

APPROVED

APPROVED
ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

MINUTES

**Grand Valley Metropolitan Council
Transportation Division
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING STUDY GROUP
Wednesday, July 18, 2018**

Grand Valley Metro Council

678 Front Ave NW

Harrall, vice chair of the TPSG Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:35 am. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and the organization they represented.

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Voting Members Present

Wayne Harrall (*Vice Chair*) *Proxy for Tim Haagsma*

Scott Conners

Rick DeVries

Jeff Oonk

Proxy for Bill Dooley

County of Kent

City of Walker

City of Grand Rapids

City of Wyoming

Staff and Non-Voting Guests Present

Dennis Kent

Mike Brameijer

Abed Itani

George Yang

Andrea Faber

Laurel Joseph

Darrell Robinson

Kerri Smit

MDOT Staff

GVMC Staff

GVMC Staff

GVMC Staff

GVMC Staff

GVMC Staff

GVMC Staff

GVMC Staff

Voting Members Not Present

Jerry Alkema

Sandy Ayers

Mike Burns

Sharon DeLange

Bill Dooley

Roy Hawkins

Doug LaFave

Brett Laughlin

Terry Schweitzer

Tom Stressman

Phil Vincent

David Ducat

Todd Wibright

Mike DeVries

Conrad Venema

Rick Sprague

Chris Zull

Dan Strikwerda

Tim Bradshaw

Allendale Township

Village of Caledonia

City of Lowell

Village of Sparta

City of Wyoming

GRFIA

East Grand Rapids

Ottawa County Road Commission

City of Kentwood

City of Cedar Springs

City of Rockford

City of Cedar Springs

City of Grandville

Grand Rapids Township

ITP-The Rapid

Kent County Road Commission

City of Grand Rapids

City of Hudsonville

City of Kentwood

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Harrall entertained a motion to approve the December 6, 2017 TPSG meeting minutes.

MOTION by M. DeVries, SUPPORT by Kent, to approve the December 6, 2017 TPSG meeting minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. POLICIES AND PRACTICES DOCUMENT UPDATE

Referring to **Item IV: Attachment A** Robinson explained this this is an update of policies and practices. Updates began in March/April mostly because of performance measures, the certification review that was in June and also the GPA's. New sections have been added. Performance Measure targets is the first section, which introduces what they are and what is planning to be done with them. There are new sections for Safety Performance Measures, The Transit, Asset Management and Freight. Another new section is for GPA's. This was taken from the MDOT document, the MPO's statewide have been working on for several years.

Kent added that there are new GPA categories. Road were combined into one and Bridge categories were combined in another. Kent also advised to look at the definitions again.

Robinson explained that the general language is good there are just new categories. Less categories will make things easier. This document discusses how projects are moved from conception to approval and defines rules excepted by MDOT and FHWA. FHWA has supported in the past, projects that can be combined into General Program Accounts (GPA's) make it easier for them. It's a lot easier to move projects around as GPA's. Possibly in the future, Federal Highway may want changes.

Kent asked if there is always some discussion on public involvement.

Harrall asked what issues are with TAP projects, are they eligible? A lot of situations they are not able to make an obligation and then it moves into the next fiscal year. May need to change it quickly if ready to bid. Robinson answered, yes they are eligible. The only difference is the fund source, there is TA (state funded) and TAU (GVMC funded). They are one GPA category that the projects fall under. Mostly non-motorized, air quality and safety related type projects. Some CMAQ fall under the same as TAP projects.

Kent asked without moving into the exact definitions, do they understand it? They were

APPROVED

APPROVED

ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

trying to put safety and roadside into one category. The issue that you have with GPA's is that you can move projects in and out administratively but there is a budget that you can't exceed without becoming an amendment. Conners asked if it requires a lead agency to oversee it. Harrell answered, if it is a Non Act 51. Discussion Ensued.

Robinson added that the final new section - reminded about the lawsuit and noted air quality issues. Conformity Analysis – if project has a possibility of adding lanes or any significant to a road. It will have to go through Interagency Work Group. Some roads are exempt.

Itani explained that when developing the TIP have to figure what project will have to go through the Interagency Work Group for air quality. There isn't a guideline to figure out what is regionally significant. If it's a freeway it can be modeled but if it's something less than a mile it more than likely does not need to be modeled. Anything less than a half a mile is exempt. When you update the model and you simulate traffic it's not worth doing the analysis. Plan to add another month to the approval time for air quality. It would be a project by project basis. Discussion Ensued.

Kent suggested that when developing the new TIP for FY2020 – FY2023 this fall, if a project that is even close to being regionally significant, add a note to the TIP right away.

Itani explained that the reason this is being done is for performance based planning, adding a couple more items to the existing language. Don't know IRI's versus PASER will look like. If doing PASER on NHS it's showing pacer but the IRI could be showing something different. It has not been done before. The same goes for congestion management. When developing the TIP and the plan we're looking for deficiencies. When the list is sent each segment that is identified deficient, it will have everything related to performance based measures. Include safety, freight, congestion, pavement condition, etc. So when trying to improve that facility that information will be available. The selection process will not be any different than what it is today just more information. Once projects are selected there will be before and after analysis to see that the goals are being achieved. IRI targets are not finalized.

Joseph added that they are looking at roads in September

Devries asked how it plays out when you give the communities the information and mention a past situation.

Itani explained that if using EDFC, the problem wouldn't be an issue. If using STP it's not an issue. Addressing congestion there are several tools out there to use. When doing the plan with the new model analysis can be run on average daily traffic. New model will show peak hour deficiencies. The selection process will be the same as it was before except more information will be available. Discussion Ensued.

Kent suggested returning the discussion to the Federal Performance measures. Advised that no one would notice if targets are being made on a project by project basis. If proceeding the way expected, probably adopt a state wide target. Examples were offered.

Funding was discussed. (CMAQ, STP, ITS)

Schweitzer asked about the draft policy language and use of MPO monies for purchase of Right-Of-Way.

Robinson explained that it was added by Kent because MDOT funds its own projects. It was suggested to remove the engineering costs from GVMC funding, and it should only be approved on a case by case basis. He asked if other areas need to be modified.

Kent noted the reference to earmarks and that there is a better current terminology. They are no longer called earmarks. Robinson agreed to change the term to discretionary funding.

Robinson stated the MPO has currently only approved two performance measures, safety and transit. Next that will need to be in place by November 16, 2018 are congestion, travel liability, freight, pavement and bridge. These measures must go before the policy committee so it should be completed in September. Robinson also noted the MPO should write in a bridge policy language. Continued discussion.

Robinson asked if it was necessary to review performance measures again or if it should just be passed on to technical committee. Robinson also suggested meeting on a monthly basis.

MDOT requested to start the TIP process early because of the extra time needed for air quality conformity and for staff to have extra time to enter projects into Job Net.

Harrall entertained a motion to recommend policies and practices document with all the noted changes to the Technical Committee.

MOTION by Schweitzer, SUPPORT by Devries to pass the Policies and Practices Document to the Technical Committee at the next meeting with noted changes.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Harrell asked how the Certification went. Itani responded that all went well and by the end of September, we will receive a draft report with any corrective action.

Brameijer asked for feedback on how to present the pavement conditions to the technical team.

Itani advised that more marketing needs to be done for transportation. Devries suggested using Facebook

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

APPROVED

APPROVED
ITEM II: ATTACHMENT A

Harrall adjourned the Wednesday, July 18, 2018 TPSG Committee meeting at 10:45 am.