

MINUTES
MICHIGAN STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING
January 28, 2010
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present: Ted B. Wahby, Chair
Linda Miller Atkinson, Vice Chair
Maureen Miller Brosnan, Commissioner
Steven K. Girard, Commissioner
Jerrold M. Jung, Commissioner

Also Present: Kirk Steudle, Director
Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor
Marneta Griffin, Commission Executive Assistant
Jerry Jones, Commission Auditor, Office of Commission Audit
Patrick Isom, Attorney General's Office, Transportation Division
Greg Johnson, Chief Operations Officer
John Friend, Bureau Director, Highway Delivery
Mark VanPortFleet, Bureau Director, Highway Development
Myron Frierson, Bureau Director, Finance and Administration
Bill Shreck, Director, Office of Communications
Ed Timpf, Administrator, Finance and Administration
Leon Hank, Chief Administrative Officer
Sharon Edgar, Administrator, Bureau of Passenger Transportation
Rob Abent, Bureau Director, Aeronautics and Freight Services
Melvin Williams, Administrator, Freight Services and Safety Division
Denise Jackson, Administrator, Statewide Planning
Susan Mortel, Bureau Director, Transportation Planning
Bobbi Welke, Southwest Region Engineer
Tony Kratofil, Metro Region Engineer
Ron DeCook, Director, Office of Governmental Affairs
Tim Hoeffner, Administrator, Office of High Speed Rail

Excused: James S. Scalici, Commissioner

A list of those people who attended the meeting is attached to the official minutes.

Chair Wahby called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Bureau of Aeronautics and Freight Services Auditorium in Lansing, Michigan.

I. COMMISSION BUSINESS

Commission Minutes

Chair Wahby entertained a motion for approval of the minutes from the State Transportation Commission meeting of November 19, 2009.

Moved by Commissioner Brosnan, with support from Commissioner Jung, to approve the minutes from the State Transportation Commission meeting of November 19, 2009. Motion carried.

II. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Steudle's report focused on:

High Speed Rail Update

The President will be announcing today \$8 billion in ARRA funds targeted to high-speed rail improvements. The largest portions of the funding will go to Florida and California, with the Midwest region sharing \$244 million. Michigan will get about \$40 million to make improvements to three rail stations across the state. The Michigan grants will build or renovate rail stations in Battle Creek, Birmingham/Troy and Dearborn, an effort that is essential in improving rail services between Detroit and Chicago. The funds doled out to Chicago in particular will also help Michigan. We already have the fastest train in the Midwest. That fastest train runs only between Kalamazoo and the state line. The federal grants will provide no assistance for upgrading the rest of the state's passenger rail system to the 110-miles-per-hour standard. The big issue is taking care of the mess on the Southside of Chicago. We're going to put it to good use and put people to work.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Update

On February 17th President Obama signed a one-time economic recovery package totaling \$48 billion for transportation. The package equals roughly 1 year's worth of typical federal monies. It cannot be used to support maintenance and other services—it has to be for capital construction projects and it was run through our normal federal highway process so all of our same federal rules and contracting processes are still the same.

As of last week we had 365 Highway projects under contract. The engineers' estimate on those projects was \$762 million with the low bids at \$658 million. We have one or two projects left to obligate by the end of March and we have a couple on the local side as well. We will meet the deadline of March 31st.

Jobs for Main Street

At the end of December the U.S. House passed the Jobs for Main Street bill. This bill provides \$37.3 billion for transportation investment to create jobs—\$27.5 billion for highways nationwide, \$8.4 billion for transit nationwide. For Michigan this could mean \$850 million for highways and \$117 million for transit but there are significant challenges and changes from the recovery to this one. The first one and most pressing is 90 days from enactment to award funds for 50% of projects (ARRA required 120 days to obligate funds). There also is no exemption to this requirement for urbanized areas (ARRA exempted MPOs from the 50% obligation requirement). Also included in the bill was the provision that would waive the state match for two years for states that wanted to opt into that—that would help us with the match problem. It remains to be seen whether that will be included in the Senate bill. The Senate will consider the bill or pass their own, but not until February at the earliest.

Federal Reauthorization Update

We are now operating under the 3rd extension of SAFETEA-LU, which is set to expire at the end of February. SAFETEA-LU expired September 30, 2009, was extended through 10/31/09, again through 12/18/09, and now through 2/28/10. Reauthorization legislation only moved in one chamber (House). The Obama Administration has endorsed an 18-month extension.

The bill that was introduced in the House is the “House Transportation Infrastructure Committee” (Congressman Oberstar) and it really only released half of a bill (didn’t really have any money attached to it). It includes big sweeping policy changes such as performance management, a new Metro Mobility and Access Program, and a new Freight Improvement Program. One piece that is in here suddenly is an expanded federal role. This bill takes a lot of the authority of the independent states in the country and moves to the federal government. There is some consolidation of 100 programs—75 of them get eliminated and they get channeled into a smaller number of programs. Additionally, there it’s likely to include some kind of earmarks. The Legislation does not yet include any specific funding amounts, new apportionments formulas or changes to existing formulas or provisions to address donor equity.

The House authorization proposal totals \$450 billion compared to SAFETEA-LU’s \$286 billion which would be a 57% increase. The House proposal, while it doesn’t have how we are going to pay for it, is consistent with the two federal financing commissions that are out there that says we need to be spending about \$400-\$500 billion on transportation. It is consistent with the TF2 in Michigan that said we need double transportation investment.

Some of our concerns include: the performance measurement process is overly focused on process and leaves little room for state/regional/local input; it unnecessarily restricts tolling and establishes new hurdles for tolling and P3 projects; it requires a national strategic plan that revolves around projects (we like the notion of a plan, but without specific projects); it focuses heavily on urban areas, which is good, but not when it comes at the expense of rural areas; and, ambitious new programs will once again leave core programs starved for funding.

While the House is moving legislation, the Obama Administration has yet to release anything specific regarding what they are looking for in a bill. They have spoken about ensuring the legislation focus on the “abilities” (livability, sustainability, accountability). This will likely translate into greater focus on transit to address congestion, improve freight movements, and embrace some form of a performance based program. Meanwhile, there has been little action in the Senate on authorization, amounting to one or two committee hearings.

We are undoubtedly heading for another extension of SAFETEA-LU. Congress has a lot of other front-burner issues (health care, financial regulation, jobs bill, deficit reduction) that will compete with transportation for their time and attention. However, the biggest reason why we are likely to experience further delays getting a transportation bill is money. The federal transportation tax revenue stream will not even provide enough funding for a continuation of spending at current levels.

There were two rescissions in FY 2009. The first occurred in April and eliminated \$85.4 million in apportionments from Michigan; the second was the large \$8.7 billion SAFETEA-LU rescission that eliminated \$263.3 million in apportionments from Michigan. Thus far in FY 2010, MDOT has received about 29% of what we received through all of FY 2009. The amount of funding we have available through the end of February 2010 is roughly \$200 million less than what we planned to invest through this point in the fiscal year. MDOT has devised a short-term method to continue letting projects using “advance construction,” essentially moving forward with projects using only state funds, and converting the projects to federal-aid at some point in the future when the federal-aid is made available. Our ability to utilize advance construction is limited by our available state revenue and anticipated federal revenue and we may reach our limit sometime in June 2010.

Commissioner Jung asked, regarding high speed rail, if there were any plans for Detroit to Kalamazoo.

Director Steudle replied that one of our proposals was to do track improvement from Kalamazoo back to Detroit to allow that to get to 110. The way we will approach this is, now that this leg is running at 110, the administration has said that this initial piece was the down payment on a much larger, long-term commitment to high speed rail.

Commissioner Jung gave kudos to the department on the financial side for keeping the funding up and running.

Commissioner Atkinson stated that in the discussion about the grants, station improvements were mentioned. She then asked if there would be any improvements in rail itself.

Director Steudle replied that the grants are specifically for stations. We still invest other monies into the rail itself. We’ve got an ongoing discussion between Amtrak and Norfolk Southern about the piece from Kalamazoo to Dearborn and track improvements that need to happen there and how we’re going to pay for them.

III. **RESOLUTIONS**

Resolution of the State Transportation Commission of the State of Michigan Amending the Jobs Today Project List Approved by a Previously Adopted Commission Resolution – Myron Frierson

At the State Transportation Commission meeting held on November 19, 2009, the Commission approved a bond resolution intending to amend the project list (attached Exhibit X). MDOT has afforded the 30-day legislative notification period required by statute and is seeking Commission approval to finalize the project list changes. A roll call vote approving the authorizing resolution is requested. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion to approve the Resolution Amending the Jobs Today Project List. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Jung to approve the resolution. Mr. Kelley called the roll; motion carried on a unanimous vote.

Resolution of the State Transportation Commission of the State of Michigan Amending the Economic Stimulus Project List Approved by a Previously Adopted Commission Resolution – Myron Frierson

At the State Transportation Commission meeting held on November 19, 2009, the Commission approved a bond resolution intending to amend the project list (attached Exhibit Y). MDOT has afforded the 30-day legislative notification period required by statute and is seeking Commission approval to finalize the project list changes. A roll call vote approving the authorizing resolution is requested. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion to approve the Resolution Amending the Economic Stimulus Project List. Motion was made by Commissioner Jung and supported by Commissioner Girard to approve the resolution. Mr. Kelley called the roll; motion carried on a unanimous vote.

Resolution of the State Transportation Commission of the State of Michigan to Adopt an Amended Project List for the Comprehensive Transportation Refunding Bonds, Series 2009 – Myron Frierson

This bond resolution adopts an amended project list (attached Exhibit Z). A roll call vote approving this authorizing bond resolution is requested. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion to approve the Resolution to Adopt an Amended Project List for CTF Refunding Bonds, Series 2009. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve the resolution. Mr. Kelley called the roll; motion carried on a unanimous vote.

IV. **OVERSIGHT**

Commission Agreements (Exhibit A) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson presented information on 35 agreements. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval of Exhibit A; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Girard, and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Commission Agreements (Supplemental Exhibit A) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson presented information on 1 agreement. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval of Supplemental Exhibit A; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Girard, and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve Supplemental Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Bid Letting Pre-Approvals (Exhibit A-1) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson gave a brief re-cap of the January 8 and 14, 2010 lettings: 21 State projects with a total engineers' estimate of \$96.4 million and low bid dollars totaling \$84.5 million were let. The State low bids for fiscal year-to-date 2010 total \$213.5 million

compared to \$231.8 million for the same period of fiscal year 2009. (Note: After the February letting you will begin to see the impact of ARRA from last year. The January letting for 2009 was our normal expected program). The average number of bids received for the total number of projects let is 6.1, and the average number of bids received for the 21 State projects was 4.5. Overall, 317 State projects with a total of \$852.4 million in construction cost estimates were projected to be let during the 2010 fiscal year. Leading up to and including the January 2010 lettings, 80.8% of the projected construction cost estimate anticipated for this period was let. For this same period through January 2009, 90.2% of the projected construction cost estimate was let.

For the February 5 and 19, 2010, bid lettings, 35 State projects are advertised with engineers' estimates totaling \$104.7 million. Eighteen of the 35 projects include warranties with a total engineers' estimate of \$91.3 million. A total number of 82 projects are scheduled to be let in February with a total engineers' estimate of \$130.3 million. Of the 82 projects advertised, 32 have been approved for use of the ARRA funds with engineers' estimates totaling \$31.7 million.

Exhibit A-1 includes 46 projects. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve Exhibit A-1. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Letting Exceptions Agenda (Exhibit A-2) – Mark VanPortFleet

Mr. VanPortFleet provided information on 3 State projects and 1 Local project that were over the engineers' estimates. Pending any questions, Mr. VanPortFleet asked for approval of Exhibit A-2; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Girard to approve Exhibit A-2. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Contract Adjustments (Exhibit B) – John Friend

Mr. Friend briefly went over the performance matrix showing the department finalized out at \$220,875,349.05 and that we are running at about 4.4%--within the 5% performance criteria that was set by the Commission. He then provided information for 6 MDOT projects and 6 Local projects.

Bobbi Welke, Southwest Region Engineer, gave an update on MDOT Extra item #2010-13 (4.44 miles of hot mix asphalt cold milling and overlay...on I-94...in the city of Battle Creek, Calhoun County) where the bridge shifted (in May 2009—see minutes of 5/28/09 meeting). This Extra cost is one of the five elements that will be coming for approval. This first element of \$1,486,657 is offset by \$612,616 of work we did not do; therefore asking for a net increase to this contract of \$874,041. This will pay for the new foundation that was built for both bridges. The remaining four elements (local utilities repair, maintenance of traffic costs, stabilization costs of the bridge, and the investigation costs) will come before the Commission at later dates.

Pending any questions, Mr. Friend asked for approval of Exhibit B.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Girard and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve Exhibit B. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

V. **APPOINTMENTS**

Asset Management Council Appointments – Frank E. Kelley

Mr. Kelley asked the Commission to approve the appointment of Mr. John Egelhaaf (to fill the vacancy of Dave Bee) to the end of Mr. Bee's appointment which is 9/30/2010. Mr. Egelhaaf's bio was provided for their review.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion for approval. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Girard to approve the appointment of John Egelhaaf. The motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

VI. **PRESENTATIONS**

Final 2010-2014 Five Year Transportation Program – Denise Jackson, Statewide Planning

The draft 2010-2014 Five-Year Transportation Program was presented in November. Since that time, we have received public comment from the draft posted on MDOT's website and has been completed.

Brief Update

This Program, under its reduced investment scenario, totals \$5.877 billion. The total investment reflects all modes: nearly \$3.9 billion for the Highway Program, \$623 million invested for the Aviation Program and nearly \$1.4 billion for the Passenger Transportation, Marine, and Rail Programs. Every program is smaller than the previous Five-Year Program. We continue to focus on safety and preserving the existing transportation system.

Identified Changes

The most recent updates to the Program include the compiled public comments on the document after getting approval to post the November draft to the web, the completed economic benefits analysis of the Highway Program, and the development of the Financial Crisis Key Messages (document) which has been added to the document.

The Program document was posted to the web on November 30th and requested public comment through December 11th. We received 75 total comments after the website posting (comments were forwarded to appropriate region)--49 focused on specific MDOT projects, most focused on freeway, and 1 mentioned improving bike lanes in the Metro Region. The remaining comments addressed several key issues: impacts of Michigan's inability to match federal aid beginning in FY 2011, lack of transportation revenue causing MDOT to reduce its program, inability to meet pavement condition goals in the future, and a grouping of others related to the fact that even if all federal aid can be matched after FY 2010, current state funding is not enough to maintain infrastructure needs.

During the comment period, articles focused on the impacts of a reduced program appeared in newspapers across Michigan. A few examples include: “Lack of Road Money Will Cripple State” –Detroit Free Press; “State Falling Further Behind on Highways” –Holland Sentinel; “Funding crisis delays road projects in region” –Traverse City Record Eagle. The Michigan Infrastructure and Transportation Association (MITA) were quoted in many of these articles expressing concerns about the funding crisis.

The Michigan Benefits Estimation System (BEST) tool was used to analyze the economic benefits of the Five-Year Highway Program. Under the match all federal aid scenario, our investment would support approximately 17,500 to 14,600 jobs. The reduced program dramatically affects the employment supported by the 5YP. On average, the reduced program supports approximately 10,200 jobs annually.

After the Five-Year Program was presented in November, MDOT developed a Financial Crisis Key Messages document that identified the funding challenges facing Michigan. This document is 13 pages long and summarizes how the funding crisis will affect all modes of transportation in Michigan. The key messages are: there are challenging times ahead for Michigan, transportation funding investments are facing significant declines, motorists are driving less and buying more fuel efficient vehicles and hybrids, state transportation revenues are declining for all modes, and we are reaching a point of not being able to maintain capital investments and system reliability that Michigan’s economy needs.

A state revenue shortfall of approximately \$370 million is projected between 2011 and 2014. This state revenue shortfall will result in the loss of approximately \$2.1 billion in federal aid over the 4 year time frame due to inability to provide state matching funds. In FY 2011, which begins in October, at this time we are estimating a state revenue shortfall of \$84 million and therefore a loss of \$475 million in federal aid. Barring any significant changes, we will be implementing the Reduced Strategy come October 2010 (this time next year). The Highway Program is reduced by approximately \$600 million per year beginning FY 2011. The reduced program continues preservation and safety focus. However, substantial progress made to achieve road and bridge condition goals will be eroded. Routine maintenance accounts for nearly half of reduced highway program investments. No program is completely eliminated although most are substantially reduced. Consequences of the reduced program are outlined in the Key Messages document.

Revenue shortfalls have been plaguing the passenger transportation program for several fiscal years resulting in a slow, steady decline in the program. The cost of maintaining the system has increased steadily over that same time period, i.e., the cost of fueling buses tripled from 2000 to 2008. The impact of this trend can be seen in this graph...in 1998 the state covered close to 50 and 60% of operating costs for rural and urban local transit systems respectively. This fiscal year the percentages are down to 30 and 35%, and by 2014 we project it to be 23 and 27%.

The Transportation Funding Task Force (TF2) defined and analyzed different levels of funding in their report to the legislature. “Preserve” was the level needed to just maintain the current level of service available, “Good” was the level of investment that would

preserve, modernize and expand the system to provide users with increased transit options. Local transit would need an additional \$245 million per year to preserve the current level of service and passenger rail would need an additional \$51 million a year to reach the good level of service. Intercity bus service was recently enhanced with a new route that improved connectivity which is why we consider the funds needed for “preserve” the same as the amount needed for “good”.

There have been on-going revenue shortfalls for our Rail Freight Program for several fiscal years. This 5YTP is based on a continuation of FY 2010 revenue levels. Additional program reductions may be needed – and will be made annually – if revenues do not support the already reduced program. MTF and federal aid dollars support grade crossing safety. Funding for local grade crossing safety projects is approximately 20% below FY 2001. CTF supports the state-owned rail infrastructure and freight-related economic development. This funding is approximately 72% below FY 2001 levels.

The reduced program continues a safety and preservation focus. Fewer grade crossing safety enhancement projects will be undertaken due to funding constraints and rising construction costs. The Michigan Rail Loan Assistance Program (MiRLAP) has been suspended and the balance of the fund diverted to the general fund. Suspension of MiRLAP particularly affects smaller, short-line railroads, for which capital assistance can be critical to address emergency situations as necessary to maintain service. The CTF appropriation for the management of our state-owned rail infrastructure and freight-related economic development was cut almost in half from FY 2009 to 2010. The effect is offset by the use of bond money in FY10, but unfortunately, the consequences of the most recent cut are only delayed. Reduced CTF funding undermines preservation efforts on state-owned lines and limits MDOT’s ability to address new rail-dependent business opportunities or emergency situations.

State aviation fuel tax revenue is also on a steady decline. The fuel tax is 3 cents per gallon and has been unchanged since its enactment in 1929. The revenues in 2000 were about \$8 million and are now at slightly over \$5 million.

We have challenging times ahead. MDOT is continuing to look for efficiencies and savings. We are prioritizing program needs to ensure constraint to available revenue and are looking forward to long-term funding solutions at both the federal and state level.

Request Approval/Next Steps

Our next steps will be to keep the STC informed on news relating to the federal economic stimulus package. We will be able to update you when we know the impact of the stimulus package on the Five Year Program with more certainty. We will post the final document to the web and submit it to the Legislature by March 1st.

Pending any questions, Ms. Jackson asked for final approval of the 2010-2014 Five-Year Transportation Program.

Commissioner Brosnan thanked the department for the Key Messages document and commented that she appreciated the fairness, transparency and the reality that was presented in the document.

Commissioner Atkinson echoed Commissioner Brosnan's comments and expressed the desire to continue discussing the need for alternative funding. It has been talked about prior to today but, unless she is missing something, can't find anything in the document that discusses any kind of specific recommendation for alternative funding.

Director Steudle commented that the Program document is not intended to say how we must raise revenue but says how we will invest what money we have. The TF2 report contains the recommendations.

Chair Wahby entertained a motion for the approval of the 2010-2014 Five Year Transportation Program. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Girard to approve the Program.

Mike Nystrom of MITA addressed the Commission regarding the Five Year Program and how dire the situation is relating to jobs, road safety and the economy in Michigan. The state is going backwards in that 24 counties turned paved roads back into gravel just in the last year. MITA believes that this dilemma we are facing in Michigan will hopefully cause our state elected officials, including the Governor, to wake up to the fact that this needs to be a top priority for our state. We need to get this done in order to turn the economy around, create good paying jobs, improve safety and start improving our pavement conditions at the both the state and local level.

M-3/Gratiot Avenue Access Management Plan – John Crumm, Program Manager, and John Paul Rea, Associate Planner, Planning and Environmental Services Group, Macomb County Planning and Economic Development Department

Tony Kratofil, Metro Region Engineer, introduced the presenters. Access Management is one of the tools available to improve safety and traffic operations particularly on developed roads that did not have access control. It's really about trying to have the right number of access points on the trunkline system and allowing traffic to flow at the right speed and reduce the potential for crashes. Every year MDOT sets aside a small portion of the federal statewide planning and research dollars to conduct access management planning. This project was unique in the sense that normally we would contract those services and manage them ourselves; in this case we went through SEMCOG to assist us. They managed the project; we feel there's a lot of value in that because they bring together transportation planning and land-use planning all the time.

John Crumm stated that with this grant they were able to collaborate with SEMCOG, RCMC, and MDOT. He thanked Greg Johnson, Tony Kratofil and Drew Buckner for their help is making this possible. This plan crosses 9 communities: Macomb Township, Chesterfield Township, Lennox Township, Village of New Haven and City of Richmond (north segment communities) and City of Eastpointe, City of Roseville, Clinton Charter Township, and City of Mount Clemens (south segment communities). The County will continue to have them meet and work as a collaborative effort along Gratiot across jurisdictional boundaries.

John Paul Rea stated that the purpose of the project was to evaluate and improve traffic flow and safety along the Gratiot Avenue corridor (M-3/M-19). Current access-related

issues include: poor driveway geometrics, major crash problems, congestion, not walking/transit friendly. We also wanted to strengthen multi-jurisdiction coordination.

The benefits of Access Management include safety (reduces crashes), capacity (improves traffic flow), walkability/transit (reduces conflicts), aesthetics (increases landscaped areas), business vitality (improves the roadways), and preserve investment (very cost effective).

Types of recommendations include closing driveways, consolidating closely spaced driveways, connecting parking areas, front or rear service drives/connections, future development in driveway alignment, intersection improvements, geometric design of driveways and parking, and integrating the non-motorized component.

The elements of the Access Management Program were separated into the North communities and the South communities (North and South Gratiot Access Management Plans). We adopted this plan as part of the communities' Master Plans and we also provided them with recommendations to support zoning ordinances.

The Plan itself consists of 5 chapters—chapters 1-4 are consistent for all of the communities, and chapter 5 is community specific. The Plan also has an executive summary, glossary/acknowledgements, and table of contents. Each community received a hard copy and an electronic version of the Plan. The Plan recommendations are applied during the Site Plan Review (discuss required improvements with MDOT and RCMC), road project planning (coordinated between road agencies and private property owners), local initiatives (partnerships with DDA's, Corridor Improvement Authority, others), and pilot projects.

A concept called C.A.M.P. was set up to demonstrate projects and get communities interested in access management. We took a cooperative approach to find "opportunity zones" which were based on crash concentrations, density, and recommendation clusters. We discussed with community officials which owners might be most willing to participate and approached property owners to gauge their interest. Each one of the communities was given a C.A.M.P. zone of opportunity: Richmond – South of 31 Mile Road; Roseville – Gratiot Avenue/I-696; Chesterfield Township – South of 21 Mile Road; and, Mt. Clemens – North of N River Road. We did a series of retrofits, one of which was in Roseville at 12 Mile and Gratiot. Corridor examples include Macomb Township and Richmond.

Commissioner Brosnan asked how much the grant was.

Mr. Kratofil responded \$227,500. It was 30 miles and I don't think we've ever done a 30 mile segment like this before and affected that many communities with one punch.

Commissioner Atkinson commented that we got our monies worth.

Commissioner Brosnan agreed.

Chair Wahby commented that there have been great enhancements to that area that were

long overdue and were very critical to the businesses along that corridor.

VII. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chair Wahby asked if any member of the audience wanted to address the Commission; none were forthcoming.

Chair Wahby asked if any Commissioner wanted to address the Commission.

Commissioner Atkinson commented on the passing of Jack L. Gingrass on January 23, 2010, at age 88. He was a former Commission Vice Chairman, appointed to the STC by Governor Engler in 1992, and served as vice chairman until his appointment expired in 2000. In addition, he was a state representative for 14 years, and also served as mayor of the City of Iron Mountain.

Chair Wahby asked for a moment of silence in remembrance Mr. Gingrass.

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chair Wahby declared the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

The next full meeting of the Michigan State Transportation Commission will be held on Thursday, February 25, 2010, in the 1st floor Bureau of Aeronautics and Freight Services Auditorium in Lansing, Michigan, commencing at the hour of 9:00 a.m.

Frank E. Kelley
Commission Advisor