

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Road Plan Committee
February 9, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Miller at 4:00 PM.

Present: Miller, Halstead, Stites, Schafer, Harshfield and Planning/Zoning Administrator Meyers.

The Current Road Plan was reviewed and the following comments offered:

- The current Plan makes too many references to other documents. The Plan should be able to stand on its own.
- Community Goals – many are too subjective. Need to combine the desires as listed in the survey into document.
- Concern over the actions of the Plan – i.e. Chapter 2: Actions – call for a working relationship with the County as the Township has no jurisdiction over roads. The committee would like to be more involved with GTCRC throughout the process and asked Meyers to see if the GTCRC could provide a conduit for exchanging information with the committee throughout the process.
- There was concern over the use of “context-sensitive design.” Committee would like to see another term used.
- Definition is needed for turf shoulders.
- Safety is not adequately addressed in the Plan – while roadway character is important, safety is paramount.
- Alignment needs to more adequately defined – pg 6, first bullet.
- AASHTO needs to be further defined.
- How do AASHTO and the Federal Highway Administration and County Road Commissions compare and contrast?
- Again, too many references to other materials and the document cannot stand on its own.
- Meyers was asked to review the Reclassification and new classifications system as outlined on pg. 7 and comment at the next meeting.
- The reason for opposition to any improvements to North Broomhead Road was included in the plan was discussed.
- Natural Beauty Roads were examined. Meyers stated that she has examined correspondence from the former committee to petition GTCRC for 7 natural beauty designations. The Committee strongly felt that encouraging Natural Beauty Road classification to too many roads is both costly and counterproductive. Meyers also added that she has been in contact with the RC about adopting a Natural Beauty Roads policy. When Mary Lajko was with the RC the plan was to adopt the program as defined by MDOT. To date, the project is on hold.
- The Committee questioned the ability of the Township to require “beauty strips” in logging activities within the State Forests.
- What plans are in place for updates to the 2001 M-72 Access Management Plan?
- US-31 Regional Corridor Study area, pg, 11 needs to be updated and include the latest study, the Grand Vision. Again, the reference to other documents, in this case, Alternative 5 has not been properly researched. What does this mean?
- Speed Limits – do we need to promote the reduction of speed limits on gravel roads?
- Non-motorized Travel: The aging population needs to be addressed here.
- Meyers was asked to research the Boardman River Valley Master Plan for the next meeting.
- What bridges is the Township to support construction and repair of?

- Pg 14 – Safety and Liability – was not well received by the Committee. Safety is a legitimate concern; however..... is not appropriate. This section will need to be reworked.
- The funding of Township Road Projects section needs to be reevaluated. This is a must as road funding is decreasing each year. Cost estimates “must” be identified prior to millages, etc.
- Glossary of Terms must include all terms that may not have a clear meaning.
- Appendix A must be reviewed and contrasted with GTCRC.
- Shoulders, (per Appendix A), is of issue for safety – it is not all about appearance.
- No statements should be included in the Plan that are out of context.
- Pavement back to Gravel program should be addressed.
- Appendix c – Roadway Classifications shall be looked at.

Next the Committee looked at the current 1999 Master Plan. Non-Regulatory Actions #4 Page 20 addresses Roads and Transportation. “A” states that the Township should go on record in opposition of to any more public investments in M-72 that make it an even greater high speed thoroughfare. We have no control in this issue. We need to instead work with the State to be kept up to date of all plans, designs, etc. that the State has in mind. More importantly, we need to work with the State to upgrade intersections that are unsafe.

Census and other data needs to be reviewed for back-up information. For example, how many senior citizens? Car pooling data, etc.

Railroad issues need to be reviewed and considered.

Overlays for selected roads is an issue for the Planning Commission.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2010 at 4:00 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leslie Meyers, Recording Secretary