<td>M-37</td>
<td>Lake Eastbrook Blvd. to I-96</td>
<td>Concrete Joint Repairs</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>New Trunkline Road Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200171</td>
<td>M-37</td>
<td>44th Street to 32nd Street</td>
<td>Mill and Resurface</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>New Trunkline Road Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>Trunkline Road Scoping</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>New Trunkline Scoping GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>Trunkline Bridge Scoping</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>New Trunkline Scoping GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>131775</td>
<td>I-96</td>
<td>68th Ave. to Bristol Ave.</td>
<td>Concrete Joint Repairs and Resealing</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$2,441 (50% in GVMC MPO)</td>
<td>Trunkline Road Preservation GPA Project Cost and Year Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>129341</td>
<td>I-196</td>
<td>32nd Avenue to 44th Street</td>
<td>ITS Cameras and Related Equipment</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>New TOS GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200162</td>
<td>M-37</td>
<td>Lake Eastbrook Blvd. to I-96</td>
<td>Concrete Joint Repairs</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$1,523</td>
<td>New Trunkline Road Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200171</td>
<td>M-37</td>
<td>44th Street to 32nd Street</td>
<td>Mill and Resurface</td>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>$872</td>
<td>New Trunkline Road Preservation GPA Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robinson suggested voting on the changes to the TIP before continuing on to the second item.

**MOTION by Conners, SUPPORT by Harrall, to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the amendments/modifications to the FY2017-2020 TIP requested by MDOT.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The second item discussed was 100th Street. MDOT was looking for support from the MPO on which alternative they would like to move forward with. There were a few presentations with MDOT, a couple months talking with the Road Commission and Byron Township and a Planning Environmental Languages study. Now that they are closing that out and beginning the design phase, they would like the MPO to support one option or the other. One option is to have the more traditional diamond type improvements; the other is a roundabout two lane bridge. The pricing is about the same for both options. It is not fully funded, but MDOT would like endorsement with one alternative or the other to hopefully move forward. Byron Township and the business community support the tight diamond over the roundabout option.

Hooker met with over 30 businesses and they were unanimously opposed to the roundabout because of the large industrial area. Trucking companies feared they would tear it up. Not one of the businesses support the roundabout, and there were several letters of opposition. Byron Township is firmly behind the tight diamond.

Kent explained that they wanted to see construction on this project begin in 2020. There will be a public meeting the end of May or early June to go over these two options; no venue has been selected yet, but the meeting will possibly be held in Byron Township.

 DeVries entertained a motion to support the tight diamond option.

**MOTION by Hooker, SUPPORT by Warren, to recommend to the Policy Committee support of the tight diamond option for the 100th St. bridge project.**

Conners suggested they discuss this further before calling the motion to question.

Kent stated that this was a unique situation as part of the Planning Environmental Languages process. It would be good to have MPO support for one of the options.

 DeVries stated that there is a motion with support on the table. Conners added that if they were to give a professional opinion on this matter then professional data should be looked at.

Haagsma explained that they looked at the AECOM model and then projected traffic. They found that the roundabouts break down sooner than the tight diamond. He stated that at first he supported the roundabouts; however, when he saw the data from the modeling, he supported the diamond. The diamond lends itself better for future expansion. The roundabout would have to be removed if the bridges ever had to be expanded. Discussion ensued.
Robinson added that Grand Valley Metro Council in association with MDOT, Byron Township, Gains Township and the Road Commission had met earlier to discuss each option.

Sevensma asked if the tight diamond has any facilities for pedestrians or bikes. Kent replied that yes both options do and that the final look will depend on negotiations and costs. The general preference is to have a full non-motorized facility and sidewalks on both sides.

Haagsma added that there are shoulders on the outside lanes.

Hooker explained how at least one business would be affected negatively from the roundabout.

Strikwerda added that he was also initially for the roundabout as they are typically a better option. However, in this situation, the diamond would work better because of the expansion.

Discussion ensued.

Green explained the data. In 2016 they collected 24 hour counts, full signal of review. They used that count into the sinc analysis for roundabouts and the stimulation model. Using that data, they grew the data first by 1% and thought it would take a conservative look. They asked GVMC for some of their information on growth, and they gave a prospect of 1.37. Then they took each option for 20 years, and grew it another 10 then 20, out to 40 years. Roundabouts take more right of way, and the tight diamond does not constrain right of way. He continued to explain and noted they have all the data if anyone would like to see it.

Robinson asked when doing a design on a project like this one, do they typically go out 50 years? Green said that 20 years is consistent for projects. Kent added that when you go out past 20 years the data can be unreliable. Discussion ensued.

DeVries called the motion to question.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

V. **TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR REGIONAL TARGETS**

Referring to **Item V: Attachment A**, Joseph explained one of the performance area measures in this group is the Transit Asset Management state of good repair. The final rule was effective in October 2016. Last fall, our Technical and Policy Committees moved to support The Rapid’s targets (regional targets). Now we have targets from MDOT and Hope Network. We have three sets of targets now. FTA literature recommends that we have one region-level target with each of these asset classes. We met with our transit agencies and did follow up work with them. We developed the targets from the memo and are asking for them to be considered. We took a conservative approach, and the targets will not have to be updated annually. Please refer to the memo for additional details.
MOTION by Laughlin, SUPPORT by Haagsma, to recommend to the Policy Committee to adopt the regional transit state of good repair targets. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. FY2017-2020 TIP DOCUMENT AMENDMENT

Referring to Item VI: Attachment A, Robinson discussed that another requirement of MAP-21 and the FAST Act is to have performance measure language in the TIP document. This document was created before performance measures were in existence or approved by the Federal legislation. Through the MTPA process they attempted to create this language to insert in our documents. It identifies all the asset management performance requirements and how we are currently addressing them, what we want to do in the future, and with FTA, we would have to amend this again in October so we went ahead and inserted that language as well, including operations maintenance and capital assets for all of our transit programs. Federal Highway and FTA have seen these. The language has to be incorporated by May 22nd in order to continue amending the TIP. We’re bringing this to the Technical Committee now and the Policy Committee in two weeks to have it completed and sent in to our Federal partners to be in compliance and able to amend the TIP.

MOTION by Haagsma, SUPPORT by Harrall, to recommend to the Policy Committee to amend the FY2017-2020 TIP document to add the new performance-based planning language. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. GVMC TRAFFIC SAFETY PLAN AND CMP REVIEW

Referring to Item VII: Attachment A, Yang discussed that GVMC is required by FHWA to develop a safety and CMP plan. We uploaded the draft documents on our website. Please review them, and if there are questions or comments, let him know. No action or approval is needed.

Robinson asked if this was done every year. Yang answered no; these documents are updated every four years. Robinson added that this is something that we insert in our long range plan. Basically, it is our explanation on how we deal with safety and congestion. We have had good reviews from our Federal partners.

Zull asked if the changes to CMAQ funding will affect these plans. Robinson stated that we will need to discuss this later

VIII. PRESENTATION ON MDOT LOCAL SAFTEY GRANT APPLICATION

Yang introduced Pam Blazo with MDOT who will be delivering a presentation on the application process for local safety grants. Robinson added that we just approved our FY2019 list of safety grants, and GVMC did very well.

Blazo continued with her presentation and explained the eligibility for federal safety funds for 2020.
She explained who is eligible and what roads. It is an 80/20 based funding. There is a $600,000 cap for projects. The majority of projects are funded at 90% federal level. Not a lot of people are taking advantage of this program. Read the Call letter every year because it always changes.

When applying, make sure you include a cover letter, location map, form 1627, cost estimate, time of return and/or highway safety manual analysis and UD-10’s crash reports on your application. If you do not include it all, it may not be approved. Each year financial dollars change.

Yang noted plans are already on the GVMC website.

Spot Location and Systemic are the two main project types for HSIP funding. There are four low cost systemic applications and a one page application—2 required documents. For focused/targeted projects – don’t ask for funding for non-safety related items.

Pictures are not required but are helpful. High risk rural road have 2 times the funding chances.

Conners asked what is the lower threshold for projects. Blazo replied that there are none.

Robinson requested to have the presentation on the GVMC website and advised to check the TIP for safety projects that may be eligible for this.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Brameijer stated the MDOT committee in charge of developing pavement condition performance measures had just released a draft of the white paper for the pavement performance measures coming out on May 20th. The current target recommendations can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline Calendar Year 2017</th>
<th>Recommended 2-Year Target(s) CYE 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Recommended 4-Year Target(s) CYE 12/31/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Percent Good</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Percent Poor</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate NHS Percent Good</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate NHS Percent Poor</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dewey gave an Air Quality Update. The EPA announced 2015 ozone non-attainment areas yesterday. On west side—partial county non-attainment areas were announced for Muskegon and Allegan, and all of Berrien, and the seven counties in the SEMCOG MPO were designated as non-attainment areas. Grand Valley Metro Council is in attainment. There was a lawsuit against the EPA by South Coast Air Quality Management District in South Florida. They sued the EPA to say that you can take off the designation for attainment areas but you cannot stop doing conformity based on the 1997 ozone standards. This is unprecedented and brand new and impacts GVMC, as well as 12 non-attainment areas across the state of Michigan. There will be a hold for Federal approval for changes or
additions to non-exempt projects. An assessment is needed on all projects in the TIP to see which projects are non-exempt. The hold is until GVMC can start to do conformity analysis. If you have an amendment to the TIP that is a non-exempt project, GVMC will have to run conformity and submit the TIP amendment. This applies to new TIPs and long range plans. The EPA is still working out the details. This is effective immediately.

Discussion ensued.

Robinson recommended if you have a non-exempt project to talk with the MPO ASAP, so we can begin the process.

Robinson stated that the development of the 2020 TIP needs to start earlier—in November/December we will need to start. Also, the GVMC July Tech meeting will move or be combined with Policy.

X. **ADJOURNMENT**

DeVries entertained a motion to adjourn the May 2, 2018 Technical Committee meeting.

**MOTION by Haagsma, SUPPORT by Conners, to adjourn the May 2, 2018 Technical Committee meeting at 10:50 am. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**