

2010 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 13, 2010

February 10, 2010

March 10, 2010

April 14, 2010

May 12, 2010

June 9, 2010

July 14, 2010

August 11, 2010

September 8, 2010

October 13, 2010

November 10, 2010

December 8, 2010

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 13th, 2009 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 13th, 2009, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineering; and Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer.

Guests present were: Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-Bismarck (Via Conference Call).

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen introduced Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern, and asked that everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves, and that Matt also talk a little about himself as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 9TH, 2009, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lang referred to Page 8 of the minutes, and pointed out that it states that Franken and Oberstar are both Senators, when in-fact Mr. Oberstar is actually a Representative.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 9TH, 2009, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE NOTED CORRECTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 13th, 2010**

MATTER OF 2011-2014 MINNESOTA T.I.P. PROJECTS

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that they received one application from the City of East Grand Forks for the ATP's City Sub-Target Funds in 2014. He explained that this project is actually a familiar one to our T.I.P. as it was programmed to occur in 2010 for many years, however was recently delayed in order for the funds to be used for the 23rd Street N.W. project instead, therefore, since 2014 is when the City of East Grand Forks will again receive the Sub-Target Funds, it was decided that the City should apply once again for the 5th Avenue N.W./U.S. #2 Intersection Project. He referred to a conceptual drawing of the project, included in the packet, and pointed out that it came from the U.S. Highway 2 Access Management Study that was done for the City of East Grand Forks. He added that the previous cost estimates have been escalated to show the year of expenditure costs for this project. Boppre reported that the East Grand Forks City Council approved the application for this project at their meeting last week. Haugen added that a copy of the resolution was included in the packet as well.

Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering, reported present.

Haugen distributed some additional information, and explained that last Friday he received correspondence from MNDOT, concerning the addition of a project in our 2011-2014 T.I.P.. He explained that the project was originally included in our 2009-2012 T.I.P., and consisted of improvements on Highway 220, basically between Climax, MN and the intersection of U.S. Highway 2, to be done in 2012, but paid for in 2013, however was dropped from our current 2010-2013 T.I.P.. He pointed out that the project cost has been escalated to \$5.5 million.

Haugen added that on the back of the table he just distributed is a map. He explained that previously, when this project was programmed, it was asked that they consider improving the southbound movement of Highway 220 where it intersects with Old Highway 220/Bygland Road, so that southbound traffic does not have to stop, but instead make the small stretch of county road become the stop condition instead.

Haugen stated that both projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and, because they are the only projects competing for funding, should be given a top priority ranking.

Bergman asked how the 5th Avenue N.W. Intersection project will affect the bus routes. Haugen responded that they will actually be discussing that when they do the route review later in the year.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. PROJECT APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT A PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 13th, 2010**

Haugen commented that he would like to briefly discuss some transit issues. He explained that on the North Dakota side it was recently discovered that there are a lot of unspent rural transit monies, which are now being proposed by diverted to urban monies instead. He asked, if this were to occur would it all need to be used for capital items or could some of it be used for operating costs. Hanson responded that she does not know what the transit folks have been working on, and, unfortunately, Denny Johnson is out of the office attending training, however he should be available next week to answer that question. Bergman commented that the last he heard it could be used for capital items only.

Haugen stated, then, that until we know more about what may actually be available with the transit rural conversion, we do not really know what we will be programming for 5309 requests. He added that a conference call is scheduled for January 21st, to discuss 5309 funds, and possible state funding.

MATTER OF 2ND STIMULUS PLAN

Haugen reported that most everyone is now aware that Congress may act on a second stimulus bill. He said that the House already acted on a bill, but the Senate will most likely not do anything until February.

Haugen referred to the packet, and explained that he included information he received that gives an indication as to what might be happening with the bill. He added that one of the handouts was the transit section of the bill, that was distributed to transit operators on the North Dakota side, as to what they might expect for transit.

Haugen commented that a couple points of interest are the fact that the funding might be as much as we received with the first Stimulus Bill, or at least 75% of what we received; and the other is that the House changed the rule that the first 50% has to be obligated to it needing to be awarded, which is a major difference.

Hickman reported that the only bit of additional information she has is that currently the House version does state that it must be a contract award within 90-days, however it is still uncertain if the Senate version will do the same, but, certainly, if it comes out any differently we would have to go to conference, so beyond that there is very little additional information.

Hanson commented that the NDDOT has started identifying projects on the state system, mostly in the rural areas, to try to ensure we have enough projects available to cover 50% of our money within the 90-days, if that is how the language ends up being, so they are currently working on projects on the state side of things. She added that they are recommending that cities, counties, transit, etc., all start looking at trying to identify projects that might be candidates for funding.

Grasser stated that they are in the process of looking at projects, but if they set a 90-day timeline, quite frankly it would be an impossible target for them to meet unless they already have something in the bid process because plans have to be in ten-weeks prior to the bid opening,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 13th, 2010**

which is seventy-five days right there, and then once the bids are opened it takes an additional three to four weeks to award the project, so it would be almost impossible to meet that deadline. Hanson responded that their DOT management understands that for city and county projects it really wouldn't be very likely that they would be able to have them ready within that timeline, which is why the state started escalating the design on several of their projects in hope that they can cover the entire 50% of the monies within that 90-days, which would then give the cities, counties, and transportation enhancement a little breathing room and allow them to come in for the second 50%. She added, however, that they are also hoping that the language changes to allow for a longer timeline, which would be better for everyone, but they do want to be prepared in the event that does not occur.

Broppre said that he talked to Lou Tasa from MNDOT just yesterday, and, in the event that just this kind of thing would happen, they actually already have the second phase of the 23rd Street N.W. project reprogrammed. He commented that this same issue occurred with the first stimulus package, very few cities had any projects that could meet the timeline for funds, so only a few received stimulus money at that time, and that is something they don't want to see happen again, so he did have some conversations with Senator Franken's office about trying to make sure that smaller communities receive some of the funding this time as well.

Grasser asked if NDDOT would consider a half dozen projects for a February or March bid opening contingent on funding, if they could get the plans to them in the next three weeks. Hanson responded that any project they do would have to be included in both the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., so with this possible second stimulus funding they will have to go through the normal process of doing T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. amendments. She stated, however, if there are some projects that could be ready, they would certainly like to know as soon as possible so they can help get them ready for the process.

Haugen reported that there are two projects that he is aware of that might be ready for stimulus funds, and they are the two signing projects on US 2 and I-29. He stated that they are already doing the solicitation of use and the project memorandum, and they are both currently programmed for 2011.

Information only.

MATTER OF RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that both City Councils have taken action on the Railroad Crossing Study. He explained that the City of East Grand Forks is waiting to get gates and lights on all three of their downtown crossings prior to implementing a quiet zone. He said that one of the three will get upgraded in 2011. He stated that the City of Grand Forks did establish quiet zones at three of the four zones, adding that the fourth zone, the one on 32nd Avenue South by Longview Fiber will not be quieted at this time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 13th, 2010**

Haugen commented that he just finished reviewing the draft report, and submitted some comments to SRF for inclusion in the report, and once that is done the final report will be distributed to the Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee for their review and comments as well.

Haugen reported that they held the kick-off meeting for the State Mill Spur portion of the study last month. He said that they are in the process of scheduling follow-up meetings in February and March, and hope to have the study completed soon. He added that just yesterday they heard from BNSF that they are willing to fund 50%, and the State Mill is willing to fund 50% of the third component of the proposed scope of work, which is to study the possible closure of Bacon Road.

Information only.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Kouba referred to a power point slide presentation and explained that in 2008 both cities were photographed, and in 2009 we got the PCI and software back up and running so that anyone needing to use it within the City would have the ability to do so. She added, that in order for everyone to really understand how to use the information correctly, they provided training on the software as well.

Kouba referred to a map illustrating the condition index and went over it briefly, pointing out that the areas shown in yellow indicate those areas that are at the desired condition index level, meaning those roads are in good shape.

Kouba reported that Grand Forks needs to put the last two years of projects into ICON, and East Grand Forks needs to put all their projects into ICON. She explained that once the projects are in we can truly reflect what is happening on our roadway system, and then we can begin working on the budgets.

Grasser asked what factors were used in this program to determine the condition index. Kouba responded that Goodpointe determined the index. Williams stated that they used rideability, number of years, cracks, shifts, etc.. Grasser asked if rideability was determined by accelerometers in the vehicles. Williams responded it was.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Cost Estimating Webinar

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 13th, 2010**

Haugen stated that next Wednesday morning the MPO is hosting a webinar on cost estimating in conjunction with Federal Highways. He said that the webinar begins at 9:30 a.m. in Conference Room A101.

Haugen reported that this is a North Dakota cost estimating webinar being provided by Federal Highways, and the other two MPOs and their districts will also be participating as well. Hickman commented that if there is anyone from East Grand Forks that would like to attend, they are certainly welcome to do so. She added that it entails cost estimating primarily for planners.

2. PTP Refresher Webinar Series

Haugen reported that they are also offering a PTP (Professional Transportation Planners) Refresher Webinar Series, which begins next Wednesday as well. Ellis stated that this series will run from January 20th through February 24th, from 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. each Wednesday in Conference Room A101.

3. February Technical Advisory Committee

Haugen asked, because of the PTP webinar taking place on Wednesday, February 10th, he was wondering if there would be a problem with moving the Technical Advisory Committee up to 12:00 noon or 12:30 p.m.. After some discussion it was determined that the February 10th Technical Advisory Committee would be held at 12:30 p.m. instead of 1:30 p.m..

4. DOE Grant Awarded

Haugen reported that we received a \$125,000 Department of Energy Grant for traffic signal coordination upgrades. He asked that Mr. Lang have Mr. Noehre get in touch with Ms. Williams about the \$40,000 the district was going to provide the City for these upgrades as well.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 13TH,
2009, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:10 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Executive Assistant

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010 – 12:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 10th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dennis Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County Planning; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT Transit-Bemidji; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT Planning-Bemidji; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineering.

Guests present were: Paul Benning, NDDOT-Local Government, Bismarck; and Peg O’Leary, GF Historic Preservation Commission.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves and the organization they represent. He then welcomed Dennis Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck, and asked that he give a brief overview of himself.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 13TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 13TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen reported that Mr. Magnuson has a prior commitment that he needs to leave early for, therefore he is requesting that we suspend the agenda in order for him to present his agenda item at this time.

MATTER OF MERRIFIELD INTERCHANGE UPDATE

Haugen referred to the packet. and pointed out that it included a memorandum from Mr. Magnuson regarding a meeting that the County had with the NDDOT concerning the Merrifield Interchange. He asked that Mr. Magnuson give a brief synopsis on the meeting.

Magnuson reported that the County Commissioners expressed that they had some questions regarding the future of the Merrifield Interchange project, and instead of just sending letters and e-mails back and forth between themselves and the NDDOT it was decided that a group of representatives from the County Commission and staff meet with the NDDOT to discuss those issues and concerns.

Magnuson stated that the meeting took place on January 28, 2010 in Bismarck; with Commissioner William Murphy, County Coordinator Ed Nierode, County Engineer Richard Onstad, and himself representing Grand Forks County; and the NDDOT Director Francis Ziegler, Grant Levy, Dave Leftwich, Paul Benning, and Les Noehre representing the NDDOT.

Magnuson reported that the meeting involved discussion on the planning and funding processes for a future Merrifield Interchange, along with a background on the challenges that NDDOT offices are currently facing. He stated that the NDDOT explained that in order for the State NDDOT to justify state and federal funds one of two conditions has to be met. He said that the first condition is that the land and infrastructure surrounding the potential Merrifield Interchange would have to be developed, and there has to be issues with the existing level of service in the area, so basically the area would have to be built out to urban densities, and there has to be enough congestion to warrant an interchange.

Magnuson stated that the second condition is that the interchange would need to be part of a bypass project, in other words without a bridge component being planned and funded, the interchange would not be eligible for funding. He added that the DOT does recognize that the bridge and interchange would not necessarily be done at the same time, but there would need to be a funding commitment for a bridge before the interchange would receive funding.

Sanders reported present.

Magnuson reported that in the end, the economic condition of the country has the DOT concerned about existing federal funding levels, and they sense that in the future the cost benefit analysis may come into play as well, so they encouraged us to look into the possibility of a public/private partnership to fund future projects, and to continue involvement in the MPO's

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

planning process to ensure our projects remain in the transportation plan so that they can be eligible when one of the conditions are met, and future funding becomes available.

Brooks commented that, when you suggest that the project remain in the MPO Plan in the event funds should become available, he sees two conditions that still may not be met, so even if funds were to become available, if the project still does not meet the criteria necessary to be eligible for those funds, how would that be worked out. He explained that, basically what he is saying is that development probably won't occur in that area without an interchange, and without an interchange it would be unlikely that a bridge would be built, so ultimately it seems pretty unlikely that an interchange would be built whether funds were available or not. Benning responded that the general concept for interchange justification is to first put in the corridor, then you put in the surrounding network, and then when the level of service starts breaking down on that then you can move forward and put in an interchange, otherwise, you have a chance now, as your long range transportation plan shows, to put in an new interchange at 47th Avenue. He added that if the private/public partners would want to go forward and use their funds they can do that at any time.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF PROPOSED 2010-2013 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a public notice was published informing the public that a public hearing would be held at today's meeting.

Haugen reported that the NDDOT is requesting we consider three amendments to the 2010-2013 T.I.P., two are changes in project scope and cost and the other is a new project. He added that all three are projects in the FY2010 Annual Element of the T.I.P..

Haugen stated that one of the amendments is just a reconciliation of our T.I.P. with the State's S.T.I.P., for pavement work on U.S. Highway 2, between Arvilla and North 55th Street. He explained that this project was shown with a higher cost estimate in our T.I.P. than was shown in the S.T.I.P., so we are amending our T.I.P. to show the lower cost estimate of \$4,264,000, with \$3,451,000 being federally funded.

Haugen said that the second project is regarding a sign replacement project on U.S. Highway 2. He explained that both the termini and the cost of this project have increased; with the new termini expanding to the Red River to the east and Niagra to the west; and the total project cost increasing to \$500,000, with \$404,630 being federally funded.

Haugen stated that the third project is a new one; to begin the project development process for the scheduled replacement of the Sorlie Bridge in 2018. He reported that the NDDOT contacted him three weeks ago to ask that this project be put in for a T.I.P. amendment, with a dollar

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

amount of \$3,125,000. He explained that this is described as Phase 1 funding for the preliminary engineering process, with NDDOT being the lead agency, and all funding coming from North Dakota through the Bridge Plus Federal Program. He stated that Phase 2 is being proposed to be funded entirely by Minnesota, at a cost of \$3,125,000; and then if there is a third phase needed to complete the project development, that would be split in the more traditional 50/50 split process.

Haugen commented that the first phase that shows up on our T.I.P., again is funded solely by North Dakota, but because it is a joint facility, and there are federal funds being spent on it, it will also need to be included in Minnesota's S.T.I.P., and he isn't sure how that will be done McKinnion responded that it might just be shown as being funded with "other" funds at this time.

Haugen stated that they did advertise that this is the time and place for public comments. He added that they also advertised that if people were unable to attend today's meeting, written comments could be submitted until noon, none were received, so at this time he would open the public hearing.

Peg O'Leary, Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission, was present for discussion. She stated that the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission, and North Dakota State Historical Preservation Commission want to make sure that it is understood that the Sorlie Bridge is on the National Register of Historical Places, and mitigation will have to meet all the pertinent criteria. She said that they are concerned to see what the actual need for replacement is as opposed to rehabilitation; what the engineering reasons for it are, what is the long-term plan, is there a long-term plan to widen DeMers, and, while she knows that this is all part of the ongoing process, she doesn't know where it fits in to Phase 1, or Phase 2, or Phase 3, but there are certainly concerns that they have expressed in previous meetings at different places and times, and that they continue to have. She added that the Sorlie is a fine bridge and is an excellent point of reference for our two communities.

Haugen asked if either Mr. Benning or Ms. Hanson would like to talk about what the T.I.P. amendment is accomplishing, and what will happen from this point forward, once the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. are amended.

Hanson stated that essentially what they are putting into the T.I.P. right now is the dollars that will be spent on the preliminary engineering process. She explained that the preliminary engineering process involves the beginning work on the environmental document to get environmental clearance. She reported that part the environmental document process includes the solicitations of agencies, the public input process, the investigation of alternatives, and the environmental impacts that will need to be looked into and evaluated before environmental clearance is approved. She added that what they are approving today just allows them to move into the process of determining what the best alternative is, whether it would be replacement or rehabilitation. Benning commented that they also need to develop the purpose and need as well, what is the purpose for the bridge replacement, and what is the need for total replacement rather than just giving it a paint job or something. Haugen reported that, actually, what we are doing

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

today is getting the funding in place so that you can engage a consultant. Benning agreed, adding that this is all a little bit of a new twist from Federal Highway. He explained that, although this rule has been around for a while, at least on the North Dakota side, this is the first time they have required us to follow it. Haugen asked, with the funding in place, is that when you will specifically engage in the Section 106 process, the historic part of the process. Benning stated that that will part of the Project Concept Report.

Brooks commented that he isn't necessarily hearing that it will be replaced, that it is written as "possible" replacement, so there is still a chance that there will only be a rehabilitation project. Benning responded that there are various alternatives, and one is to do nothing.

Haugen reported that North Dakota is the agreed lead agency on this project, but that doesn't mean that MNDOT won't be involved, but North Dakota will be doing the hiring. Benning stated that NDDOT and MNDOT share the lead agency title, with North Dakota being the lead agency on one project, and Minnesota being the lead agency on the next, this was just North Dakota's turn.

Hanson commented that this is a cooperative effort between both states and cities, and they will be working together on public input, with resource agencies, and they just want to get started on the process because it takes several years to work on one of these larger projects in order to get through the environmental process. She added that, although they don't have construction funding for several years, they still want to get started planning toward that right now so they want to get started on the environmental process at this time.

Rau reported that Al Grasser, City Engineer, has sent out some e-mails concerning how they can determine how much money the city will need as they currently don't have it budgeted in this year's budget, although they do have some money set aside for bridge replacement they don't currently have access to those funds, so a budget amendment will be necessary.

Benning commented that as far as doing any rehab or removal, when they do the inspection work there is a rating between 0 and 100, with 100 being the best, and if a bridge isn't below 50 they can't by law remove a bridge, they have to do a rehab on it, so when they do the scoring it has to be below 50 to even be considered for replacement.

Hanson stated that their Planning and Programming Engineer is working on some estimates for Mr. Grasser, at his request, as to what will likely be the City's share would be for each year of the process, over the next few years.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen commented that there was one other question that came up regarding local match on the Minnesota side. He asked if, when Phase 2 comes in to play, will East Grand Forks be participating. McKinnon responded that this one will be 100% state funded, so East Grand Forks will not be participating.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

Haugen asked if there was a timeline set yet as to when the RFP would be issued, and, perhaps, when the selection process would occur. Hanson responded that she does not have a timeline at this time, but essentially they need to have the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. amendments approved first, then they can go ahead and request authorization of the PE funds from Federal Highway, and once that is approved then they would issue the RFP, so she wouldn't think anything will be done for at least another month or so.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY SANDERS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2010-2013 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF PROPOSED TRANSIT PROJECTS FOR THE 2011-2014 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that essentially for transit, most of the requests are simply a continuation of its operations. He said, however, that for Grand Forks there are a couple of other programs that they anticipate applying for, or have already applied for, with both programs being shown on Page 22 of the packet. He added that East Grand Forks is just a continuation of the projects in the current T.I.P. with the addition of one more year.

Ehrenstrom referred to the East Grand Forks project lists, and asked if it might not be a good idea to remove the names of the organizations shown in the remark sections, as we are actually establishing a new RFP, and the current organization could possibly change. Haugen agreed. Brooks asked what page these projects are shown on. Haugen responded that they are shown on Page 17. He referred to Project 2, and pointed out that the RFP they are currently working on is their Demand Response RFP, and it does list Grand Forks Taxi as the current provider, but that may not be the case in 2011, and this is also the case with Project 1 as well.

Haugen referred to Page 22, and explained that the City of Grand Forks participated in a statewide 5309 grant request, and received just over \$2.2 million dollars, with the bulk of those monies being used to rehab and upgrade their bus barn, to replace a couple of vehicles, and to purchase a new bus washing system.

Haugen commented that Projects 2 and 3, on Page 22 of the packet, are projects that would be done in the event there would be a solicitation of projects for JARC and New Freedom Funds, and Page 25 lists the new FY2014 projects.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY RAU, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2011-2014 T.I.P. PROJECT APPLICATIONS, SUBJECT TO NOTED CHANGES, AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKINGS.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen commented that with this, all of the programs that he is aware of, have been solicited and projects have been forwarded, or will be forwarded to their respective State DOTs after February 19th so that in March we can start working on a Draft T.I.P. document for approval in April.

Benning reported that the NDDOT is still working on their urban program, which is currently being reviewed by the Districts and the DOT. He stated that comments need to be submitted by February 23rd, and once received it will be sent to their office holders for their review and comments, and then to the Deputy Director who will review and sign-off on it. He commented that they are looking at getting it back out to the MPOs in April. He added that they are struggling with this this year just like everyone else because they aren't sure what the highway bill will be like, and what they will get for JOBS, but they still hope to get it done by April.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF PROJECTS FOR POSSIBLE 2ND STIMULUS

Haugen reminded everyone that last month we discussed action that the House took, and both State DOTs sent communications out to their Counties and Cities informing them that they should start thinking about putting together a list of potential projects. He said that MPO staff participated in a conference call a couple of weeks ago in which Federal Highway Headquarters was on the line and they were stressing that the MPO should start acting on getting amendments in the loop so that they will be ready to go if and when Congress should act on this.

Haugen stated that we published a notice in our local newspapers informing the public that if they have a project they would like to see done, they should submit it to their respective governing bodies, who would then forward them to the MPO by February 24th in order to allow us time to prepare and publish a public hearing for the next MPO Technical Advisory Committee meeting, after which the projects would be forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval at their March 2010 meeting.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side there have been a couple of projects submitted that could possibly make the list, and the City of Grand Forks has a list of projects for the street side going through the process right now as well.

Benning reported that, for clarification, the NDDOT has contact the local jurisdictions, such as cities and counties, and have told them that we know another JOBS bills is coming through, so start putting together a list of potential projects, however they have not sent out an official request to the local entities, nor have they sent anything to out to the Counties or Cities either, as they have been told to wait on that for the time being. He said that once they have the okay to move forward, they will, but at this time they just alerted everyone that it may occur, and when given the okay, they will then send out letters to all the entities requesting projects be submitted. Haugen commented that the FTA has taken a similar stance, and are not officially requesting projects be submitted at this time either.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

Brooks asked what will happen if the official request is not given until after the February 24th deadline, will the MPO need to re-advertise. Haugen responded that they will have to see how long of a delay there is between February 24th and when the request is made, and if there is a considerable delay, they may have to re-advertise, but if it is only a few days they probably won't have to.

McKinnon commented that the big issue here is that projects will need to be ready to go, not something that is starting from scratch. He stated that they have some ready now, but it will be tough. Brooks asked if the potential projects could be included in the T.I.P. as illustrative projects. Haugen responded that the problem is that in order to include them as illustrative projects we would still need to go through an amendment process to include them in the T.I.P., so what we need to do is to create a list of projects that are ready to go, however if they aren't ready to be formally adopted by the MPO at their March meeting, then we will have to figure out whether or not we can wait until the April meeting, or arrange for a special one sometime in-between.

Information only.

MATTER OF STATUS OF RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen referred to Page 31, the staff report, and reported that a draft quiet zone report was sent out to staff people involved in the study asking for their review and comments, and he would appreciate it if anyone who has had a chance to review it would provide any comments they might have. He added that they have received a few. He stated that he had hoped to have this on the agenda today for approval of the final report, however, as noted in the staff report, there has been some cost estimates provided us by BNSF that are substantially higher than what the consultant had identified for some of the necessary improvements at various crossings. He explained that BNSF is trying to work within their bureaucracy of trying to determine exactly why their cost estimates were so much higher than SRF's, so we are working with them on this, however, in the meantime, until we get this figured out we were unable to move forward with the final report. Ellis asked if this same issue might affect the constant warning signal at 2nd in East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that he doesn't know the answer to that. He added that the area they are currently working on is that area out by the Amtrak station. He stated that all three of the crossings there have all the safety equipment required except for the constant warning signal and circuitry. He explained that when they met with BNSF, and all of those people who are part of the diagnostic team, the representative from BNSF did not say that any of the equipment needed to be updated, just that we needed to have the constant warning signal installed, so that is what SRF based their estimates on, as well as the addition of a couple of medians, but those would not be part of BNSF's cost estimating anyway.

Haugen reported that this information has been presented to the public, and to both City Councils, who have taken action on the report for the quiet zone portion, and we have also submitted some applications to the DOT for funding. Haugen stated that once this was done they formally engaged BNSF on the DeMers Avenue east crossings, and that is when BNSF came

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

back with their substantial augmentation of the cost estimates to try to get better equipment than is currently at these crossings.

Haugen commented that, initially, East Grand Forks was given an option of either closing one of their roadways, and getting improvements installed at the remaining crossings so that a quiet zone could be implemented sooner than later; or leaving it open and waiting until they can come up with the funds needed to install the required safety equipment at all three locations. He stated that just last evening, at their working session, the subject was brought up again, and the council is reconsidering closure of one of the crossings, so there might be a chance this could occur and a quiet zone could be implemented by 2011.

Haugen reported that they are working on the State Mill Spur study, and a public meeting has been scheduled for February 23rd. He explained that they will hold a neighborhood meeting, then a public open house, to discuss all of the crossings along the spur.

Haugen stated that just this month BNSF and North Dakota State Mill finally got their finances together, after which we engaged SRF to complete the 3rd component of the study, which is to specifically look at a possible closure of the Bacon Road crossing, and how it would impact the northern network.

Haugen reported that they will be scheduling a meeting with the property owners from the Bacon Road area on February 23rd, when SRF is in town. He stated that one thing they learned during their visits with BNSF and the State Mill is that a major reason for them wanting to look at closing the Bacon Road crossing is because there may be a possibility that the State Mill will begin having their grain brought in by 110 unit car trains, when currently 90% is being trucked in, and if that should occur it will impact the system quite a bit. He added that he has talked about this with Les Noehre, however he isn't sure if he has talked to the NDDOT to try to engage their Rail Division to do a subsequent study to see if there is some way we can work with BNSF and the State Mill to try to better accommodate 110 unit cars.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. NDDOT Traffic Counts

Haugen reported that he received communication from the NDDOT that they plan on doing traffic counts throughout Grand Forks this year. He said that they did provide a map of the locations being counted, so he would like Jane Williams to stop over and take a look at it.

Haugen asked if anyone knew when they might be doing the counts, would it be in the spring or the fall. Benning responded that it will probably be in the fall, and the reason he thinks that is because the main staff person is retiring at the end of April, so most likely the counts won't be done until after that, but he will check on it and let Earl know for sure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 10th, 2010**

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY EHRENSTROM, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY
10TH, 2010, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 1:20 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Executive Assistant

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 10th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer; Dean Rau, Grand Forks City Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT Planning-Bemidji; and Teri Kouba (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Randy Sandvig, NDDOT and Pete Geselichen, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 10TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY RAU, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 10TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

MATTER OF 2010-2013 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that there are three issues needing to be addressed, however, due to a communication problem the public hearing scheduled for today will now be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

Haugen commented that this means that we will not be able to act on two of the items we were contemplating acting on today; the JOBZ 2 Bill, or the second stimulus; and the Airport Road Reconstruction project.

Haugen reported that Congress has not yet acted on the JOBZ 2 Bill so we will not be able to act on the second stimulus package; and the FAA has not yet awarded the Airport Authority any funding for the Airport Road Reconstruction project, so we will not be amending that into the T.I.P. until after the funds have been awarded. He stated, however, that the one action we will try to handle today is awarding Cities Area Transit both JARC and New Freedom monies from Federal Transit.

Haugen explained that in our current T.I.P. the Cities Area Transit was programmed to receive \$201,500 in JARC funding, however they were actually awarded \$79,860; and they were programmed to receive \$60,600 in New Freedom funding, but will actually receive \$31,200. He stated that rather than do an amendment to the T.I.P. we will simply modify it to show the awards actually being programmed.

Haugen reported that the \$79,600 in JARC funds being awarded will cover 50% of the actual cost of operation of Route 12/13, which services the western portion of Grand Forks. He added that the \$31,200 in New Freedom funds will be used towards the purchase of new Response Demand Vehicles for the system.

Brooks asked, because you are only receiving half of the anticipated funding, will the service be cut at all. Haugen responded that the original solicitation was for two years of federal funds, and NDDOT is now only prepared to award one year at a time. He added that they haven't yet awarded the second year of funds, but we do anticipate receiving additional funding for the second year.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE MODIFICATION OF THE 2010-2013 T.I.P. TO SHOW ONE YEAR OF FUNDING FOR GRAND FORKS' CITIES AREA TRANSIT PROJECTS 3 AND 4.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen reported that in regard to JOBZ 2, or the second stimulus, we are extending the deadline for getting project applications/nominations to the MPO. He explained that the basic reason for this is because the Senate has not yet acted on the bill. He added that today the Senate will be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

acting on the possible extension of SAFETEA-LU to the end of this calendar year, which would mirror the action the House took last week. He stated that with that they would be fully appropriating the 2010 dollar amounts.

Information only.

MATTER OF TIMELINE FOR DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this is simply a status report letting you know that it is unlikely that we will be addressing the North Dakota T.I.P. in April. He explained that in most cases we would be adopting a Draft T.I.P. in April, but this year, for a variety of reasons, North Dakota will most likely not be prepared to have us take action in April, however, since Minnesota will be ready with theirs, we will be taking action to adopt their Draft T.I.P. in April, and the North Dakota Draft T.I.P. in May.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2012-2015 T.I.P. PROCESS

Haugen reported that this basically lays out the improvements we are making to the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. development process for North Dakota. He stated that they have been referencing this for the last year at our Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Executive Policy Board meetings, and you have seen some modifications in our last T.I.P. solicitation process where the MPO attached a one page questionnaire to the scoping worksheets on the North Dakota side.

Haugen stated that intent today is to just give this body an idea of where we are at with the different programs. He referred to the memorandum included in the packet, and pointed out that there are a myriad of federal programs for which, in the past, the primary solicitation has come from the NDDOT, but which will now primarily come from the MPO in the future. He added, however, that there are still some programs that we will still work on cooperatively with the NDDOT, and the other two MPOs, to determine how best to process them in the future. He commented that on the Minnesota side they haven't yet started much discussion on their programs, and how they are worked through the ATP process.

Haugen referred to Page 23 of the packet, and pointed out that it shows a timeline we are following for the implementation of the revised T.I.P. development process and procedures.

Haugen reported that another thing we have been working on is the scoring criteria we will be using to prioritize projects once they are submitted to the MPO. He explained that the three MPOs, along with central office staff from the NDDOT and Federal Highway, have been going through different ranking materials and different systems to try to develop a uniform ranking system for the prioritization of projects. He commented that there is a Federal Highway supported, national transportation evaluation system called TELUS, which is where the scoring sheets come from, and with that, one of the reasons we did this is was to try to get us all in tune

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

with the eight primary factors that SAFETEA-LU requires we consider when we plan and fund transportation improvements. He pointed out that in addition to the eight primary factors, we have also included a ninth factor, which allows us to include a more regional criteria as well.

Haugen pointed out that they created draft scoring sheets for the Local Urban Roads Program, the Regional Urban Roads Program, the Transportation Enhancements Program, the Safe Routes To School Program, and the Transit 5309 Program.

Haugen reported that for each of these factors they also created a different weighing system. He explained that they felt that some of the factors were more significant than others, so they were given a higher weight. He referred to the scoring sheets, and went over how the process will work.

Haugen commented that they are trying to set up meetings with the various agencies involved to try to go over how we think this draft can be improved. He said that they hope to get this finalized before we begin the next T.I.P. solicitation process in August.

Haugen referred to the map of the study area, and pointed out that it shows the two primary boundaries we deal with when we work with the federal programs. He stated that these are the Federal Urban Aid boundary and the MPO Study Area boundary, and they involve the rural type programs.

Haugen reported that the three MPOs and the NDDOT will be meeting on March 31st and April 1st to try further refine this process, and to determine how we are going to process some of the other federal programs as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2010 FLOOD COORDINATION

Haugen reminded everyone that back in 2007 we produced, by working with the Technical Advisory Committee and others, a Traffic Incident Bridge Closure Management Plan so, not only when we have flooding events, but anytime any bridge needs to be closed for whatever reason, we have a plan in place that coordinates both sides of the river as to what activities and notifications should be occurring. He added that they also identified that, since we have the likelihood each spring of having closures occur, we would include a reminder/refresher of the plan on our March Technical Advisory Committee agenda, and that is what we are doing today.

Haugen referred to Page 45 of the packet, and reported that last summer the Technical Advisory Committee worked through this document to ensure that when Table 2 and Table 3 are used they are reflecting the most reliable information we have available to us. He stated that the major revisions made to Table 2 were the last two bullet points: 1) Elevations for Action 2 activities may change due to weather, manpower, emergencies, and speed of rising river elevations; and 2) Action 2 River Elevation/Stage for the Kennedy Bridge will be increased by TWO (2) feet if

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

berms are placed on the Highway 2 on and off ramps. He referred to Page 46, Bridge Closure Contact List, and pointed out that the only change here was to add the number for the East Grand Forks Emergency Manager.

Haugen commented that earlier Nancy Ellis shared the information that the City of East Grand Forks is trying to arrange a meeting of most of those in attendance today to discuss flood coordination events for this flood fight.

Haugen reported that they did anticipate that if the Louis Murray, or the Red Lake River Bridge in East Grand Forks were to close for this flood event there would be a large increase in traffic out to the Mallory Bridge. He referred to Page 30 of the packet, and pointed out that the drawing illustrates some modifications that have been suggested for this area due to some of the concerns/issues we experienced during last year's flood event. He stated that since this drawing was created, however, Jane Williams did highlight some MUTCD changes that have occurred in 2009 that could allow for some different modifications as well, which he forwarded on to everyone involved. He added that Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer, also sent an e-mail indicating that Joe McKinnon, MNDOT, might bring some possible modifications as well.

McKinnon stated that one idea they had was, at the intersection of Polk County 72 and Trunk Highway 220, to put in a four-way stop, which would be in compliance with MUTCD requirements. Ellis commented that if they were to put in a four-way stop at that intersection, at 7:30 in the morning your going to have three hundred cars backed up there, so it probably wouldn't be the best alternative.

Brooks asked if, during the last flood, traffic counts were done or is that something that should be considered. Haugen responded that the issue of doing traffic counts was included in the staff report for discussion today. He explained, however, that the MPO's traffic counting equipment probably wouldn't work well for doing these counts as they need to be taped down to the roadway, and with the wet conditions we have at this time of year, it would be hard to get them to stay in place, so he has contacted the NDDOT to see about using some of their equipment if possible, but it didn't sound like they would be able to do so right now, so he will check with MNDOT and ATAC as well.

Brooks commented that he was aware that there were some traffic signal timing issues on Highway 2 in Grand Forks, which he is sure Jane Williams was notified about right away, but that should be addressed for the future as well. Ellis added that this was also an issue on the Minnesota side, particularly because the only person who knew how to adjust the timing of the signals was on vacation during that time, so it might be a good idea to make sure there is someone else that knows how to make those changes in the future.

Further discussion on traffic issues, and possible solutions, for the intersection of Polk County 72 and Trunk Highway 220 ensued. Haugen asked when Ms. Ellis would like to hear back from MNDOT and Polk County as to what they might be doing at this intersection. Ellis reported that Jane Williams has just come up with a suggestion that they will send back with Mr. McKinnon

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

for their review and consideration. She added that flood meetings are held every Monday, and while she understands that they may not be able to respond by this next Monday, the sooner they can respond the better. She stated that they should send their response to Rich Sanders, as he is in charge of the county road, and then to her so she can forward it to city officials as well.

Haugen commented that the last change made to the plan was the elimination of left turns on Gateway Drive, from the Kennedy Bridge to 3rd Street.

Haugen reported that they continue to maintain transit service to East Grand Forks, and the Point during flood events, and will do a similar job as they did last year once the bridges start closing. He stated that they primarily made the Point area a demand response area, and they had a downtown shuttle that connected the East Grand Forks routes to the Grand Forks transfer center.

Information only.

MATTER OF LAND USE PLAN SCOPES OF WORK

Haugen reported that we have programmed in the MPO Annual Unified Work Program, for both the latter part of 2010 and the first part of 2011, for the MPO to assist both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks with an update to their Land Use Plans. He stated that, essentially, these land use plans are important for two reasons: 1) they drive our future traffic demand model forecasting – where the cities plan to grow needs to be shown and reflected in our travel demand forecasting; and 2) we can assist each other in trying to make our transportation and land use patterns work together rather than against each other – to reflect that the Obama Administration has combined three major departments: housing, transportation, and environment protection.

Haugen stated that we have prepared two scope of works, one for East Grand Forks and one for Grand Forks. He explained that both are very similar in their overall concept, however each has their own planning process they follow. He pointed out that the East Grand Forks Scope of Work is located on Page 55 of the packet, and the Grand Forks Scope of Work is located on Page 61 of the packet.

Haugen commented that, as reflected in the staff report, with recent North Dakota legislation, and recent City of Grand Forks and Grand Forks County planning agreements, there are areas that are no longer under the control of the City of Grand Forks in terms of future land use. He stated that we will be visiting with the three major jurisdictions governing future land use in the area between the City of Grand Forks' extraterritorial and the MPO study boundary to ensure that we understand what their plans and land use are showing for future growth potential in those areas. He said that those three jurisdictions include: 1) the County for those areas south of US Highway 2; and 2) Falconer Township and 3) Rye Township for those areas north of US Highway 2.

Hanson stated that she did receive a couple of comments from Federal Highway, and she can forward that e-mail after the meeting, but she just wanted to note that Sara Altman from

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

MNDOT is reviewing the East Grand Forks plan in conjunction with Federal Highway, and they hope to have their comments submitted by next week. Haugen asked if their comments would be forward to Ms. Hanson, or to the MPO, and how will the bi-state MOU work. Hanson responded that her understanding is that the comments will be forwarded to herself, however they may be sent directly to the MPO and copied to them instead, either way would be fine.

Brooks asked if there was any indication in the e-mails that there would be a problem with the Technical Advisory Committee approving this be forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval. Hanson responded that the only comments they received from North Dakota Federal Highway is that they know that we will be updating our Long Range Transportation Plan soon. She said that a Land Use Plan update, separate from the Long Range Transportation Plan is okay as long as it is done with the goal of the Long Range Transportation Plan in mind, specifically in terms of it having the same planning end year, and reasonable time frames for the data so that it can be worked in to the Long Range Transportation Plan, and ultimately that it can become one document. She added that they also reminded us that we cannot use the PL funds or the DPG funding for local comprehensive or smart growth plans.

MOVED BY HANSON, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LAND USE PLAN SCOPES OF WORK, PENDING THE RESOLUTION OF ANY COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE NDDOT AND FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that there were a couple of meetings held in February concerning the State Mill Spur portion of the study, including a neighborhood meeting, and a meeting dealing specifically with the potential closure of Bacon Road.

Haugen stated that as a result of those meetings, we are now waiting for BNSF and the State Mill to figure out whether or not they will begin using a Unit Train service the State Mill. He explained that each Unit Train is over a mile long, and its basic intent is so that they don't have to be broken down into sub-unit trains at any point between origin and destination, which would mean there could be the potential that we could have over a mile of train slowly moving along the State Mill Spur to get to the mill.

Haugen commented that if it the State Mill decides to begin using Unit Trains, we will need to figure out how a 110 unit cars will be serviced at the mill. He explained that they are currently servicing about half that many cars, or about 50, which do cross Gateway Drive several times a day. He stated that the Unit Train, itself, would probably occur about once a week, arriving anytime within a twenty-four hour period, while there is currently only daytime service on the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

spur. He added that the Unit Train would be in addition to the current train operations that are occurring on the State Mill Spur, so it wouldn't mean less trains at all.

Haugen reported that in terms of Bacon Road itself, most of the discussion with the property owners was that if the Unit Trains came only once a week they could live with a once a week closure of Bacon Road, but they don't want to see it permanently closed.

Haugen stated that we are now waiting for BNSF to come up and do an on-site visit with all the different departments, and their engineers, to determine whether or not the State Mill itself can handle a Unit Train. He said that it is his understanding that this will occur sometime next week, so we may finally get some information at that time.

Haugen reported that in terms of the quiet-zone, we are still working with BNSF, and the Federal Railroad Division, to determine what improvements are necessary to quiet the three crossings out by the Amtrak station. He said that they were told that constant warning time is an issue at all three crossings, otherwise all other requirements are met, but just having to install constant warning time at all three crossings will increase the cost of making them quiet zone eligible considerably from what was originally thought.

Williams commented that during the meeting they had with the local business and property owners, the Grand Forks Fire Department was also in attendance and they expressed some very serious concerns about the additional delays, up to two minutes, the potential closure of Bacon Road and the possible use of a Unit Train would cause. Haugen stated that they also expressed some interest in ITS technology that they might be able to use to help them identify what is going on during train crossings in order for them to determine how to best route their emergency response vehicles. He added that if the State Mill does decide to use Unit Trains there is the potential that we may not have a crossing open along the entire spur, from 2nd Avenue North to Gateway Drive, and if the train moves slow enough they could be closed for some time. Williams agreed, adding that there is a potential it could close the State Highway for up to 20-minutes. Rau asked if they had looked at the possibility of installing tracks to the north. Haugen responded that they had, but what ends up happening is that you just shift the Gateway Drive closure over to 42nd Street instead. Brooks commented, however, that they could move double the speed on 42nd so that still might be better, as it would mean closing Gateway Drive for only 10 minutes instead of 20 minutes. Williams agreed, adding that 42nd is a faster track and there are less crossings. Haugen responded that that is true, but then we have the new drainage ditch on the north side to factor in, and we have the North 81 crossing, and then eventually the Gateway Drive crossing, and most of those roads have a higher volume of traffic than what the current mill crossing does.

Haugen reported that we do have the North Dakota Rail Division involved with this issue now, so hopefully they can help us determine our best alternatives. He said that we mainly need to know if the State Mill property itself, with some minor modifications, can handle a Unit Train on site or not. Rau added that there is also the concern that a Unit Train, if it is long enough, could close 27th Avenue as well, and the properties over there don't have any other access except over

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 10th, 2010**

to Mill Road because that bridge is out, so that is something else we need to take into account as well.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Merrifield Update

Haugen reported that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting comments were made about a 47th Avenue Interchange being a priority within the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that similar comments were made at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting the following week, and he thought that he should address the issue.

Haugen commented that he did include copies of that section of the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan that is relevant to this issue, and explained that the graphic shows the MPO's recommended projects, and their proposed timelines. He referred to the graphic and pointed out that 47th Avenue is labeled as an illustrative project, not only because it is non-fundable, but it was felt that there wasn't a need to actually have it constructed within the 2035 timeframe, so the action calls for corridor preservation for a future interchange down the road. He added that we will be doing a Long Range Transportation Plan Update next year, so all of these project will be revisited at that time.

Information only.

2. Invitation To Public Meetings

Haugen referred to Page 71 and stated that the North Dakota Department of Transportation, in conjunction with Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute (UGPTI) will be hosing a series of meetings across the state concerning the levels of service North Dakota's state highways and local roads should provide. He pointed out that there will be one held in Grand Forks on April 9th at the Ramada Inn. He stated that they do ask that you pre-register by March 26th if you are going to attend.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 10TH, 2010,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:45 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the April 14th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Paul Benning (Proxy for Stacey Hanson), NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Grand Forks City Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT Planning-Bemidji; Richard Onstad, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Sara Aultman, MNDOT-St. Paul; and Kent Leben, NDDOT- Bismarck and Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-ND (Via Conference Call).

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 10TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ONSTAD, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 10TH,
2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010**

MATTER OF DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. - MINNESOTA

Haugen referred to the staff report included in the packets, and pointed out that it identifies that we are approving the Draft 2011-2014 Minnesota T.I.P. today, however, because North Dakota did not have a Draft T.I.P. prepared we will be approving theirs in May.

Haugen commented that he does have a couple of updates concerning the proposed T.I.P., the first being that the Grand Forks Airport has still not yet received confirmation on funding for the Airport Road reconstruction project, so that project is not ready to be amendment into our current T.I.P.; and, as most of your are already aware, the second stimulus has not been passed by Congress yet, so any action on projects relying on stimulus funds are on hold as well.

Haugen stated, however, that we do have to take action on the Draft Minnesota T.I.P. today. He explained that staff did work closely with the District Office, and the ATP to ensure that the projects we have listed in our T.I.P. are consistent with those listed in the S.T.I.P., and a public hearing notice was published indicating that a public hearing would be held at today's meeting. He added that the notice also identified that written comments could be submitted until noon today, none were received. He opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion so the public hearing was closed.

Haugen referred to the project tables, and pointed out that there are a total of 22 projects programmed on the Minnesota Side between 2011 and 2014, as well as one illustrative project for a new street connecting to the sugar beet plant from the north, for which the City of East Grand Forks has requested an earmark. He stated that approximately \$13,700,000 worth of work will be accomplished during this four year period.

Haugen reported that in the past our draft documents have included only a basic resolution identifying that it is an approval of the draft document, a short introduction, and the project listings themselves; and then when we get to the final document we include more appendices, more descriptions of the funding sources, and other information; therefore, at this time our draft only shows the individual projects prioritized by year, and their funding sources.

Rau referred to the project tables, and stated that he did find a few errors that need to be addressed: 1) There is no Project 9 listed – it jumps from Project 8 to Project 10; 2) Project description for Project 17 states: “Construct a multi-purpose rail...” – should state: “Construct a multi-purpose trail...”; 3) Project description for Project 21 states: “Projects begins...” – should state: “Project begins...”.

Ellis pointed out that the project description for Project 8 states: “Inslattation of...” – should state: “Installation of...” instead.

McKinnon pointed out that the remarks section for Project 21 states that it will be constructed in 2012 but payment will be in 2013. He said that that should actually state that the project will be constructed in 2013 but payment will be in 2014 instead.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010**

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY RAU, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE OF THE DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. SUBJECT TO CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that, as the staff report indicated, the MPO received a request from the City of Grand Forks to amend the functional classification map. He said that as a result of that request, some additional items needing to be addressed for both North Dakota and Minnesota, were discovered as well.

Haugen referred to a power point slide presentation, and went over it (a copy of which is included in the file, and available upon request).

Presentation ensued, with Mr. Haugen giving a brief history on the development of Functional Classification.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side, a request was made to add 20th Avenue South and South 48th Street, both of which will be constructed by the end of 2011, and both of which will receive federal aid. He added that South 48th Street has been a future functionally classified street for some time, however 20th Avenue South has not, and will be a new addition to the system.

Haugen reported that while looking into this request staff noted some other issues with the functional classification map that need to be addressed. He explained that our ramp systems are not classified; that there are some non-existing streets being shown as existing classified streets; and some inconsistencies between what the State has mapped and what we have mapped.

Haugen referred to a slide of the 2006 Functional Classification Map for Grand Forks, and explained that back in 2003, when the update was performed, signatures for the MPO, Federal Highway, and the NDDOT were added to ensure that all three entities were using the most up-to-date map, and were consistent with our functional class system. He stated, however, that in looking at the map on the NDDOT website, you will notice that their freeway ramps are classified, as are the ramps on the DeMers overpass, where on ours they are not. He added that the only ramps that we are consistent on are those on Columbia Road, which are not classified on either map.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the various inconsistencies between NDDOT's map, Grand Forks County's map, and ours, and went over them briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010**

Haugen commented that they found an inconsistency between the NDDOT map and ours along North 81 as well. He stated that a possible reason for this is that, although the maps are consistent in terms of the urban aid boundary, the graphic in the center shows that back in 2002 the urban aid boundary was reduced along Highway 81, from a mile north to 27th Avenue. He said that they will look into this more during the next month to determine which map is the more accurate. He reported that he also met with Richard Onstad yesterday to make sure that we understand what the County has classified, and did find some inconsistencies there as well, so we will continue to work on this to ensure that all these inconsistencies are addressed.

Haugen reported that one of the results of updating the functional classification map is that we will also need to look at our urban roads map to ensure it is consistent with the functional classification map as well. He reported that there are some areas that do need to be updated, including the addition of South 48th Street and 20th Avenue South, the ramps on Columbia Road and the DeMers Overpass, a short segment of roadway that is not already classified on 27th Avenue North, etc.. He commented that urban roads would be North Dakota's identification for federal aid eligibility.

Haugen stated that down in the southern portion of Grand Forks, the urban aid boundary is the very southern line on the map, and it shows that the roadways in that area are eligible for the Federal Urban Road Program, however, Belmont Road, as it extends south, is not, which is one of the quirky areas that isn't in the city limits, that it is a county highway, but it is inside the urban aid boundary so it doesn't show up in the County's Major Collector System. He added that another roadway that is in a similar situation is DeMers Avenue from 55th to 69th as well.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, again, we began the process of updating the functional classification system in 2003 and submitted our information to MNDOT at that time, however they wanted to delay taking action until they were able to complete a statewide update in 2005. He said that we just received notification from MNDOT that they received approval from Federal Highway in March 2010. He commented that he then went on-line to see what they were showing for their functional classification system, and did find some inconsistencies that will need to be resolved. He stated that Teri has already had some conversations with Theresa Chapman about this issue.

Haugen stated that we will continue to work with the appropriate staff from both sides of the river throughout the remainder of April so that we can have something available for approval from the MPO Executive Policy Board at their May meeting.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that, as you are aware, we have three different components to this study. He pointed out that he did include some meeting summaries in the packets, including some committee meetings and public input meetings that were held on various portions of the study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010**

Haugen stated that the first portion focused on the Bacon Road Closure issue; the second on the State Mill Spur; and the third on the Quiet Zone.

Haugen commented that there really isn't much information included concerning the quiet zone issue. He explained that they still have an issue with BNSF concerning the cost of upgrading the three crossings out by the Amtrak Station on DeMers Avenue, west of the interstate and 55th Street. He said that we were first under the impression that we needed to install a constant warning time signal at each of the three crossing to make them eligible for quiet zone status, but BNSF then told us that we needed complete upgrades at all three crossings, increasing our cost from \$30,000 to close to \$150,000 per crossing. He stated that they have been working with the Federal Railroad, and they have agreed to meet with BNSF and us out at the three crossings to do a field review to see what shape the existing equipment really is in.

Brooks asked if Federal Railroad has the final say on whether or not the additional upgrades are necessary. Haugen responded that they so have final say on whether or not these additional upgrades are "reasonable" or not.

Haugen reported that in terms of the Bacon Road Closure portion of the study, one of the big issues that we have been dealing with involves the possibility of the State Mill using a Unit Train.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that he did include a summary from a meeting held with stakeholders, business owners, property owners, representatives from the State Mill, emergency responders, representatives from BNSF, MPO staff, City staff, and staff from the consulting firm, SRF.

Haugen reported that discussion was held at that meeting to try to determine how a unit train would be able to be accommodated on the State Mill property. He stated that as a result of that discussion, two items of importance were brought to light; one was the fact that we need to use an estimated length of 7,000 feet when talking about a unit train, and the second was that we need to have 8,000 linear feet of track available on site to accommodate a unit train as well, therefore the State Mill, and BNSF have to try to figure out if there is room for an 8,000 foot long pad on site to accomplish this, and it didn't appear that BNSF was very confident that they could provide this much track on site.

Haugen stated that one major question coming out of this discussion was how will all the State Mill Spur crossings be impacted if the State Mill does begin using Unit Trains. He referred to the last memorandum included in the packet, and went over the information briefly.

Haugen reported that he also included summaries from the neighborhood meetings we had on the State Mill Spur portion of the study. He stated that the stakeholders didn't seem to have too much of a concern with the plans we have for each of the crossings along the spur, with the exception of the area at 4th Avenue, between University Avenue and 4th Street. He explained that there is also an alley crossing in that area as well, and we established that that is also a public crossing and thus needs to be treated as we would a street crossing in order to improve safety.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010**

He said that they had initially thought they would like to close the 4th Avenue North crossings, but keep the alley entrance open, but the business owner, Dick Walsh Construction, expressed his wishes that they both remain open, but if either were closed he would prefer that it be the alley crossing instead. He stated that they would show the two alternatives, closing the 4th Avenue crossing and keeping the alley crossing open, and closing the alley crossing and keeping the 4th Avenue crossing open, at the next meeting for discussion.

Haugen commented that this is basically the status of the Railroad Crossing Study. He explained that in terms of the quiet zone portion they are waiting to hear the results of the BNSF/Federal Railroad meeting in May; and in terms of the Bacon Road Closure portion they are waiting to hear from BNSF as to whether or not they can accommodate a Unit Train. He stated that one other thing was that they had initially thought that the 27th Avenue North crossing could remain open, but 8,000 feet would take us past 27th Avenue North, so it would have to close as well. He added that the State Mill Spur portion of the study is really contingent on whether or not the State Mill begins using Unit Trains or not.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Livability/Sustainability Document Distributed

Hickman reported that she just wanted to let everyone know that there is a document out there about livability and sustainability, which lists most of the programs available. She stated that this is a DOT/HUD/ETA partnership, and includes several of the different funding programs and grants available from all three agencies.

Hickman commented that there is a very big interest from the national level in livability/sustainability, and this document is just a list of the programs that would be eligible for those kinds of activities.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY MCKINNON, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 14TH,
2010, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:07 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the May 12th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT Planning-Bemidji; Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Sara Aultman, MNDOT-St. Paul; Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-North Dakota; Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer; Brady Mallroy, WDAZ; and Susan Moe, FHWA-Minnesota (Via Conference Call).

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 14TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 14TH, 2010,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

MATTER OF DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. – NORTH DAKOTA

Haugen commented that, as you will recall, we adopted a Draft T.I.P. for Minnesota at our meeting last month, and anticipated doing the same for North Dakota this month, however we will not be able to do that at this time, but hope that we will be able to do so at our June meeting.

Hanson reported that the final projects went out of their office this past Friday, so all the jurisdictions should know which projects were able to be funded, and they should be able to move forward with the Draft T.I.P..

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that the last sentence reports that we are still waiting to hear from FAA concerning the funding for the Airport Road reconstruction project, therefore, we are unable to amend that project into our T.I.P. at this time either.

Haugen commented that the information following the staff report should have accompanied Agenda Item X, therefore we will be referring to it when we get to that agenda item later in the meeting.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE TO THE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Haugen reported that, as the staff report indicates, discussion was held at our April meeting concerning some discrepancies that were found with our current Functional Classification Map for the cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He explained that staff has been working with State, County, and City staff to work out these inconsistencies, and a new map, illustrating the necessary changes for the North Dakota side, was included in the packets.

Kouba stated that, basically, due to a request from the City of Grand Forks, they have included two new roadways on the functional class system. She pointed out that they added the 48th extension from 32nd to 17th as a minor arterial, and 20th Avenue from Columbia Road to 20th Street South as a collector.

Kouba referred to a table, included in the packet, and pointed out that with these additions, as well as the addition of the ramps on Interstate 29, and the overpass ramps on Columbia Road and DeMers Avenue, both the percentages and the number of miles have increased slightly.

Kouba commented that, basically we have increased some of our mileage, and, although we have still managed to stay within the percentages, we are still below on the local and a little over in the collectors and the principle arterials.

Hickman asked if this has been discussed and coordinated with the district and central office for the NDDOT. Haugen responded that we highlighted the changes being proposed at our last

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

Technical Advisory Committee, so they were coordinated at that time. He added that the request to add 20th Avenue, and changing South 48th Street from a future to an existing functionally classified roadway, was made by the City of Grand Forks.

Kouba stated that they are basically asking for approval of the new functionally classified map for the City of Grand Forks, so that it can be sent to the NDDOT for their approval as well.

Haugen commented that there was one additional change made to the map. He explained that the State's map shows North Washington Street, or North 81 as being a minor arterial and ours showed it as a minor collector, so we changed our map to correspond with the State's classification. He added that the area included in the change is that portion of North Washington, or North 81, from 27th Avenue North to the intersection of I-29 and North Washington. Williams asked if this affected the mileage. Haugen responded that some of the minor arterial mileage did increase with this change.

Williams referred to the map, and commented that there are some additional minor changes that need to be made, none, however, that would affect mileage or percentage, mostly just labeling changes, that she would like to work with Teri on.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP FOR GRAND FORKS, SUBJECT TO MINOR LABELING CHANGES.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Aultman gave a brief update on proposed changes to the Minnesota Functional Classification map. She stated that there are some additional roadways that MNDOT would like to see classified as principal arterials, and added that they did touch base with Joe McKinnon, District Office, regarding this.

Aultman reported that they looked at the ADT, specifically existing roadways that are already classified as principal arterials, to see how they fit within the federal guidelines that suggest that we have 5 to 10 percent of our mileage classified as principal arterials, and they concluded that they should make Bygland Road a principal arterial as well. She added that they also decided that the other roads that are being proposed be made principal arterials should wait for reclassification as they don't believe that with the current ADT they would be justified. Haugen pointed out that Teri has already made these proposed changes to the map being shown on the screen.

Aultman stated that a finalized map should be available for the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SIGNAL COORDINATION STUDY

Haugen reported that last fall they presented the Columbia Road Corridor results; and the upgraded signal equipment and timing plans were implemented along that corridor as well. He said that, initially they had hoped to have installed the upgraded equipment and timing plans on the Washington and Gateway Drive corridors by now as well, but part of the funding for this was to come from a stimulus grant out the Department of Energy, and because it took longer to access those monies, this has not yet taken place. Williams added that the equipment for those corridors has not yet been purchased. Haugen stated, then, that the upgrades and timing plans for those two corridors will most likely not be installed until this fall. He added that initially we had hoped to have the Washington and Gateway corridors done in the spring, and then have the DeMers and 42nd Street corridors done in the fall, but it now appears that all four will be implemented in the fall instead.

Haugen stated that they are also upgrading the signal for the transit system as well. He said that they currently have some pre-emption that could occur, but they are going to upgrade it. He added that part of the consultant's job is to help us integrate the transit priority into the signal coordination system.

Bergman reported that all the transit equipment has been purchased, and has been installed in the vehicles, however they are now just waiting for the intersection equipment to be installed as well. He said it is his understanding that this will begin on Monday.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that, as you are aware, we have three different components to this study. He referred to the staff report, and stated that he would like to begin with the quiet zone portion of the study first.

Haugen commented that little has changed in regard to the amount of progress made with this portion of the study. He stated that they are essentially in the same position they were last month, however that should change once BNSF staff meets with Federal Railroad and City staff next week concerning what kind of equipment upgrade is truly necessary in order for the three crossings out by Amtrak to be eligible for quiet zone status. He explained that there is a discrepancy between what BNSF feels is necessary for these three crossings to be eligible for quiet zone status, and what the consultant feels is necessary for these three crossings to be eligible for quiet zone status, so Federal Railroad will be doing a peer review to help determine which entity is correct.

Haugen reported that, in regard to the State Mill Spur portion of the study, they are in the process of drafting a report, and are trying to arrange public input meetings the first week of June.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

Haugen reported that in terms of the Bacon Road Closure portion of the study, the issue of the State Mill possibly using a Unit Train has been our greatest concern. He stated that they have been waiting for official word from the division of BNSF that addresses the Unit Train landing facilities, and their analysis as to what can occur up on the State Mill property as to whether or not they can accommodate a Unit Train. He pointed out that if a Unit Train is capable of being accommodated on the State Mill property, this would impact the entire study considerably.

Haugen commented that they are going to try to hold a meeting with the property owners adjacent to Bacon Road as BNSF and the State Mill would still like us to consider closing Bacon Road regardless of whether or not they use a Unit Train, so we need to get input from the property owners as to how they would feel about closing Bacon Road.

Haugen explained that the major issue with closing Bacon Road is the fact that there are three sets of tracks crossing at that location, and all three sets are used to maneuver cars in and out of their flour facility. He added that with it being a public crossing, there is also a requirement that there be a 250-foot site distance clearance on either side of a crossing, which would result in the loss of about a dozen cars that could be cued into their loading facility, so they are hoping that they can ease their operation by making Bacon Road something other than a public crossing.

Haugen stated that the first meeting with the property owners focused on the impact the proposed Unit Train would have to the City of Grand Forks, and the next meeting will focus on the impact closing Bacon Road, regardless of whether or not a Unit Train is used, would have on the City as well.

Haugen commented that the State Mill had expected an answer on whether or not it is possible to accommodate a Unit Train, but BNSF has not yet given their recommendation at this time.

Williams asked if BNSF has said whether or not they would need to lay all new track. Haugen responded they would. He explained that they need to land 8,000 feet of train, and that 8,000 feet of train cannot impede on the current operations. Williams asked, then, if they would be laying the track side-by-side. Haugen responded that that was one option they looked at, however they were more convinced that looping it around would be better than a straight linear line along Mill Road. He pointed out that you not only run into 27th Avenue, but also into the English Coulee as well when trying to accommodate 8,000 feet of train.

Information only.

MATTER OF NEW T.I.P. PROCESS

Haugen referred to information included in the packet, and gave a brief power point presentation.

Haugen stated that as they move forward with this they are trying to identify, and get a better handle on the current process used for the area between the Federal Urban Aid Boundary and the MPO Study Area. He commented that there are three funding programs he is trying to get

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

information/clarification on; 1) County Roads, 2) Rural Off-System Access Development, and 3) Bridge (on and off system). He explained that they have already submitted ranking and scoring sheets for the area shown in dark gray, and as they move out they run into some programs that they are not very familiar with, so that is what they are trying to identify.

Haugen reported that in terms of the County Road program, he is trying to even some things out from the S.T.I.P. document, just some basic information that shows how much is or was distributed in 2013. He stated that there is a formula used that allows for funds to only be spent on the County Major Collector Road System. He pointed out that according to the S.T.I.P. document, on November 13th there is some sort of three year program of projects being submitted to Federal Highway, and he is just wondering if this is something new, or in addition to our normal MPO T.I.P. timing process.

Haugen commented that in identifying the County Major Collector System, the next few maps in the power point highlight some areas for which we would like to have clarification on what can be spent and where. He referred to the maps and pointed out that one area in question is that area between Belmont Road and 62nd Avenue South, which is part of the Grand Forks County Road system, but is also within the Federal Urban Aid Boundary, and therefore not classified as a County Major Collector, which in turn makes it ineligible for federal aid on the County Roads Program. He added that this area is also not part of the City Street System, but is eligible for Urban Roads Program funds.

Haugen stated that one of the questions he has asked NDDOT is whether or not we can seek County Roads Program funds for those areas within the Urban Aid Boundary. Hanson responded that you can spend your urban dollars outside the city limits, but you have to stay within the urban aid boundary. Haugen commented that this is different than what they have been told in the past, explaining that during discussions regarding the Merrifield Road Bridge/Interchange Project, they were told that urban aid could be spent on that facility. Lang asked if that was because it is located within the Urban Aid Boundary. Haugen responded that Merrifield is not within the Urban Aid Boundary, but it is within the MPO Study area.

Haugen referred to a map, and pointed out that Merrifield Road is located on the County Major Collector System. He stated that the study area goes out to 62nd. He added that it is a county highway, just as Belmont is a county highway once we get past the city limit line.

Haugen stated that his question involves county roads that are not part of the city, but are within the Urban Aid Boundary, and whether or not they are eligible for county federal aid. Hanson responded that they have to be classified on the County Major Collector System to be eligible for county funds, however, if it were an off-system bridge it would be eligible for bridge funds, but the roadway itself would have to be a County Major Collector to be eligible for county funds. Haugen said, then, that because these roadways are in the Urban Aid Boundary they won't be classified as County Major Collectors. Hanson responded that that is correct, and explained that they can't classify them as County Major Collectors if they are in the Urban Aid Boundary, and that is something that has recently been asked of the DOT, and they verified that with Federal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

Highway. Haugen asked if they could offer a suggestion that they do as is done on the urban side where they don't use strict functional class, but instead use a simile of functional class to identify things like Urban Roads or Regional Primary or Regional Secondary, so that on the county side we could identify, perhaps, some county roads as something such as Urban County Major Collector Program, which is a funding program, not a functional class. Hickman responded that it is a funding program based on functional class. Haugen stated that they are functionally classified as minor arterials. Hanson responded that they are eligible for urban funds, and urban funds can be used, and if it is a county road the county would just have to pay the match, and as an MPO that is something that needs to be worked out with our jurisdictions.

Haugen referred to a slide of South Columbia Road that shows a one-mile stretch of roadway that is not classified as a County Major Collector, and is therefore not eligible for the County Roads Program. He stated that he has had discussions with the County Engineer about having this stretch of roadway included on the County Major system, and he encouraged him to approach the County Board to see if they would approve this and submit it to the DOT. He asked if this would be the only way to make this stretch of roadway eligible for federal aid. Hanson responded that that would be correct.

Haugen referred to the next slide, and commented that it shows a section of roadway on North 81. He pointed out that if you look at the County Major Collection System map, the area he identified on North 81, you would assume it is a County Major Collector, so he is wondering if it is a mapping error. Lang asked how he arrived at this deduction. Haugen responded that it is the color of the roadway on the map that gives that impression. He pointed out that all other State Highways are shown with a different color, this is the only State Highway shown in this color. Hanson responded that she would have to verify this with their Roadway Data people back in the Central Office. Lang commented that it would be his guess that it is a mapping error.

Haugen commented that there is a program called "The North Dakota Road Program" in the S.T.I.P. document. He said that he did e-mail these questions to Stacey Hanson, who has been busy and unable to reply yet, but annually the S.T.I.P. says that they solicit to the counties, projects that could be federally funded with this North Dakota Road Program, so he is just wondering if there is an application available to apply for these funds, and can it only be used on, getting back to Belmont, and 62nd in particular, is this an avenue that we could use to get some additional revenue sources into the Urban Aid Boundary. Hanson responded that she did do some checking on this, but it does appear that they do accept applications so there must be a form available, and she will try to get him a copy of it. She added that the funds can be used on county roads, but she doesn't know if it has to be a CMC or just a county road, so she will need to get clarification on that.

Haugen reported that in terms of the Bridge Program, there are on-system and off-system bridges, and there are some conflicting terms, or conflicting information on the local government manual versus what is in the S.T.I.P., and he is wondering if the 50/50 split of funds, with 50% to the State and 50% to the Counties, means that 50% is spent on on-system bridges and 50% on off-system bridges, and does it vary year to year. Hanson responded that 50% basically goes to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

State bridges and 50% is for County bridges. She explained that the 50% that goes to the County bridges is split up for on-system and off-system County bridges, and the 50% that goes to the State also includes, or takes care of any City bridges that are submitted for the bridge program, so the City portion comes out of the State's share, not the County's share.

Haugen asked if there was any good literature available on the bridge program, explaining how it is split out. Hanson responded that the information that they typically refer to comes out of the local government manual, but she can visit with both Planning and Bridge personnel to see if there is any other documentation available. She added that other information that might be helpful is, to be eligible for bridge replacement you have to have a sufficiency rating less than or equal to 50 from your bridge inspection, plus you must also be either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete, and then in order to eligible for rehabilitation you need to have a sufficiency rating greater than 50 or less than or equal to 80.

Haugen asked if Federal Urban Aid Boundary impacts whether it is on-system or off-system eligible. Hanson responded that on-system is basically any of the federal aid routes, so if you have a county bridge that is on a CMC route, it would be an on-system bridge; and if you have a city bridge that is on the urban roads system that would be an on-system bridge; and anything on the highway system is a on-system bridge. Haugen commented that Dean Rau was able to provide him with the 2-year inspection cycle for bridges in the Urban Aid Boundary. He asked why none of the State bridges, including the Kennedy, Sorlie, etc., were included on this document, and is there a third document that shows only the State bridges. Hanson commented that it is good to know that those bridges were not included on the list. She said that the list is generated by their Bridge Division, so she will visit with them to make sure that those bridges are included on the City's list, but she thinks that when they split it out it comes out to ownership, and the City probably only gets a list of bridges they own and have to maintain, and the State gets the list of any bridges on a State or U.S. Highway.

Haugen reported that in the S.T.I.P. document they talk about how the off-system bridges are selected, and he is wondering, again, if there is any type of application because it does talk about some of the justifications like traffic volume, safety factors, vehicle use, whether it is on a bus route, mail route, school route, etc., and is there some way the County identifies the justification for these bridges. Hanson responded that that is something she would need to talk to their County Managers about, but she doesn't think there is an application, that it is simply based on historical practice that when the counties get their bridge list they monitor them and they know which ones are eligible for projects.

Haugen stated that the next couple of slides just show the functionally obsolete and structurally deficient bridges statewide. He pointed out that he did blow up a portion of the map that indicates areas that might be the areas covered in our study area. He went over them briefly.

Haugen commented, again, that he did meet with the Grand Forks County Engineer, and provided a draft scoring and ranking sheet for the County Road Program, however there are still

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

a lot of questions that need to be answered before it is presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, hopefully in June, but certainly by July.

Information only

MATTER OF FHWA'S PENDING POLICY CHANGE REGARDING NEPA & FISCAL CONSTRAINT

Haugen stated that this is probably not a pending policy change from Federal Highway, and it is more of a Minnesota issue, so Sara Aultman agreed to give a brief overview.

Aultman reported that Federal Highway passed a policy back in 2008 to help clarify NEPA, in that if you are going to have any kind of scoping document for a project, part of that project needs to be fiscally constrained. She explained that the issue they are having in St. Cloud is that, for whatever reason, they were not aware of the 2008 policy so their projects are not fiscally constrained. She stated that they submitted some of their scoping documents to FHWA about a year ago, and they have been kind of lingering in the office, and they thought it was actually a pending policy, so FHWA is now trying to figure out what to do with these documents.

Haugen commented that his only concern is actually on the North Dakota side, in that the City was processing a PCR for the 42nd Street Underpass, which is not in either our T.I.P. or the S.T.I.P., and will this fiscal constrained issue hold that up at all. Hickman responded that it has the potential to be held up, but she isn't as familiar with that as she is with some other things that are going on. Hanson asked if that document is on hold at this time, and does the City intend to move forward with it. Rau responded that it isn't a final PCR at this time, but they are working on it. Hanson stated, then, that there is always the potential for that project to be a City funded project because it isn't in their current federal programming.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update From FHWA

None.

2. Update From MNDOT

Aultman reported that on the Minnesota side there is a Complete Streets Bill in the Legislature. She stated that it has passed the House, and there is a lot of interest there, so as that progresses she will share the information with the MPO and NDDOT.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 12th, 2010**

3. Update From NDDOT

Hanson reported that North Dakota Cities and Counties would have received, within the last couple of weeks, an e-mail from the DOT regarding Title VI, just as a good reminder of it's requirements and program efforts with respect to federal aid. She added that subsequent to that e-mail, a second e-mail went out notifying those jurisdictions of upcoming advisory group meetings that will be held in various locations across the state so that Cities and Counties, in their own Title VI efforts can attend these meetings and get to know the Advisory Groups that are in their local area.

Haugen commented that the MPO also received a letter from the DOT about Title VI, with a survey attached to it. Hanson stated that that would have come from their Civil Rights Office. She added that their Local Government Office, through the Civil Rights Office, was asked to basically get this same letter information and attachments out to the County Auditors and City Engineers as well, in order that the locals would receive information concerning the advisory group meetings that are being held as well.

Hanson reported that a big statewide wrap-up meeting will be held on May 17th. She explained that this is the final meeting in a series of meetings held across the state to get public input on the levels of service that roadways should be providing. She added that they will also be discussion transit issues as well. Haugen asked if there would be any availability of the materials on the web prior to, or soon after that meeting for those that can't make the trip. Hanson responded that that is a good question, and although she isn't working on this project she will check with those in charge, as she feels that it would be a good idea.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 12TH, 2010,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:25 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 9th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit, Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 12TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE THE MAY 12TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2010-2013 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the staff report, included in the packets, identifies the amendments that need to be made to the 2010-2013 T.I.P.. He added that a copy of the public hearing notice was also included, and indicated that the public had until noon today to submit comments as well, however none were received.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion. Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen then referred to slides of the T.I.P. project tables, and went briefly over the proposed amendments as follows:

Grand Forks Project #11: This amendment involves 5309 Grant Monies for FY 2009 that the City of Grand Forks will be using to purchase automatic vehicle locators (AVL) for its fixed route and dial-a-ride vehicles that are out in service; for the filling in of a service pit in the bus barn; and for the purchase of some non-revenue service vehicles. The total cost of this project is \$286,000, with \$229,000 being covered by the FTA 5309 Grant, and the remaining \$57,000 being covered with local monies.

Grand Forks Project #16: This amendment involves a modification to the current project, to update our traffic signals in order to be able to install coordination timing plans, and also get a transit signal priority system installed as well. The modification involves the addition of two more signal locations to the roughly 20 locations already identified. The staff report notes that this modification will increase the cost of the project by \$93,000, with \$78,000 of that being paid with federal dollars, and \$15,000 with local dollars.

Haugen commented that these are funds that have already been awarded to CAT, and the projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and are fiscally constrained, therefore, staff is recommending that we forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the amendments to the 2010-2013 T.I.P. as presented.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY2010-2013 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Williams asked if amendments would be necessary to the T.I.P. should additional funding be made available for Safe Routes To School projects. Haugen suggested that this question should be addressed when discussing Agenda Item VII.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

MATTER OF MODIFICATION TO DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. – MINNESOTA

Ellis reported that the City of East Grand Forks has received transportation enhancement funding from the State for two, well actually three projects that are currently included in the T.I.P.. She stated that one of those projects, a 2011 T.I.P. project, involves the construction of a bikepath from 5th Street N.W. to connect with the bikepath at 8th Street N.W.. She explained, however, that a problem arose when another T.I.P. project, a full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W., which was being funded using City Sub-Target funds, was pushed back to 2014, thereby causing a problem with the installation of the proposed bikepath until that project is completed. She stated that because of this they are asking for approval to submit a request to the ATP to move the 2012 T.I.P. project, which is a continuation of sidewalks along Central Avenue, and across 2nd improving the pedestrian islands up to 14th, to 2011, and the 2011 T.I.P. project back to 2012.

Ellis commented that in terms of the cost of making this change, there would be a difference of about \$10,000 to the City's share. Haugen added that they discussed this with MNDOT staff, and they seemed okay with the change.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO THE DRAFT 2011-2014 MINNESOTA T.I.P.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. – NORTH DAKOTA

Haugen reported that he did include a copy of the Draft 2011-2014 T.I.P., which was available both on the MPO website, as well as a hard copy in both the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks offices for public input; however, because some changes were required, and an updated version has just been distributed.

Sanders reported present.

Haugen referred to the updated document, and went over the changes as follows:

- 1) Page 3 – Changed “Minnesota Department of Transportation” to “North Dakota Department of Transportation”.
- 2) Page 4 – Changed “Minnesota Side” to “North Dakota Side”.
- 3) Grand Forks Project #5 – Transit project seeking New Freedom Funds. The project description has been changed to identify that one demand response vehicle will be purchased instead of “some” vehicles.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

- 4) Grand Forks Project #9 – There used to be some operational improvements on I-29 listed, but that has been completely eliminated and in its place it indicates that two Dynamic Message signs will be installed along I-29, essentially near 32nd Avenue and Gateway Drive. The cost of each sign is \$175,000, for a total project cost of \$350,000, and it will be funded with an 80/20 match, with the 20% being funded by the State of North Dakota.
- 5) Grand Forks Project #14 – Previously there was no Project #14, it was intentionally left blank, but now a project has been programmed, to install a Dynamic Message sign on U.S. #2 west of I-29. The cost for this sign is \$112,000, with 80% being funded with federal dollars, and 20% being funded with state dollars.
- 6) Grand Forks Project #19 – Downtown Traffic Signal Upgrades. Change involves a more descriptive project description, with no change to the cost of the project.
- 7) Grand Forks Project #27 – This project was previously Grand Forks Project #35, but it has been identified that this project's funding will occur in 2013 rather than in 2014, so it was moved up. The project is being funded through the safety program, and involves new pedestrian countdowns at a couple of intersections in Grand Forks.

Haugen asked for clarification on whether the Draft S.T.I.P. is correct in that the local match for this project is being funded by the State of North Dakota, or should it be the City of Grand Forks. Hanson responded that she would double check on this, but that it is her belief that Washington would have a State and City match, and Columbia a State match. Lang stated that he would agree with this.

Williams stated that she has a question on one of the e-mails she received yesterday, in that it reported that some of the other jurisdictions were taking their money and buying as many pedestrian heads as they could and then installing them themselves, is that correct. Hanson responded that that is correct. Williams said, then, that it appears that Grand Forks may be able to use these on Columbia, Washington, 32nd, and Gateway, as they are all State Highways, correct. Hanson responded that you will need to go through traffic operations with the safety program and they would have to approve that. Williams asked, however, if it would be a possibility if approved, and if so, how would they amend it in. Hanson responded that they would have to work with traffic operations on this.

Haugen clarified that this is an HSIP request that the City of Grand Forks sent directly to the State, with a request for \$198,000, to do pedestrian count downs. He stated that they are being awarded \$30,000 of the requested amount, so there is still the issue of who pays for the local match, otherwise everything else has been identified sufficiently. Hanson responded that the City and the MPO should see

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

more information concerning this project soon. She explained that technically, as of right now the HSIP is still in draft form, and has not yet received approval, so the projects going into their Draft S.T.I.P., and your Draft T.I.P., are based on the Draft HSIP, however, everything being proposed does meet all the requirements, so they don't foresee any issues with getting them approved, but she believes the Final HSIP will be completed within the next couple of months.

- 8) Grand Forks Projects 31 and 32 – Rehabilitation of US #2. Project descriptions expanded to include more information on what rehabilitation will encompass for each project. Lang pointed out that the word “Gateway” was misspelled for each project.

Durrenberger asked if there was a reason there was no Project 27. Williams stated that there is a Project 27, but there isn't a Project 28.

- 9) Grand Forks Project 34 – In remark section the candidate for the intersection improvement has been identified – Washington and 40th Avenue South.

Haugen referred to the Illustrative Project section, and pointed out that there are no longer any illustrative projects identified. He explained that when the draft document was sent out they had conflicting information regarding the previously shown illustrative project, DeMers Avenue, between Washington and 5th Street, whereby it was listed as “pending”, which means that if there are any funds left over they would be used to complete this project, however it has now been programmed, and is shown as Project 13.

Haugen reported that the last series of changes were necessary due to a request that we provide information on the status of our 2010 projects, or the current year projects, that are more reflective of how they are shown in our T.I.P. document. He explained that he took the annual element of the T.I.P. document, all the North Dakota projects, and provided, under the status section, the status of each project. He went over each project as follows:

- 1) 5309 Funds – Waiting for these funds to be awarded. Johnson reported that, as of yesterday afternoon, they were supposed to hear back from FTA on the draw-down, which was awarded \$1.4 million for the entire State, but that did not occur. He added that there is also a possibility that the 5309 program could change, and he doesn't know how if or when that may occur, but if it does it could conceivably make the process more competitive. Haugen said that once the monies are awarded, we may have to do an amendment to our T.I.P. to include the amount awarded us.
- 2) JARC/New Freedom - Route 12/13, is in operation. Bergman responded it was in operation. Haugen asked if the vehicle has been purchased. Bergman responded it has not. He explained that they have been awarded the money, but they have not yet purchased the vehicle.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

- 3) Advanced construction payback on the I-29 reconstruction project done last year.
- 4) South 48th Street Project - City Council awarded the bids for this project at their meeting this past Monday. Williams added there is still some issues with the engineering portion of this project. Haugen commented that he does know that the bid came in about 25% lower than the estimate given.
- 5) Cherry Street – Under construction at this time.
- 6) US #2 to Arvilla – Up for bids. Lang explained that bids were supposed to let in April, but then everything got slashed, so he isn't sure what the status is on this project at this time.
- 7) PCR For the Sorlie Bridge Project – Agreements are still being worked out between the two states as to who will be the lead agent on the project. He asked if Ms. Hanson received his e-mail concerning this project. Hanson responded that she had received the e-mail, and after checking on it, found that they are still working on the agreement.
- 8) Kennedy Bridge Pier Replacement Project - Haugen reported that this project has been eliminated.
- 9) Safe Routes To School For Safe Kids Coalition – This is an on-going operation, with this past year being the third.
- 10) South 42nd Street Side Path – Bids are being awarded for this project.
- 11) Sign Project – Bids will be awarded in October.
- 12) Traffic Signals and Transit Priority – Transit equipment has been purchased with the exception of the two just added. Haugen asked if the bids would be going out soon for the 2070's. Williams responded that that is what she wanted to ask Ms. Hanson. She explained that she can't find any reference, that they have the sole source letter now, but she cannot find a previous project that was equipment purchase only because their city employees will be doing all of the installation of the equipment, so there will be no contractor involved, so how do they sole source the equipment purchase only, on bids, or how. Hanson responded that she would check with their procurement people to see if there is a state process that might govern, but as far as Federal Highway, if they don't have the federal funds she doesn't know if there is an FTA process that would govern or a DOE process that would govern sole sourcing a project. Johnson added that he could also check on this as there have been instances when they have sole sourced equipment on FTA side that just requires justification as to why it is being sole sourced. Williams

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

explained that the reason they are sole sourcing this project is because there is only one vendor that is allowed to sell this equipment in this area. Johnson asked what is meant by one vendor allowed. Williams responded that the makers of the equipment being purchased has divided up their sales areas within the United States, and only one vendor is allowed to sell it in this area. Johnson asked if this equipment was the only equipment that will work with the system. Williams responded it was. Johnson stated, then, that that is the justification, that you are adding additional equipment to the existing equipment, and only this equipment will work. Johnson asked that a copy of the sole source letter be given to him for review.

- 13) I-29 Reconstruction – Lang stated that the reconstruction is already underway.

Haugen stated that those were all the changes incorporated into the document, however there was one request that was not reflected in the document, and that is a request from the State that PCN numbers be assigned to each of the projects listed in the document, so between now and the final document, this will occur.

Williams referred to Item 13, and asked if it also includes the non-infrastructure item for the radar, the \$15,500.00. Haugen responded it is part of the 3510. Williams commented that that is something she isn't sure of, that she doesn't have the final number was on that. Haugen responded that as far as he knows that number hasn't changed, but he will look into it.

Williams asked if we were to receive safe routes to school dollars from our application from last year, which T.I.P. document will need to be amended. Haugen responded that it will depend on when the monies are awarded. He explained that if it is awarded before August, using 2010 funds, most likely the 2010-2013 T.I.P. will need to be amended; however if it is awarded later than that, or if it is using 2011 funds it will show up in the 2011-2014 T.I.P. ; and if it is awarded between now and August using 2011 funds, it will show up in our draft, but if it is awarded later than that using 2011 funds it will have to be amended into the final draft of our 2011-2014 T.I.P..

Williams asked if Ms. Hanson had heard anything on the safe routes to school projects. Hanson responded that she has heard that the infrastructure projects selection should be coming out soon, but that the non-infrastructure selection will be coming out at a later date, so she would anticipate that we should hear about the infrastructure projects in the next couple of weeks.

Haugen commented that we have noted a couple of changes even to the handout distributed today, so any action that the Technical Advisory Committee might recommend will include those changes as well. He stated that the other action this committee should make today, if approval is granted, would be to continue the public comment period until noon on Wednesday, June 16th.

***MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE
FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA 2011-2014 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

***THE CHANGES DISCUSSED, AND TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
UNTIL 12:00 NOON ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 2010.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS
DESIGNATION**

Haugen reported that last month we approved an update to the Functional Classification System on the North Dakota side. He asked if Ms. Hanson would give a brief update on where the approval process is on this. Hanson responded that they have been reviewing it, and have been trying to work with Federal Highways over the last couple of days to get approval, but found out that they were not receiving our e-mail. She stated that this issue has since been rectified, and they should now have the maps and the final copies, so we are hoping for approval soon.

Haugen stated that, assuming the Functional Classification System update will be approved as we submitted, we would then need to update the Urban Roads Map. He referred to a slide presentation, and explained that they show what changes will need to be made to the Urban Roads Map based on the functional classification updates submitted.

Haugen pointed out that we have several areas that need changes:

- 1) 48th Street – Change the dashed line to a solid line as an Urban Road, not part of the Regional System.
- 2) 20th Avenue South – Change it to an Urban Road.
- 3) DeMers/Columbia Ramps – Previously these ramps were not functionally classified, so now that they are we are proposing to give the ramps a Secondary Regional classification.
- 4) DeMers/4th Avenue Ramps – Also give these ramps a Secondary Regional classification.
- 5) 27th Avenue North – Have a segment that is not functionally classified, classify it so that it is not a part of the Urban Road Program.
- 6) South Belmont Road – This should be classified as an Urban Road.

Information only.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED UPDATE TO THE MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**

Kouba referred to the map included in the packets, and reported that, basically there is an agreement, and the last map that MNDOT had sent indicated that there were still a couple of minor changes needed, but this will be the actual agreed upon map.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

Kouba pointed that she also included a table listing the current miles for the City of East Grand Forks, which pretty much follow the national averages, and are definitely below the national average miles so she sees no problem with getting anything new added.

Haugen commented that one difference between the Minnesota and the North Dakota systems is that on the North Dakota side we functionally classify roadways out to the MPO Study area, while on the Minnesota side we only functionally classify out to the flood protection project, so we are not classifying out to the MPO Study area on the Minnesota Side.

Haugen pointed out that the Map Title should be updated to 2010.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP FOR EAST GRAND FORKS, SUBJECT TO THE MAP TITLE BE CHANGED TO 2010.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NEW T.I.P. PROCESS

Haugen reported that staff has been working on the T.I.P. project selection process, with the last several months focusing on the North Dakota side, but it was stated that they would begin working on the Minnesota side as well, so today's discussion will focus on the Minnesota side.

Ellis stated that they have been working with the NDDOT, and the three MPOs, to try to more closely mirror the SAFETEA-LU process when doing our T.I.P. project selection, prioritization and approval as candidate projects in the T.I.P.. She commented that on the Minnesota side they have discussed this with the Fargo/Moorhead MPO, who is in the process of working with MNDOT on their T.I.P. process as well.

Ellis stated that the basic principle is that the MPO should be, and is required to drive project solicitation and prioritization, so it should be developed cooperatively with MNDOT and the ATP so that we are aware of any projects that are being proposed to receive federal monies, or are being submitted as a federally funded project so that we can review it to ensure it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Ellis reported that she went through all the projects, or funding programs right now that would mirror the North Dakota T.I.P. programs. She said that what the current process is, and what it should be, right now for cities we have a four year cycle subtarget, and there are four cities within the ATP that provide a project that would receive federal aid dollars, and then if one city has a project they would like to have done sooner, while another does not have one ready, they can swap funding for that year, but typically it runs on a four year cycle so we know that every fourth year the City has to have a project ready.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

Ellis referred to the Minnesota Programs document, included in the packet, and went over the current and proposed processes for each T.I.P. funding program. She concluded by saying that we are simply trying to be more a part of the process.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update On Secretary LaHood's Visit

Johnson reported that it was interesting, and was quite a feather in North Dakota's cap. He said that they listed the cities that Secretary LaHood went to with his tour, and they included cities such as Los Angeles, New Orleans, Minneapolis, and Bismarck, so it was quite a coup.

Johnson gave a brief overview on what occurred, explaining that there were a couple of panels that were put together to talk about needs and such, basically focusing on the next highway bill, which is what Secretary LaHood was looking for. He stated that their Congressional Delegation has been very active in working with Secretary LaHood in getting the rural state's needs met, so the secretaries and directors of the various DOTs, including Montana, and Wyoming were present on a panel. He added that Idaho would also be included in our region, however they were unable to attend as they had a prior commitment.

Johnson stated that, in a nut-shell, there was a lot of interest expressed, from a lot of different groups, on money needs and how to deal with those needs.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 9TH, 2010,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 14th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer; Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 9TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lang referred to Page 6 of the minutes, and reported that when he talked about Item #6, US 2 to Arvilla, he did not know when bidding would be taking place, however, he has since been informed that it will occur on July 30th.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 9TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packets, and pointed out that it indicates that a Memorandum of Understanding was signed back in 1997 per ISTEA's requirement that a written agreement be made between the State DOT's, the Transit Operator, and the MPO. He explained

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010**

that since the agreement was signed in 1997, there have been two reauthorizations and one CFR change, and as a result of both the Transit Operator's and the MPO's Tri-Annual Reviews, we were informed that the MOU needed to be updated. He stated that it took several months for all parties to reach an agreement on the language, but it was finally accomplished, and a copy of the document was included in the packets.

Haugen reported that this updated MOU was presented to the respective boards and agencies, and was approved by the East Grand Forks City Council at their meeting last week, and the Grand Forks' Safety Committee last evening. He stated that it will be presented to the Grand Forks City Council next week, and there is no indication that they wouldn't approve it, therefore staff would request this body forwards a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board so that they can approve it at their meeting next week as well, after which staff can then present it to both DOT's for their signatures. He added that there is an August 12th deadline for getting this document signed.

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING, AND FORWARD IT TO BOTH STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION FOR SIGNATURES.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF UPDATE TO NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS MAP

Haugen reported that last month discussion was held on the proposed changes to the North Dakota Urban Roads map, and he has not received any further comments on those changes.

Haugen stated that he included a copy of a map in the packets that highlights the proposed changes. He referred to the map, and to a power-point slide show, and went over the proposed changes briefly.

Durrenberger asked what is proposed on the Columbia Road Overpass. Haugen responded that the overpass itself remains the same, but the ramps will be added as regional secondary roadways. Lang asked if that was the same at DeMers. Haugen responded it was.

Ellis asked about 20th and South Belmont, and whether or not they should be shown with dotted green lines. Haugen responded that they will be shown with a solid green line. Ellis stated that they look black. Haugen agreed that they are currently shown in black, as he is just highlighting those segments that will be changed. Ellis asked if they aren't proposed roads. Haugen responded that they are existing roads, and those roads shown with dotted green lines are proposed roadways, not existing roadways. Rau explained that they are looking at getting 20th classified as a collector. Ellis responded she knows that, and that that is the same with Belmont, but she was confused in that some are dotted as proposed, and some aren't. Rau stated that roads

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010**

such as 48th, which is shown in dotted green, are not in yet, but are being proposed to be constructed as a collector roadway.

Rau asked Ms. Hanson if NDDOT had received any communication concerning functional classification changes. Hanson responded that they have not heard anything on functional classification from Federal Highway at this time, and she did check with them last week, but they hope to have something soon.

MOVED BY RAU, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS MAP FOR STREETS INSIDE THE FEDERAL URBAN AID BOUNDARY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON T.I.P. SELECTION PROCESS 12-15

Haugen reported that as they have gone through the T.I.P. Selection Process update there have been several requests for us to document what the new process will entail, which is what this procedural manual is intended to do.

Haugen commented that the manual tries to identify basic schedules/timelines, as well as the various requirements we have to follow out of the CFR. He added that it also highlights the financial plan, and what is required as part of the financial planning documents.

Haugen referred to Page 46 of the packet, and pointed out that this is the North Dakota Federal Aid Program Responsibility Matrix, which, unfortunately did not copy well. He explained that this is something that the MPO's and the NDDOT have been working on to help identify all the different federal programs and funding splits; how we determine the initial cost estimates; how we go through the prioritization process; how we determine whom, within the DOT Divisions, have the primary responsibility for the program; and which federal agency is in charge, Federal Highway or Federal Transit.

Durrenberger asked if public hearings are required for this. Haugen responded that he does not think they are required to hold public hearings on this.

Haugen referred to Page 48, and commented that this is something to highlight: "Regionally Significant Projects Regardless Of Funding Source". He stated that this is something that is coming back into our T.I.P. document. He explained that what this means is that if there are projects, particularly those that are occurring on our functionally classified roadway system, that are not utilizing FHWA type funds, they still should be showing up in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen referred to Page 62, and pointed out that it gives us further clarification on what is considered a T.I.P. amendment and what is considered a T.I.P. modification to projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010**

Rau referred to Pages 70 to 73, which lists the timelines for both North Dakota and Minnesota, and asked if we also had the new timelines for the Minnesota side as well. Haugen responded that they don't, however there shouldn't be many major changes from the current timeline.

Haugen stated that they hope to be able to submit this document for approval at the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDIES

Haugen referred to the staff report, and went over it briefly:

1. Bacon Road Closure Study: Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks received a request from BNSF and the North Dakota State Mill to consider the complete closure of the Bacon Road Railroad Crossing. He stated that as part of our Scope of Work, we indicated that BNSF and the State Mill are funding 100% of the cost involved for this portion of the Railroad Crossing Study, so we agreed that we would look at all alternatives, not just the closure of the crossing.

Haugen stated that the predication of this request is based on the issue of a 250-foot clearance requirement on either side of the crossing to ensure that no railroad cars can be stacked. He said that we had gotten quite a ways into the study when we were asked how a variance from that requirement could be requested, so we began looking into the regulation and found that it is based on a Federal Highway Guideline as the Federal Railroad Agency does not have such a regulation. He stated that BNSF has said that they may have an internal regulation that states this, but they have not been able to produce a document substantiating it, therefore we are still trying to establish the actual requirement for sight distance.

Haugen commented that they have come up with four alternatives:

- a. Do nothing, leave as is.
- b. Close Bacon Road at an estimated cost of \$30,000.
- c. Make it a private crossing, which could reduce the 250-foot clearance requirement, however, if the 250-feet is a safety requirement, that should be considered even if it is a private crossing. Haugen stated that many of the adjacent property owners were nervous about this crossing being made private, as they would have less rights to cross there.
- d. If close Bacon Road, establish an alternative route. Haugen commented that they looked at 27th Avenue North as a possible alternative route, but in 2002 or 2003 the City of Grand Forks signed it closed due to the condition of the coulee bridge, and the cost estimate to make the necessary improvements to make it a viable alternative is \$2,000,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010**

Durrenberger asked, if this crossing were made private, would it be possible to maybe have manual arms that could come down when cars are in there. He added that he would suspect that something like that wouldn't be allowed if it were kept public. Haugen responded that its true that it wouldn't be allowed if it were kept public, but, yes, the Mill could have more control over when and who would be crossing it, but a lot of the adjacent property owners have trust issues with both the Mill and the Railroad, so they immediately felt that it would only be open for them to use for a year or two, and then completely shut-off from them. He added that part of the sentiment, if you will recall, a few years back there used to be a crossing back by Home of Economy, and that just got closed without much fanfare by both the Mill and the Railroad, so they fear the same thing would happen here.

Haugen said that they presented the four alternatives, and our study is now at the point where we need to know if there really is a 250-foot clearance requirement, or if it is based solely off the guideline.

- 2) Mill Spur Study: Haugen reported that a draft report is available on the MPO website. He stated that staff held final open houses and neighborhood committee meetings.

Haugen said that he included updated maps reflecting updates based on the input they received. He pointed out that that two biggest challenges are reflected on Figure 7, and involve modifications that were necessary to provide better safety, and to allow for a possible future quiet zone , by relocating a driveway at the 8th Avenue North crossing that will allow enough turning radii for an occasional larger size semi-trailer truck. He stated that this does not impact the cost much but does introduce some limitations to parking on 7th Street.

Haugen commented that another challenge is reflected on Figure 9, and involves Gateway Drive. He explained they attempted to try to convey how the construction of a median, located on the westerly side of the railroad crossing on Gateway Drive, would entail and impact the lanes that are currently existing out on Gateway Drive. He stated that SRF inserted a cross-section on the map that illustrates this, however the Grand Forks Engineering Department pointed out that it probably doesn't match what they graphically show occurring on the photo for that cross-section. He said that the main thing that would be occurring would be the removal of the island, and relocation of the traffic signal to allow for a railroad crossing gate system to be installed.

Haugen reported that they have not received any direct opposition to any of the closures, and, in-fact, at the public input meetings they had residents who live on some of the avenues we are suggesting be closed who have stated they are in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2010**

favor of the closures. He added that most of the businesses they visited with are also in favor of the closures as well.

Haugen referred to the last page of the packet, and pointed out that it is the preferred improvement cost estimates. He stated that the bulk of the cost is at the actual crossings themselves, where the minimum requirements to establish a quiet zone are flashing lights, gates, power out indicator lights, and constant warning times.

Haugen stated that they are recommending three of the crossings, so the remaining seven crossings would need roughly about \$350,000 invested in each of them to bring them to quiet zone status.

Haugen commented that the reason why they have these cost estimates, and all the different columns, was to identify all the different funding sources that would implement many of those different recommendations, so all the costs could come entirely from one program, or there are five different programs that could participate in the columns. He added, however, that the \$45,000 for closure would come entirely from BNSF and a program the NDDOT has that is used toward contributing to closure costs, so there would be very little city monies used for closures.

- 3) Quiet Zone Study: Haugen reported that they are still waiting for the FRA report regarding the three crossings out by the Amtrak Depot on 55th Street North. He stated that they did hear that, because each of these crossings are technically on a different subdivision of the railroad line, each of them would be their one separate crossing zone, and would each need to submit their own application.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 14TH, 2010,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 1:08 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 11th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer; Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer; and Teri Kouba (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Cities Area Transit; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT- Bemidji; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; and Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer.

Guest(s) present were: Al Grasser, GF City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 14TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE JULY 14TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2010 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT

Haugen reported that, as part of our T.I.P. process, we are required to self-certify together with our State DOTs that we are following the appropriate regulations. He referred to a copy of the Self-Certification document, included in the packet, and explained that this is something that used to be included as part of the T.I.P., however a couple of years ago Federal Highway asked

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

that we have it as a separate, distinct agenda item. He added, however, that this year it is still included as an appendix in our T.I.P. document, so although we are taking action as a separate item now, when we approve the T.I.P. later on the agenda, it is included as an appendices in that document as well.

Haugen referred to the Self-Certification document, page 3, and pointed out that it identifies all of the CFRs and USCs, etc., that we are required to follow as we go through our annual planning process. He added that that we have provided all of the documentation as to how we fulfill those things in this document.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2010 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. DOCUMENT

Haugen reported that back in April we approved a Draft Minnesota T.I.P., and in June we approved a Draft North Dakota T.I.P., and we now need to approve a combined Final T.I.P. document.

Haugen referred to the document, included in the packet, and pointed out that there are a couple of new appendices attached. He explained that we have always included our annual listing of obligations for the prior year, shown in Appendix I; but that this year we also need to include the ARRA projects as well, so we added that information under Appendix II. He added that, again, we have also included, under Appendix IV, the Self-Certification document, otherwise all other appendices are as they have been in the past.

Haugen commented that one other addition/change is to the North Dakota project list, and it involves a new numbering system for the S.T.I.P. projects. He explained that after we have listed our number system, we added a PCN # (a project control number), which is what is used in the S.T.I.P. He stated that there are a few projects for which he still does not have a PCN # for, and he also believes that transit projects do not have PCN #s, so there are still some amendments that need to be made to the project list to include the PCN #s once they are identified.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, they have been identifying the State numbering system for those projects for years, so no changes need to be made to that project list.

Noehre commented that some of the North Dakota projects may not have PCN #s yet, adding that if they aren't in the Draft S.T.I.P., they will not have PCN #s identified yet.

Haugen stated that since we adopted our Draft T.I.P., not many changes have been made, although there was one made to Project 6, the Gateway Drive project. He explained that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

originally the cost of this project was estimated to be about \$3,000,000, and included doing that portion from I-29 to Columbia Road; and then in 2013 or 2014 doing that portion from Columbia to the Red River, again at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000, for a total project cost of \$6,000,000. He said, however, that the NDDOT, along with others, reviewed the scope of work and project estimates, and decided that they would combine the two projects, expand the termini to include that portion from I-29 to the Red River, at an estimated project cost of \$2,000,000. Lang explained that the project involves the rehabilitation of pavement between I-29 and the Red River, with the exception of that portion from the English Coulee to Columbia Road, which should be included as a separate project later on. Haugen agreed, pointing out that the area between the English Coulee and Columbia Road is shown listed as Projects 17 and 18. He asked if he should include this information in the original project description. Consensus was that it should be included.

Noehre referred to Project #10, and asked if the corrections he sent last week were made to this project. Haugen responded that the corrections will show up after today's action. He stated that he did send an e-mail explaining that the document included in today's packet is the public document that went out prior to those corrections being identified, so we will note those corrections now, and will include them in the updated document that will be forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board for final approval.

Haugen referred to Page 49, Project #10 – Signing between 32nd Avenue to Forest River northbound, and explained that he had originally identified this as being just a northbound project, but it is actually both directions. He stated that the other change Mr. Noehre identified was to the 32nd Avenue Project, Project #22 on Page 54, and involves a change to the project description, which currently states that this involves rehab and overlay, but Mr. Noehre asked that the word “or” be added to the description as well so that it states that this involves rehab and/or overlay.

Williams referred to Page 35, second paragraph, and pointed out that the third sentence, which states: “This resulted in the loss of several federally assisted projects”, is not a current statement. She added that the next sentence, which states: “The new policy establishes an assessment district ¼ the distance...” should be “The new policy establishes an assessment district ½ the distance...”

Grasser referred to Page 35, first sentence, and commented that it talks about the City Share Fund, and while they have used it in the past it is rarely used in recent times so he was wondering if we should state that somehow as the way it is portrayed it looks like it is a direct combination of those types of funds, but City Share is a mill levy. He suggested that we might want to note that the City is trying to get away from using City Share funds altogether. He then referred to the third paragraph on Page 35, and commented that the sentence that states: “This is intended to provide more equity in the application of the assessments...”, should end after the word assessments, as they aren't reducing the likelihood of protest.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

Noehre referred to Page 25, and pointed out that the first paragraph indicates that this is a three-year T.I.P., that should be four-year T.I.P.

Hanson reported that they are verifying their operations and maintenance numbers in their final T.I.P., so should she find any differences between the two documents she will let the MPO know. Haugen referred to Page 39, Table 5, and commented that last year, after the Final T.I.P. approval, we were asked to prepare an Operations and Maintenance section, however, last year, because the request came after we completed our T.I.P. process we did a separate document, but this year it is incorporated directly into our T.I.P. document. He explained that it is essentially a repeat of what we did last year.

Haugen commented that there was a notice in the paper that a Public Hearing would be held at today's meeting, therefore he would like to open the Public Hearing at this time. He added that the notice also indicated that comments could be submitted until noon today, however no comments were received.

There was no one present for discussion.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Grasser referred to Page 41, the item of Collectors, and pointed out that it states that a collector, by design, is usually a two-lane with parking permitted within the roadway. He said that, although it can be, he knows that on the Grand Forks side, on their newer streets they have been trying to eliminate parking within those systems. Williams added that on their local streets, if they are going to say anything about parking, it would be to say that if parking were permitted it would only be allowed on one side of the roadway. Haugen asked that a more precise wording be suggested. Grasser responded that it might read that the goal for the City of Grand Forks is to not have parking within the right-of-way, although exceptions are made with reconstruction. Williams suggested, instead, that it be written that local parking is permitted as signed.

Noehre commented that he isn't sure the parking description for the interstate is quite accurate either. He said that they actually have to have "No Parking" signs otherwise someone can sit there for up to 72-hours.

Haugen referred to the last table for each side, and explained that they include a summary of all project costs over the four year time period. He pointed out that the total project costs for Grand Forks are just under \$41,000,000, with \$10,000,000 for transit; and just under \$14,000,000 for East Grand Forks.

Grasser referred to Page 120, a copy of the MPO Website Home Page, and pointed out that under the announcements heading it still indicates that the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor Study Final Report is a "New" project. Haugen responded that it is still a "new" project on our website as it has not been replaced with an updated report. Grasser stated that he feels that is misleading as the other items listed are either more current, or are actively being worked on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. DOCUMENT, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CHANGES AS NOTED ABOVE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE A.T.A.C. SCHOOL STUDY SCOPE-OF-WORK

Haugen reported that this item is currently in the MPO Annual Unified Planning Work Program, and we have a contract with A.T.A.C. to complete the study. He explained that we held off doing this until school was back in session, and now that school will be starting up soon, Ms. Ellis is working with A.T.A.C. personnel to get things started. He pointed out that a copy of the scope-of-work was included in the packets, and asked that Ms. Ellis give a brief overview on what the study will entail.

Ellis stated that this is the annual A.T.A.C. School Safety Study we have done over the past few years. She explained that these studies look at engineering improvements as well as circulation, signage, operations, parking, etc., in order to ensure that we meet safety requirements for our schools.

Ellis referred to the staff report, and pointed out that they will be looking at Winship, Wilder, and St. Michaels schools this year. She commented that St. Michaels is on a very busy street, and the City of Grand Forks asked that we take a look at some of the issues they have with safety concerns. Noehre stated that they have actually looked into some of the safety concerns at St. Michaels as well, have done a speed study, etc., and ultimately found that one of the problems is simply the amount of mid-block crossings that are made along that street.

Ellis reported that the main objective of the study will be to evaluate pedestrian safety, review roadway and parking characteristics, review traffic control and pavement markings, evaluate traffic circulation and then provide possible short and long-term improvements for each school.

Ellis commented that the study will begin with meetings with school principals, PTO members, GF Engineering staff, Safe Kids staff, GF School District staff, and other representatives from the schools in order to gather information, after which a site visit will then be conducted, a draft report will be prepared, and a final report completed by November for approval in December.

Noehre stated that he would get the data they collected for St. Michaels to Ms. Ellis to provide to A.T.A.C. Grasser suggested that they might also want to invite Mark Aubol to these meetings as well.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE A.T.A.C. SCHOOL STUDIES SCOPE-OF-WORK, AS SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2010 UNIFIED PLANNING
WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that last month the NDDOT notified the MPO that there may be some additional CPG funds available, and just prior to the July MPO Executive Policy Board meeting NDDOT requested that there be an item on the agenda asking the board if they wanted to accept those funds, they agreed they did.

Haugen stated that the next step, then, is to amend our work program to identify the additional work activities decided upon through project solicitation, and through working with local staff. He explained they are essentially corridor studies that take place on the North Dakota side, and in working with North Dakota and Federal Highways, instead of embedding this into the 37 page work program, it was determined that we would just identify where those four studies fit within our typical work program. He pointed out that there is a section titled “Corridor Planning”, that still lists the current activities, and identifies new activities as well.

Haugen referred to page 135, and pointed out that it still lists the street type activities we are doing, however this will change with the addition of these new projects. He pointed out that there are two projects on Washington Street: one on Hammerling to 8th Avenue North, including the underpass structure; and one on 40th Avenue South where the new Wellness Center is locating. He added that that the other projects involve identifying corridor improvements needed to convert the rural section of roadway on 47th Avenue to an urban section; and examining the various street network potentials, focusing on the collector street network in southwest Grand Forks.

Haugen asked Mr. Rau if he got any feedback from the Safety Service Committee at their meeting last evening. Rau responded that the only comment was regarding the estimated cost, that it seemed high to them, but he did try to explain that it is a comprehensive study and these are just estimates at this time.

Haugen stated that the MPOs intent is to get a couple of these study’s RFPs completed for approval at our next meeting, and the remaining two will be done in October or November. He said that the intent of our receiving this money is to show that we are able to spend it in a quick manner.

Haugen reported that next month there will be an agenda item discussing work activities for the full two-year 2011-2012 Unified Planning Work Program, and these four studies will automatically be carried over into that work program.

Haugen thanked the Bismarck-Mandan MPO for releasing some funds, which allows us to do some additional, and necessary corridor studies in our MPO area, and also a thank you to North Dakota and Federal Highway for assisting with that process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE 2010 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NEW T.I.P. PROCESS

Haugen stated that staff thought they had gotten a draft copy of the T.I.P. Project Selection Process document out soon enough for people to be prepared to recommend final action on it, however, due to some abnormalities with the copying and distribution, some people did not receive everything in time, so we have been asked to just have a review and comment session on this item this month, and carry it over to next month for action.

Haugen explained that several years ago all three MPOs were asked to develop a process for the selection of projects for our T.I.P. documents. He stated that they have been working on that request, and have put together a manual that highlights what the process will be. He said that he hopes that they have captured the critical milestone items needed to assist with the process of project selection.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that they did include a matrix that shows all the federal programs for both North Dakota and Minnesota that are available for funding. He said that the Minnesota matrix was a draft document, and a more up-to-date version was distributed at the beginning of this meeting.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and went over the seven key highlights of the new process.

Noehre referred to 3 and 4 on the highlight list, and asked about the word “distributed” and whether or not that means that the MPO will put the funds in their bank account and then distribute them out. Haugen responded that the MPO doesn’t do anything with the money except prioritize it in our T.I.P., so that is what is meant by distributed. He stated that in our case it is one city one MPO, but in Fargo/Moorhead and Bismarck/Mandan Ms. Hanson could better explain how the monies will be distributed. Hanson responded that both Fargo/Moorhead and Bismarck/Mandan are still working this out, how the money gets sort of consolidated, and then how the projects are solicited and rotated depending on the need so that each jurisdiction gets it fair portion of projects throughout the process. Haugen added that for the five cities, there used to be a letter sent to thirteen cities soliciting projects, with a table attached to it, but now, for the five MPO cities, the State will send a letter to each MPO, and the MPO will then distribute down to its member jurisdictions, so that is the “distribution” he is talking about in the staff report. Noehre said, then, that it is essentially just notification, and distribution means there is money available for projects.

Grasser asked if there was a way to change the wording to make it a little bit clearer. He pointed out that we use the word solicitation a lot elsewhere, but he doesn’t see that word used in Item 3

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

at all, and instead the word “distributed” is used here, and while the noun they both refer to is “funds”, how he reads it is “funds will be distributed to the MPO but they used to be distributed to the City. He stated that there are more words in there than that, but that is how he reads it, so he was wondering if there was a way to reword it to make it clearer, maybe we could say “solicitation of funds” instead. Noehre suggested that both Items 3 and 4 could be removed totally because Items 1 and 2 take care of it by soliciting T.I.P. projects with the funding, that’s what those are saying. Haugen agreed, but added that it is also saying that for those five entities, they are not going to get a direct letter from the DOT saying, that as part of the thirteen cities, here is the amount your city is sub-allocated.

Suggestions on wording ensued as follows:

1. Williams suggested that they could just say that the MPO will notify the appropriate entity of the STP funds.
2. Grasser added that it could state that the NDDOT sub-allocated notification of STP funds will be distributed by the MPO.
3. Williams suggested it could say that notification of the NDDOT sub-allocated STP funds will be distributed by the MPO, or issued by the MPO, or released by the MPO as you are actually releasing the letter.

Grasser asked if it is even funds or is it programming. Haugen responded that for the other MPOs it is funds because they have more than one, so for Fargo and West Fargo, North Dakota is going to provide the COG one number for their MPO area, so Fargo won’t receive a sub-allocation of that sub-allocation, and Bismarck-Mandan is the same way. Grasser said, then, that a letter to Fargo is going to say something like “you are hereby awarded \$2,000,000 to be used as needed”. Haugen responded that Fargo will get a letter from FM-COG stating that they have received a certain amount of funds that North Dakota is sub-allocating to the Fargo-Moorhead area, and COG is asking Fargo-West Fargo for projects, and then they will go through the prioritization process of determining who gets what, and Fargo won’t be allocated a specific amount year in and year out. Hanson stated that, basically, what this means is that it will no longer be Fargo’s money and West Fargo’s money, it will be a combined pot of money for the urban area, and the jurisdictions will need to submit their lists of projects to the MPO, and those projects will be prioritized into the T.I.P. according to the dollar amount available, and what the DOT wants is some form of fairness developed to ensure that one jurisdiction doesn’t get all the projects, and the other doesn’t get any, and that has to do with how voting is set up on their member board and their policy board, but that is an issue they have to deal with.

Grasser asked if Ms. Hanson was referring to the more regional type of monies. Hanson responded that she is referring to the Urban Roads dollars. Grasser asked if each community isn’t garnered a certain amount of dollars based on population. Hanson responded that that is essentially how it was supposed to work, but in the MPO area, for the CFR we have to treat it as an MPO area pot of money for the entire urban area. She added that in the case of Grand Forks, it is much easier because it is just Grand Forks using the money from the pot, whereas Fargo-Moorhead and Bismarck-Mandan, they each have two cities using the money from the pot, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

one year Fargo could be using West Fargo's money, and the next year West Fargo could be using Fargo's money, and the same with Bismarck-Mandan, so their process is a little more difficult to set up than Grand Forks'.

Haugen stated that under the old system there were thirteen sub-allocations, but now there are essentially eleven sub-allocations, but the same basis of the sub-allocations has remained the same – funds divided by population – but combing the allocated amount into one pot for Fargo-Moorhead and for Bismarck-Mandan. Noehre commented that there are still thirteen sub-allocations, but two of them are A and B. Hanson agreed that they still start out with thirteen, but after they go through the funding formulas, then they get combined into one pot of money to address projects in the MPO area. Grasser asked, then, if the MPO is kind of the referee in those communities. Hanson responded that that is somewhat correct. Grasser asked, are they somewhat in control, or are they totally in control, he is just trying to understand the wording of this document. Hanson responded that it depends on the funding program, because for STP dollars, the federal pot of money, we need to go through the project solicitation and prioritization process, but there are other pots of money that we do not need to go through that process. She added that it is up to the MPO to generate the process, and that means that each member jurisdiction needs to be comfortable with the process, and that is why Mr. Haugen has put out these drafts, so everyone needs to take a careful look at this and make sure you understand it, and that it is a process you can work with. She said that if anyone has any questions, please work with Mr. Haugen and his staff, or you can contact the NDDOT as well. She added that, while they will be implementing this with the 2012-2015 T.I.P. process, but since it is a brand new product, they anticipate that there will be some difficulties, and that there may be some things that don't work well that we will need to look at, so they will be working with the MPO to make adjustments throughout the process.

Grasser thanked Ms. Hanson for the explanation, and stated that they will work with Mr. Haugen on drafting some word changes to clarify what he thinks he heard today, but he wants to be a little careful with this as the other two jurisdictions are two communities receiving federal funding through the same state organization, while our MPO is cross-states, so we are not competing for the same funds and yet the MPO organization's membership has four members from Minnesota and four from North Dakota, so we want to be cautious about making sure that the jurisdictions that have to come up with the local funding have the ability to control that project.

Hanson stated that she thinks that everyone has some valid concerns, and it certainly is understandable, but she has been reviewing Mr. Haugen's process, as well as the other two MPO's processes, and she has questions on all three as well, but this is all part of the federal requirements, and is something we need to work out.

Williams stated she knows that the Federal FHWA worked on all of this stuff, but when they developed this ranking policy, and all these other things we went through, was it primarily to handle a situation where you have competing agencies, and did they say anything about this at all when there wasn't a competing agency. Hanson responded that they really haven't said anything

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

about that. She stated that Grand Forks has a unique situation in that the ranking you do on the North Dakota side needs to apply to Grand Forks, and the ranking you do on the Minnesota side needs to apply to East Grand Forks, and therefore you are doing a lot of extra work to basically develop a product similar to what you do now, just a different method of getting there.

Grasser commented that he thinks we have a separate set of problems, and he knows that Mr. Haugen gets caught up in the middle of some of these discussions, wherein some MPO members want to see the money put into projects that will benefit the cross-traffic between the two states, and it is easier for some members to be able to push, if in-fact they haven't been suffering the repercussions of the loss of that money going someplace else; in other words, on the Grand Forks side we have some internal needs as far as transportation expansion, street rehabilitation and reconstruction type things, which half the MPO members do not have a direct connection with that type of project, but are more directly impacted and benefiting as individuals and representatives of the community of the bridges, and yet at the local level, when we come up with funding, and when we bring up some of these things to Service Safety and some of the other committees they say that isn't where our priority is, so we have a bit of a disconnect there that we need to work on, and, of course, there are only two members on the MPO committee that have to directly face the taxpayers on the financial issues of what is going on in Grand Forks, and what money we spend on what roads.

Hanson stated that they think that it would still be best if your engineering department develops your list of priorities, as you have in the past, and submit them to the MPO, and give them the information they need, so what you need to do now is to make sure that the process the MPO is setting up works for you, and your comfortable that it allows your jurisdiction to be able to reflect the type of projects you have historically been submitting, and what you think you will continue to do in the future. She added that she thinks that a real key part of this process still needs to be the engineering department because the engineering department and the public works department are so close to the roads and traffic, and what is going on out there, so you are the ones that really know what needs to be done.

Williams said that there was something in the draft bill that the voting structure was going to be changed for the MPO, that the voting members of the MPO would be represented in proportion to the population. She asked if that was included in the final bill, or did it not go through. Haugen responded that there is no bill to speak of, there was a draft submitted by Obestar that was done fourteen months ago, and it did contain that provision, but those were for large MPOs, and would not apply to MPOs of our size, but it was not formally submitted. Williams said that what she is talking about was actually part of the legislation of the re-authorization. Haugen responded that that is what he is speaking of, but it has not been formally submitted to the House of Representatives. He said that it floated as a draft by Obestar, and that is part of the problem, that there is no draft for either chamber to respond to. Noehre said that it is currently controlled by the two governors, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Grasser referred to Item 7, "Regionally significant projects not funded with federal resources will need to be included in the T.I.P." He asked how you define what a regionally significant project

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

is. Haugen responded that they took a stab at that. He referred to Page 160, and explained that they used the US Code that Federal Highway and FTA updated when SAFETEA-LU came out, straight out of the CFR. He stated that the key thing is “consultation”.

Grasser asked who is going to make the call, the MPO Executive Director. He stated that he has a problem with the word “all”. He commented that using that definition, for every subdivision road that goes in we will invent a process, then, to do a review, submission, and approval process of all these subdivisions. He said that we will have to go through a review and documentation process for every pedestrian crosswalk we put on a collector road. He stated that we have sidewalk work that, for the most part, our technician out in the field determines as to where and when the work should be done, and we have such a short construction season, that if we have to go through this type of process we won’t be able to get all the work done that we need to get done. Williams added that that kind of thing would eventually go through the City Council, wouldn’t it. Grasser responded that just the funding would go to them. Williams asked if Mr. Haugen wouldn’t get a copy of the City Council agendas, and therefore wouldn’t be able to review them to find out what is going on to determine if there is anything the MPO needs to be involved in. Haugen responded he does get a copy of both City Council agendas already.

Ellis asked if the MPO needs to prioritize regionally significant projects if they are not using federal dollars, or do they just need to be listed in the T.I.P. Hanson responded that they just need to be listed in the T.I.P. Grasser asked if we really want to see a T.I.P. that has all these little projects listed. Ellis responded that it is part of the CFR, not the MPO saying that we want to put every regionally significant project down. Grasser stated that he agrees that he doesn’t want to get into the level of detail either, he just wants to make sure that that is clear in this document, so he is wondering if there should be certain dollar limits, or do you want to know about every \$200 project we are going to do just because it happens to touch Washington Street, or are there some limits or exclusions that we can include in this document to alleviate that kind of thing. Hanson responded that she would check to see if there is a definition or example available for regionally significant projects.

Williams referred to that portion of the definition that states: “would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area’s transportation network”, and said that that would mean an extension of a classified road or an additional lane or something that would add capacity, and she can’t imagine them doing anything that wouldn’t involve federal dollars, so that is very very limited for what would be included in your modeling, when you would change your model.

Grasser commented that other than the first two bullet points all the rest of them are clearly major big things that should be included in that planning aspect, but those first two bullets are just a little too general and could be applied to too local of a situation, so we don’t have to worry about the others too much, but we need clarification on those two.

Ellis suggested that the bullet stating that all projects on transportation facilities installing necessary ADA improvement is too vague as well as that could mean a truncated dome or something of that sort, so that would be another one to review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

Grasser said, again, that maybe there is a dollar amount exclusion, as he can't imagine that they want to know about every project that's under \$500, \$1,000, or even \$10,000, as they wouldn't produce much of an impact. Rau added that there are times when you don't even know about a project until a few weeks or months ahead of time so you would be doing amendments all the time.

Haugen referred to the staff report, Item 5, and commented that they had to come up with some specific scoring sheets, copies of which were included in the packet. He explained that there were several meetings held with engineering staff to create these sheets, and these are the result of those meetings.

Haugen referred to Item 6, and commented that it deals with financial planning for the T.I.P., trying to ensure that we get a stronger relationship between the financial plan that is in the T.I.P. document and the financial plan in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Noehre referred to Item 5, and asked if the scoring sheets include a definition for each item so that you get some level of understanding other than a short bullet of what that exactly means. Haugen responded that this is as far as they have gotten.

Williams referred to Item 5, and asked about the statement that says the MPO will prioritize projects, whether that means MPO the staff or MPO the group. Haugen responded that it means MPO the group. Grasser asked if the scoring sheets will go to the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded that the score sheets will be submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee, and then the MPO staff will do the scoring, and then, like most everything else the Technical Advisory Committee reacts to, the document is put forth, it is part of the process that each project has the ability before the Technical Advisory Committee to have its project presented and discussed so we have a great understanding of each project, and it is your recommendation that the Technical Advisory Committee reacts to, and forwards on to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval.

Grasser commented that he is wondering if draft scoring sheets should be created by the initiating agency as part of that, which would then go to the MPO as well. Williams agreed that they should submit those with their list of projects as well.

Grasser stated that the process looks cumbersome because they are developing the scope, and what they think are the details, and then they have to explain it to the MPO who then looks it over and explains it to the Technical Advisory Committee, and so on. Williams said that they found, when they were going through and doing just the initial practice one, they knew exactly where they were going to be putting in a ramp, or they knew where they were adding a sidewalk, and when your trying to write a scoping on a project your not going to write in every little tiny thing, and that affects the score. Grasser added that a lot of those decisions aren't made until you get into the PCR. Williams agreed, adding that that is the thing with the MUTCD right now, is that it left out the engineering judgement clause, and that is where the engineering judgement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

comes into this, to have us do the initial scoring sheets, and then the MPO can go through them again. Ellis stated that it would make sense if engineering submitted your scoring sheets as they aren't going to change, so if there was something that the MPO wasn't aware of in the scope, by putting it in the scoring sheet we would have an explanation if needed.

Noehre asked how many lists there will be, he knows there will be at least two, one for Grand Forks and one for East Grand Forks, but will there also be a priority list for each fund source as well. Haugen responded that for projects that have more than one thing being funded out of that program there will be a priority list for that program. He added that this is already done now, so that isn't anything new.

Haugen commented that the matrix's are trying to identify all of the funding programs, and how they are used in North Dakota and Minnesota.

Noehre asked of the STP regional was going to remain the same as it currently is. Hanson responded that currently for regional projects the district and the city work together and submit them to the DOT, and they get programmed; but now the MPO is going to solicit for projects, so the district and the city will need to work together to get that information to the MPO, however the DOT will still be setting up the program for those regional projects because they have to compare all the regional requests they get statewide, so the MPO can submit their list of regional projects to the DOT so they can set them up in an urban regional program like we currently do.

Haugen commented that that is what has already been going on here, in December you submit your list of projects to the MPO, but that wasn't occurring with some of the other MPOs in the state, so for them that will be a bigger change.

Grasser referred to Page 213, federal funding categories, and said that it seems like there are a lot of programs out there that, from a practical standpoint, don't really have any funding associated with them. He stated that the way the DOT is working the program, he is just wondering which of these programs are really things they should be applying to that don't, in-turn, simply detract from their urban monies. He explained that he asks this because it still comes out of their urban pot, but is earmarked to something else, so on the City side it really doesn't do them much good, they are just giving up their same piece of money under a different title, so it would be helpful to him to know which of these programs actually carry with them additional funding. Hanson responded that they will be holding an MPO Director's Meeting later this month and she will address the issue at that time.

Haugen referred to the Matrix's and went over the information they provide. He stated that there is a lot of information here, but they are just trying to make it so that people understand the T.I.P. process in a document format.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2010**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 11TH, 2010,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:09 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 8th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Senior Planner; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Al Grasser (Proxy for Dean Rau), Grand Forks City Engineer; Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Joe McKinnon, MNDOT- Bemidji.

Guest(s) present were: John Markussen, KLJ Consulting.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 11TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 11TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because we have a visitor present today, everyone please state their name and the organization they are representing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

MATTER OF RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen referred to the staff report included in the packet, Page 1, and pointed out that it gives updates on the three railroad crossing studies:

1) Bacon Road Closure Study:

Haugen reported that the MPO received a request from BNSF and the State Mill to look into the possibility of closing Bacon Road due to a 250-foot sight clearance zone requirement that would not allow the Mill to have 16 railroad cars in que for loading and unloading. He explained that one of the problems encountered while doing this study is that we have been unable to obtain an actual document verifying the 250-foot sight clearance zone requirement. He pointed out that BNSF has indicated that it is an FRA regulation, but FRA can only produce a FHWA guideline, which actually provides varying sight clearance distances based on vehicle speed and train speed. He commented that, although there are some with BNSF that insist it is their policy, or is within their regulations, they have not been able to produce a document that states this, so we have determined that we would note in the study document that, based on the Railroad Highway Grade Crossing Handbook it appears that for the given conditions at Bacon Road the buffer distance could be reduced to approximately 100-feet, but add that BNSF may have a regulation requiring more.

Haugen stated, again, that the premise for doing this study was for us to look at the possibility of closing Bacon Road because of the 250-foot distance requirement, which caused them to lose the ability to stack 16 cars, however we may now be able to have that reduced down to 100-feet. He added that we also note that, as a result of our property owners meetings, the adjacent property owners have expressed strong opposition to the closure of Bacon Road. He said that they are still waiting to see if BNSF is comfortable with how we are terming this, and we are going to hold one more round of meetings with the property owners, the State Mill, and BNSF to inform them on what we have discovered concerning the site distance issue.

Haugen reported that in any event, four alternatives have been identified to address the request to close Bacon Road, with costs varying from \$0 to \$2,000,000, in the event that closure remains the preferred option.

Brooks asked, the 16 rail cars, is the 250-feet the total amount. Haugen responded that the 16 rail cars are based on the 250-foot requirement. Brooks stated, then, that if the requirement is lowered to 100-feet, you would not be able to have 16 rail cars, it would be a lower amount. Haugen responded that that would be correct.

Grasser commented that one of the inputs is vehicle speed, what was used for vehicle speed. Haugen responded that a vehicle speed of 10-miles an hour was used for both the train and vehicle speeds. Grasser asked if they could put in a stop sign there. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

responded that there are four sets of tracks that cross there, and you basically have a stop, cross, stop again, so he isn't sure that would work or not, but will check on it further.

2) State Mill Spur Study:

Haugen reported that for the past two-months we have basically been working on figures for this study. He stated that two months ago we looked at Figures 6 and 9, and today we will look at Figure 9 again.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he states there are two primary things that changed, however he only listed one of them. He said that the first one, which was not listed, involves where the relocated traffic signals would be placed. He reported that on the Mill Road side of this intersection they are recommending removal of the island, which is where the current traffic signals are located, and relocating them to the northwest of the intersection, which is shown on Figure 9.

Haugen stated that there was also an issue with the cross-section detail that is highlighted in the middle of the drawing, and how it relates to the figure as the aerial layout and lanes were not matching up, so that was corrected.

Haugen said that he did send a copy of Figure 9 to both the District Office and Engineering Staff, but have not received any feedback yet.

Haugen reported that the neighborhood committee met and reviewed the final report, and all other issues have been resolved other than the one we discussed and shown on Figure 9.

3) Quiet Zone Study:

Haugen reported that this study involved looking at the availability of installing quiet zones elsewhere in the metro area besides the State Mill Spur line, and the three crossings by the Amtrak Station have been the three crossings that we have been asking FRA to assist us and BNSF with. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of FRA's response to our request was included.

Haugen stated that the good news is that for two of the three crossings they have ruled that we do not have to install Constant Warning Time. He explained that the problem we were having with these crossings was that we knew we didn't have Constant Warning Time, and when we asked BNSF when they could install it they said that we would have to upgrade a lot of the other equipment at each of the crossings, which drove the costs up considerably, so we asked FRA to assist us in determining whether or not this was really the case, and they concluded that two of the three crossings do not need Constant Warning Time installed, therefore two of the crossings are already eligible for quiet zone status. He added, however, that the third crossing, at 55th Street, does require that Contact Warning Time be installed, but it does have all the other

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

required equipment already installed, therefore we asked BNSF for a cost estimate to install the Constant Warning Time, and we are still waiting for their response.

Haugen pointed out that the City of Grand Forks' Staff Report shows that they have already received City Council blessing to do the notice of intent to establish the two quiet zones on the DeMers crossings. He added that last month the City Council did the notice of intent for the other crossings as well. He stated that, with the exception of 55th Street, nine of the ten crossings would be able to be quieted as they currently are serviced with safety features.

Haugen reported that the last thing the study states is that for key crossings medians could be installed to reduce the risk factor even further, and to provide a buffer zone to the quiet zone itself in order for it to remain eligible for quiet zone status even if train or vehicle traffic increased.

Haugen stated that both the State Mill Spur Study and the Quiet Zone Study are available on the MPO's website. He added that they hope to finalize both the State Mill Spur and Quiet Zone studies this next month, and have the final Bacon Road Study meeting so that we can do the same with it within the November/December timeframe.

Grasser commented that they are anticipating that once they get the necessary information on the 55th Street crossing, they have some state monies available that could be used to help with the installation of some of the upgrades necessary to make it quiet zone eligible as well. He added that they want to pursue some of the redundancy issues in the quiet zones because, although we currently qualify, it is just by the skin of our teeth, so we are looking at being able to upgrade as part of our implementation process.

Information only.

MATTER OF TRIENNIAL REVIEW REPORT

Haugen referred to Page 15, the staff report, and reported that back in May Federal Highways from both Minnesota and North Dakota, met with NDDOT and MNDOT representatives and with MPO Staff and the MPO Executive Board Chair to go through the Triennial Review, done every three years, to get a top-to-bottom review of the MPO processes and practices.

Haugen stated that on August 16th we received the final report. He referred to Page 17, the cover letter that accompanied the report, and pointed out that they requested a response to the comments or concerns listed in the report by August 31st, so included in the packet, beginning on Page 35, are the MPO's responses. He referred to Page 38 and explained that some of the actions needed a response from NDDOT as well, those responses are also included.

Haugen referred to Page 35 and pointed out that there were nine observations/recommendations listed. He went over each briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

Haugen stated that NDDOT's response indicates that are working on the contract language. He said that they did meet on August 23rd, and they have provided a funding chart, and will continue to do so, and the rest of their observations they indicated that they will support the MPOs in their process of doing these things.

Grasser asked if the funding chart is different than what we have traditionally seen. Haugen asked if what he was referring to as "traditionally seen" is the federal corps programs and how they flow to the urban projects. Grasser responded that, typically with the urban list there is usually expenditures and income for that year of the plan. Haugen responded that it is a different chart than that. Grasser asked if the dollars would change or will they remain as they currently are, around \$2,000,000 for Grand Forks. Haugen responded that there will be some changes to the annual estimate coming into the urbanized area. Grasser asked if that was due to some changes to the federal formula. Haugen responded that it was, that, based on this funding chart, before the DOT has always kept a constant dollar amount throughout the T.I.P. process, but now it will be done by year of expenditure/year of revenue, so it will be adjusted. He explained that North Dakota suggested at the meeting on August 23rd, that we could use a 3% inflator for the revenue side. He stated that we haven't sent our solicitation letter yet for the Urban Program, but when you see it you will see a 3% inflator included for the annual dollar amount. Grasser asked if they are supposed to be adjusting their projects, then, for year of expenditure as well. Haugen responded that you should, that in the T.I.P. process manual you will see that this is something that will need to be done. Grasser asked if the City would be doing that, or will the NDDOT be doing it. Haugen responded that when we talk about the next agenda item, you will be directed to use 4% per year in your submittals to the MPO, so if you are submitting a project for 2015, you would use current year estimates and adjust them by 4% annually out to 2015, so it will be the City making the adjustments. He added that Minnesota will basically have to do this as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE T.I.P. PROCESS MANUAL

Haugen reported that we did have considerable discussion on this item at our August meeting. He pointed out that he only included those sections of the manual that were substantially changed based on that previous discussion, as well as via some e-mail discussions with FTA.

Haugen referred to Page 45, and pointed out that this is where they worked out the regionally significant projects definition; and on Page 47, per FTAs request, we have included a more thorough write-up on our prioritization process.

Haugen referred to Page 52, and explained that this is the T.I.P. schedule that was determined during the meeting on August 23rd, with a due date of December 15th on the North Dakota side; and a due date of January 19th on the Minnesota side.

Haugen referred to Appendix V, and explained that it includes our annual T.I.P. checklists. He stated that each state has their own separate sheets.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

Haugen reported that one thing they identified, working with Stephanie Hickman and Stacey Hanson, was a separation of the regionally significant projects into two different types: Type 1 are projects that still require federal action, so we treat them as if they are regular T.I.P. projects; and Type 2 projects are those that do not require federal highway or transit action, and may be federally funded by some other source. He added that they essentially narrowed the focus of these down to only those on collectors and above, and only if they have capacity or other operational improvement.

Haugen commented that the Type 1 projects are all T.I.P. projects going through the full T.I.P. process; and Type 2 projects are informational projects, but we still need to account for them in the financial portion of the T.I.P. document.

Grasser said that he is a little confused on Type 1 projects, where it states that “ all projects requiring an action by FHWA or FTA regardless of funding source on existing roadways that are functionally classified as urban collector or rural major collectors and above that add capacity or provide other operational improvements (i.e., traffic signals, round-a-bouts, ITS, etc.)...” and Type 2, “all projects on existing roadways that are functionally classified as urban collector or rural major collector and above that add capacity or provide other operational improvements (i.e., traffic signals, round-a-bouts, ITS, etc.)...” as to what the difference is. Haugen responded that Type 1 projects require federal action, and Type 2 don’t; so for Type 1 projects, regardless of funding source you need action from either Federal Highway or FTA. Grasser asked, then, if they were going to put up a traffic signal using city funds, would they have to have federal action. Haugen responded that they would not because they weren’t using federal funds.

Haugen commented that the next item deals with T.I.P. prioritization and selection. He stated that they have been meeting with staff and going through the T.I.P. scoring sheets and how the process is worked. He referred to Page 47, and pointed out that they have attempted to describe that process, explaining that they essentially used the eight factors in SAFETEA-LU, augmented them by the Livability Principles that Federal Highway and FTA are focused on, and created a scoring system based off of those including a ninth factor of regional. He added that, within different programs, they have weighted them so that something like an enhancement project is weighted more towards non-motorized traffic than motorized traffic, and vice-versa for something that is on a street facility.

Haugen reported that they hope, as discussed, that a project could score 60 or above, showing that it is implementing a lot of the eight factors and livability principles.

Grasser commented, that just to be clear, they have had some previous discussions about the rating process, who does the rating, and he still sees some of that as potentially still being unresolved, as he thinks that different people will rate these different projects and interpret the criteria differently. He said that he understands why we need to do that, to try to figure out where it fits in the overall federal highway funding process, but for the local process, where we are actually selecting projects, we are still considering a lot of criteria that is not reflected in that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

document, such as road conditions, capacity issues, etc., as we get into more of the operation/replacement side of things. He stated that in recognizing this, and getting some of it in the minutes so that our council members can read it, they understand it is a work in process, and they know that this isn't the only criteria that will be used in the selection of projects for the city.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE T.I.P. SELECTION PROCESS MANUAL, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR STUDY

Haugen reported that this is one of the four additional studies the MPO will be conducting. He said that this first project, for which an RFP is being done, is for the South Washington Street Corridor Study, and Nancy Ellis is going to be the MPO Project Manager on this study.

Ellis referred to Pages 80 and 81 of the report, and explained that this RFP is based on the proposal that the Wellness Center be built between 40th and 47th Avenues South, and to the East of South Washington. She added that, based on this, as well as some other potential commercial or wellness type buildings that would be located in this area, they will look at how it will affect traffic conditions and operations and trip generations in and around the area, going from a residential use to more of a commercial use.

Ellis stated that they will be looking at existing and future traffic and land conditions, as well as, if it is built in periodic stages, and if the road is built out. She pointed out that what you are looking at right now is that the road, 11th Street, actually runs north/south from 47th up to 44th, and the possibility of that road connecting up to 40th has not yet been discussed, but it would then lead up to the Wellness Center itself. She added that just having two entrance points, one from 47th and one from 44th, to the Wellness Center may cause some current traffic conditions and future traffic conditions, whether it be intersection control, transit, multi-modal, etc., that will need to be looked at as well.

Ellis reported that the RFP will look at existing traffic conditions, operations, modeling; and then try to model for future conditions, operations, and modeling for when the Wellness Center is constructed, then for when additional facilities are constructed as well.

Ellis stated that there will be a Steering Committee, comprised of property owners, both residential and commercial, City Council, Planning Commission, Park Board, the Aurora Medical Park; and staff from the Park District, Engineering, Public Works – Street, Planning, and the MPO.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

Ellis said that they hope to have the RFP approved by the MPO Executive Policy Board next Wednesday, published on Monday, September 20th, and then submitted to us by November 1st.

Grasser commented that he likes the idea that we are going to have the consultants do traffic operations to determine short-, intermediate-, and long-range potential improvements to help us with our planning process as to what happens when.

Haugen reported that they are also asking the consultant to assist us on figuring out how and if we can service the area with City Transit. Bergman asked, in regard to South 11th Street, are they looking at going all the way from 47th to 40th. Haugen responded that they will be looking at doing that sometime in the future. He added that it is his understanding that it won't be any time soon, however, so the current Route 12/13, which services the Aurora Medical Park, may need to be adjusted. Brooks commented that they are also talking about some potential locations for stops as well, some pull-outs or something like that. He added that they understand that transit probably won't want to drive the half loop in front of the facility, but it is their hope to get you to 11th, but they know that they will need to work with Transit on this. Bergman stated that even on 11th people aren't going to walk out much past the front door when the weather is 40- below, they will have to make some kind of trip through that loop. Brooks said that they will work on this with Transit. Ellis pointed out that that is one of the recommendations in the scope-of-work, as well as multi-modal. She said that they want to make sure that the connections are also looked at in terms of traffic control and safety, as well as how they will lead up to the site or buildings themselves. Grasser added that that will be a very important consideration, because he thinks there are a couple of different opinions on whether or not 11th is sufficient for the bus stop because it is a couple hundred feet to the front door. Haugen commented that the biggest problem is crossing South Washington to service both the medical complex and the wellness center, to be able to get back and forth between those two facilities and still maintain 12/13's schedule.

Ellis stated that she did not receive any comments from either Dean (Rau) or Jane (Williams) regarding the scope-of-work, so staff is seeking approval of the RFP.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR STUDY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF PROJECTS FOR 2011-2012 UPWP

Haugen stated that it is once again time for you to begin consideration of what projects you would like to see included in the MPO's 2011-2012 UPWP. He reported that, as noted, we are going to be updating the Long Range Transportation Plan during the next two years, therefore there will be less monies available than other years to do these special studies, but now is the time to begin compiling your list of projects. He added that staff does request that these projects

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2010**

have the backing of your respective City Councils before you submit them to the MPO for consideration. He stated that we would like to have this done by November so that we can have our State and Federal partners review it in time for us to start January 1st with a new program in place.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. President Obama's Labor Day Speech

Haugen commented that some may have heard about President Obama's Labor Day Speech, and proposal. He stated that the key issue is that the \$50,000,000,000 he talks about is part of a reauthorization bill, and that the \$50,000,000,000 being programmed will be programmed on the front end of the bill, which means that the back side of the bill will be light, although we don't know how congress will act on it, so there could be many changes before any bill is passed.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY JOHNSON, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 8TH, 2010, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:25 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 13th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck; Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Sara Aultman (Proxy for Joe McKinnon), MNDOT (Via Conference Call); and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Guest(s) present were: Farshad Bigdeli, KLJ Consulting Engineers and Larry Zitzow, UND.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen reported that Mr. Bergman should be here shortly, which will then give us a quorum. He suggested that introductions wait until Mr. Bergman arrives in order that he can be included.

DISCUSSION

1. Additional Agenda Item

Haugen stated that he did send out an e-mail, with attachments, to the Technical Advisory Committee regarding a request from the Grand Forks City Engineering Department to do a presentation today, so if everyone is in agreement, he would like to add this as an additional item on the agenda. Everyone was in concurrence that the request be added to the agenda.

2. Reauthorization Of Transportation Bill

Haugen reported that the latest out of the White House is that there appears to be renewed interest on reauthorizing transportation, and he seems like the latest push seems to be a Lame Duck session to get a \$50,000,000,000 investment approved.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

Hanson stated that NDDOT staff is still in the “let’s wait and see” mode in regards to the possibility of a new highway bill being approved. She said that they will try to be optimistic that one will be approved, but they are prepared to operate as they have in the past by continuing resolutions if needed, and then just do the best they can.

Haugen asked if anyone knew whether or not the \$50,000,000,000 down-payment will be a sort of second stimulus, whereby we would need to respond quickly in regard to programming projects, and when will it be distributed. Nobody was able to respond to either question at this time.

Bergman reported present, and a quorum was now present.

RESUME AGENDA

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because we have visitors present today, everyone please state their name and the organization they are representing.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 8TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 8TH,
2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RAILROAD CROSSING STUDIES

Haugen reported that two of the reports are completed and ready for approval, however the Bacon Road Closure Study is not quite completed.

1) Bacon Road Closure Study:

Haugen explained that there hasn’t been much movement since the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and they still have a request in to BNSF to provide us with some sort of documentation regarding the 250-foot clearance requirement they currently maintain. He stated that without that documentation, using the Federal Highway Guidance, it appears that only a 100-foot clearance is necessary.

Haugen reported that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, a request was made to look at how the placement of stop signs might affect the clearance requirement, and it was determined that the distance would actually be increased if stop signs were installed as the vehicles would then need additional time to get moving again, so by

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

allowing them to keep moving at 10-mph, the site distance is less than if they were stopped.

He stated that they may have to proceed forward with the study, and hope that BNSF is able to catch up at some point. He added that they will reconvene a property interest meeting at the Mill to go over the latest information, and are still hoping to have the study completed by the end of the year.

2) Quiet Zone Study:

Haugen reported that highlights from both the Quiet Zone Study and the State Mill Spur Study were included in the packets, and, as you were notified previously, full copies are available on the MPO website. He stated that staff did present both reports to the City Council and they did approve them, therefore staff is now requesting that the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve them as well.

Haugen commented that he received an e-mail from Ms. Williams regarding the fact that BNSF has provided us with a cost estimate on the required improvements for the 55th Street crossing in order for it to be quieted. He stated that the estimate was \$175,000 and includes installation of constant warning time, the bungalow, the arms, the LEDs, etc.. He added that the only thing FRA did when they came for the peer review was to make a determination on constant warning time, and not on the need for any additional improvements. Williams said that she specifically sent a letter to Tammy regarding that, and was told that the FRA does not get into what is needed to make a crossing quiet zone eligible, so basically whatever BNSF says is needed is what we need to do.

Haugen stated that the Quiet Zone Report went to print with the acknowledgement that we know that constant warning times are needed at 55th Street, but added that we are still waiting for communication from BNSF as to what other improvements might be necessary in order for the 55th Street crossing to be quiet zone eligible. He added that the constant warning time will cost about \$30,000.

Haugen reported that the notice of intent has already been submitted by the City of Grand Forks for both the downtown zone and the 42nd Street zone, and the comment period ends on October 20th. He added that the notice of intent for the Amtrak zone, the east and west "Ys", was also submitted, and the comment period for that area ends in November.

Williams commented that they needed up with five different quiet zones because there are five different lines involved, with 55th Street being the fifth one. She added that when they get to 32nd and 17th, that will actually be a sixth quiet zone because that is on a separate line as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

Haugen asked if any comments have been received on any of these areas. Williams responded that she has not received any comments to date, although she has heard, through Tammy, that BNSF is preparing some comments. She explained that, apparently BNSF comments on all such issues, and the comments more or less generic and issues such as proper placement of signage, etc.. Haugen asked if this means that we may be able to quiet the downtown by the end of the month. Williams responded that the downtown can be quieted 21 days after the end of the comment period. She stated that she is in the process of preparing signing and striping plans, so in the event one of BNSF's comments is that they want to see the signing and striping plans, they will be ready. She added that most of the signs have been purchased, and the striping is already being done. Haugen stated, then, that the downtown could be quieted by Thanksgiving, and the other two areas by Christmas, if all goes well. Williams agreed, and added that what they are planning on doing for 55th Street is to get all the information together to apply for the grant to put in the required improvements, and to also determine where the other funding will come from to pay for the remaining costs as they can only use \$75,000 for a crossing out of the grant, and the City has a 10% match, so additional funding will be necessary. She said that they will then need to apply to BNSF to find out when they can do the improvements, adding that this will be a process as it took them almost four months to just give us the estimate.

3) State Mill Spur Study:

Haugen reported that of the ten crossings along the spur, three are being recommended for closure, and the remaining seven being sequenced in when financing becomes available to put in the active warning devices. He stated that this will mean that at some point the spur will qualify for quiet zone status, but it won't qualify any time soon.

Haugen said that the report also includes discussion on some other aesthetic improvements and Rail with Trail recommendations. He referred to Page 53, and pointed out that it includes the financial summary table that shows all the different recommendations and their cost components. He said that of the \$3.2 million dollar total, \$2.5 million dollars is for constant warning devices.

Williams asked if they have received anything more on the University crossing from the State. Haugen responded that he would have to look at the e-mail he received concerning this area, but he seems to recall that it was moved up considerably from where it had previously been ranked with the State, but he isn't sure where it is at now.

Bergman asked if both 6th and 7th Avenue North crossings are being recommended for closure. Haugen responded they were, but that the closures will not affect transit.

MOVED BY HANSON, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE QUIET ZONE AND STATE MILL SPUR ASSESSMENT STUDIES.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 47TH AVENUE SOUTH STUDY RFP

Haugen reminded the committee that the MPO's Annual Unified Work Program was amended to include four additional studies, and this agenda item, as well as the next, are two of those studies. He stated that Nancy Ellis is the Program Manager for this study, and is present today to go over the RFP.

Ellis referred to Page 79 of the packet, and explained that it shows the segment of 47th Avenue South that we will be doing a transportation study on. She stated that this section of 47th Avenue South is currently a rural roadway, and doesn't have the curbing and gutter required for it to be urbanized, so as we move forward with urbanizing this roadway, we need to consider traffic conditions and such for the future of that corridor area.

Ellis stated that they will not only be looking at what intersection improvements are needed, but will also consider future traffic volumes, multi-modal improvements, and transit usage along the corridor as well. She added that in addition to increased traffic being generated by both the school and the park, a lot of development has been going on in and around that corridor, so we need to consider current and future traffic conditions, how we will urbanize it, how many lanes might be needed, turning movement lengths, and the possibility of a future interchange off of I-29 and how that would impact 47th as well.

Ellis commented that the last item of consideration for this study will be what impacts the Wellness Center, which will border 47th, might have on the traffic patterns.

Ellis reported that the RFP is to do a transportation study looking at current and future traffic conditions; multi-modal and transit between Columbia and South Washington; consideration of the Wellness Center, and its possible impacts on traffic patterns; and consideration of the impacts of a possible interchange. She stated that it will include Steering Committee Members from the Park District, the School District, the neighborhood, transit, public works, engineering, and the MPO. She added that they hope to have a consultant on board by the middle of December, and a final document available and approved by October 2011.

Bergman asked if there had been any discussion by the School District regarding a possible future school in this area. Ellis responded that there has been some discussion, and she did visit with the School District themselves, however they don't really have a long range plan as to when and where any schools might be built, so they won't commit that a school will be located there, although they do own the property.

Ellis commented that, as Mr. Haugen stated, the MPO is doing four additional studies, this one, and the Washington Street/Underpass Study are the first two, and the next one will involve looking at a grid, or street network for everything to the west of Columbia Road, with 47th being the southern border, and Columbia Road being the east border.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 47TH AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY RFP, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE WASHINGTON STREET/UNDERPASS STUDY RFP

Haugen reported that a copy of the RFP was included in the packet, however no map was included. He stated that just after the packets went out, staff received some modifications to the termini from the NDDOT, primarily affecting the southern most cross-street of Washington. He explained that they previously had been thinking that Hammerling, where it transitions from the five-lane undivided section to the four-lane divided section, would be the logical place to end the study, but the State requested that we go to the next functionally classified roadway, which would be 17th Avenue South, so the termini for the study is now 17th Avenue South to 8th Avenue North, which is also a functionally classified roadway, and where the roadway transitions from a five-lane undivided section to a four-lane divided section.

Haugen commented that some of the smaller issues we will be looking at include all the access points along the corridor and some ADA issues along the corridor, but the principle scope of work is to try to help identify phasing of improvements of this segment of Washington, which is one of the older paved segments of the corridor. He reported that this segment has been milled and overlaid and chip-sealed, so the normal sequence now would be reconstruction, however that is a very costly and disruptive process, so one of the things we are asking the consultant to do is to provide us with alternatives that will help us resolve some of the issues we have with the corridor, but keep the costs of doing so down.

Haugen explained that the DeMers Avenue/Washington Street Intersection has been recommended for widening in the Long Range Transportation Plan, however it is anticipated that the cost of the additional right-of-way to do this will be considerable, and that, along with the high cost of the widening itself, will result in a very expensive project. He said that in addition to the high cost of the widening project, it has been determined that the project will not really provide the level of service required by the NDDOT for an intersection of two state highways, therefore, we will be asking the consultant to assist us with this issue as well.

Haugen reported that, finally, in regard to the underpass itself, as you will recall the Grand Forks District Office submitted a proposal to reconstruct the underpass as part of our list of projects, with an estimated cost of \$15,000,000 to \$17,000,000; however we are now asking the consultant to look at other options that might assist in resolving some of the issues we have with the underpass structure itself at a lower cost, as well as how to sequence the improvements in with the cash flow we are anticipating will be available in the near-term.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

Haugen stated that they hope to have a consultant on board by the middle of December, however this is a little more complex study than the previous study discussed as the NDDOT has requested that their local government division be part of the stakeholder group, and that prior to any finalization of the report that a presentation be made to their management team.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE WASHINGTON STREET AND UNDERPASS STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

Larry Zitzow, UND, stated that he has one concern. He explained that they received a letter the other day concerning work that is going to be done on 32nd. Haugen reported that the work being done on 32nd is programmed to occur in 2012. Zitzow explained that his concern is that consideration be given for access to UND Campus during graduation, fall school opening, and other fall activities. Williams responded that they actually discussed this issue the other day, and, in-fact discussed the projects themselves, and they will try to have a completion date of August 15th on most of these projects.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF MNDOT VISIONING PROCESS

Aultman referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the packet, and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Aultman stated that the purpose of the presentation today is kind of three-fold: 1) to introduce their office at MNDOT; 2) to provide a summary of the recent planning efforts that have occurred at MNDOT over the last four to five years; and 3) to look at the current vision for transportation that is emerging from the recent planning efforts.

Aultman reported that their new office was created in February 2010, adding that they were originally part of Investment Management, which is their highway planning and programming department. She stated that they have five goals they want to accomplish: 1) to develop and articulate a long-term vision; 2) to lead the development of the next Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan; 3) to coordinate transportation planning efforts among modal offices, Districts, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and Regional Development Commissions; 4) to develop policies and guidance to advance multimodal planning; and 5) to enhance MnDot's multimodal planning expertise.

Aultman referred to the slide presentation, and stated that she would now like to go over the vision background. She stated that over the last five years MnDot has started and completed more than a dozen plans, which is evident in the diagram shown.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

Aultman commented that in addition to these numerous plans, they have an internal vision for MnDot's Department as well; to be a global leader in transportation, committed to upholding public needs and collaboration with internal and external partners to create a safe, efficient and sustainable transportation system for the future.

Aultman reported that MnDot's vision for Minnesota's transportation system is to create an integrated, connected and accessible transportation system that exists throughout the state and provides safe, reliable options for mobility and competitive access to statewide, national, and international markets. She referred to several slides and pointed out that they explain the various ways MnDot is accomplishing this vision.

Aultman referred to several slides illustrating the different elements of the existing and proposed strategic system, and went over them briefly.

Aultman reported that the legislature passed the 2010 Transportation Omnibus Bill, and they came up with some new and/or modified goals for the transportation system on a state level, including: 1) increasing access for all persons and businesses and to ensure economic well-being; 2) to enhance economic development; 3) to increase transit, biking and walking as a percent of all trips; and 4) to ensure infrastructure is maintained in a state of good repair. She pointed out that there are also some issues and expectations on a federal level; explaining that there has been an increased focus on a livability/sustainability partnership, as well as a number of discretionary programs, which will only increase in the future, so they are struggling within the department to try to figure out how they fit in to this new direction they all need to go in, and they came up with a Draft USDOT Strategic Plan that will: a) improve public health and safety; b) to maintain critical infrastructure in state of good repair; c) to foster economic competitiveness; d) to foster livable communities; and e) to advance environmentally sustainable policies. She added that a Federal Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill could: a) use performance measures to drive national objectives; b) call for reductions in GHG emissions; and c) increase the use of discretionary grant programs.

Aultman stated that going forward MnDot intends to conduct an intensive visioning process in 2011 that will: 1) look 50 years into the future; 2) address all modes of transportation; and 3) consider economic competitiveness, livability, sustainability, safety and state of good repair. She pointed out that their struggles will be in balancing their priorities. She added that the visioning process will lead directly into the next statewide multimodal plan, so this will all help build the framework for that plan.

QUESTIONS:

Haugen asked if there would be a representative from the MPO directors on the Steering Committee. Aultman responded that there would not. Haugen asked how they intend to get input from this area. Aultman responded that they are still working on this, and are trying to get a consultant on board, but as they move forward they will definitely keep the MPOs informed. Haugen asked, then, if this will be more central office driven or would they be working with the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

district planners. Aultman responded that it is her understanding that it will be more central office driven.

Information only.

MATTER OF NDDOT ITEMS

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that it does include information from NDDOT, concerning: 1) Reorganization of the Planning Programming Division; 2) Announcement of an additional \$60,000,000 in federal funds coming to North Dakota; and 3) Update on the outcome of the eight regional and statewide meetings held regarding transportation earlier this year.

Hanson reported that the Planning and Programming Division did go through a reorganization process. She explained that on September 1st the Director announced that that division would be split into two divisions, effective immediately, however there would be a transition period to get the required staff on board to cover some of the new duties. She stated that basically there will be a division called “Planning and Asset Management Division” and a “Programming Division”. She explained that the Planning and Asset Management Division was basically created to meet the increasing demands with the federal rules being implemented, and to work on initiatives such as policy legislation and performance measures.

Hanson said that Scott Zainhofsky, who is currently the Director of Planning and Programming, will now be the Director of the Planning and Asset Management Division, and he will have several sections in his division, including: 1) Policy and Legislation; 2) Asset Management and Performance Measures; 3) Planning Cartography; 4) Pavement Management; 5) Data; and 6) Rail.

Hanson stated that the Programming Division will have a new division leader, who is yet to be determined, and will manage the development of the S.T.I.P., federal financing, traffic operation functions, and will also include their Scoping Section.

Haugen asked where the MPO will be within this new structure. Hanson responded that the MPO will remain with Local Government for now, in the Urban and Transit sections, and then they will continue to work with both Planning and Asset Management and Program Division. Haugen asked if local government is still being housed under the planning side. Hanson responded that local government is a separate division that works very closely with the other two divisions, and is physically housed in the same area as the other two divisions as well, and will most likely continue in that capacity in the future.

Haugen asked if there was going to be a Safety Division created, and is transit going to be moved to that once it is in place. Hanson responded that there was a Safety Division created, and the Safe Routes To School program did move into that division, as did traffic licensing and traffic safety. She explained that the Safety Division was basically developed to focus on safety issues and to work towards reducing crashes statewide, and to look into fatal crashes that have occurred

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

throughout the state in order to try to determine how we can reduce the number of fatal crashes, including what can be done to reduce the number of fatal crashes caused by drunk drivers. She added that the new director is Mark Nelson.

Hanson commented that in regard to the \$60,000,000 in additional federal aid that North Dakota is receiving, basically there was an award of around \$48,000,000 in federal funds that would come into the state, but in order to spend that the state has come up with \$12,000,000 in state match, if needed for state highway projects, which is where the \$60,000,000 figure came from. She stated that, at this time, NDDOT is working with the Federal Highway Administration to see what rules and requirements are associated with these additional funds. She explained that these are basically funds that were not spent by other states, so they were released for reassignment, and we were one of the recipients of those dollars. She added that they don't know, at this time, which funding sources these monies will go to, so until that is determined we won't know what kinds of projects can be funded. Haugen asked if they are anticipating moving projects in the current S.T.I.P. forward, or identifying new projects, or is that still to be determined. Hanson responded that it is still yet to be determined, however, after the first stimulus, and getting a little behind with all the additional dollars, the state did become a little more proactive, and did start developing a few more projects to get them done and on the shelf so that if additional funding were made available, or if a project were delayed, we would have projects available for the additional funding.

Hanson stated that there had been some discussion about a possible second stimulus, with the JOBS Bill, so they really kept developing projects, so we do have some projects that have been developed and are included in the 2011-2014 S.T.I.P., in various different years, so more than likely some of those would be moved up for the additional funding. She said that they have had a lot of requests for projects out in the western part of the state because of the truck traffic from the oil wells, and there are other areas throughout the state that have flooding issues that don't qualify for ER funding, so there are a lot of possibilities out there.

Haugen said that it appears that these are all federal highway dollars, so there most likely won't be anything available for transit projects. Hanson responded that they are all federal highway dollars, and she has not heard whether or not FTA has similar dollars available.

Rau asked if these funds would transfer down to local cities. Hanson responded that that will depend on what pot of money they come out of, so if there are any ties to certain pots of monies, if it was from an interstate pot, and we are obligated to tie it back to that same pot, then it would have to go on an interstate project.

Haugen asked if all of the federal funds would go into one pot, and then be distributed per the famous flow chart, with cities getting 16.67% of the funds. Hanson responded normally that is how everything works, so we would assume that that would be something that we could do, however what they aren't sure of is if another state released inter-state dollars, do those dollars have to be used as inter-state dollars again, and that is what they are working on before they try to distribute any money. Lang asked when they anticipate knowing the answer to this. Hanson

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

responded that she isn't sure of that. She said that they were only notified of the funds a couple of weeks ago, and she isn't sure if the actual funds have even been release yet.

Hanson reported that NDDOT worked with Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute to conduct eight regional transportation meetings. She explained that the eight meetings were held to get public input on issues such as: 1) levels of service for state and local roads, to see what people thought in terms of what level of service those roads should provide; 2) current and future levels of funding; and 3) highway performance classification system the DOT uses and how counties could a similar system to prioritize their roadway systems throughout the state.

Hanson referred to a power point slide, and stated that the summary meeting held in May suggested that the number one area of concern, across the board, was roadway maintenance, the second was ride, and then from there it kind of varies somewhat.

Hanson reported that Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute is working on a final report for the DOT, which they had anticipated being done in September, however that did not occur, but it should be done soon, and will be made available on the DOT's website.

Haugen referred to a slide of a graph developed from the findings of the meetings, and explained that what it attempts to identify, based on what Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute was able to work on with the NDDOT, is that under the current funding scenario, which they are projecting out to 2030, they have roughly \$3.2 billion dollars, and, again, none of these numbers are adjusted for inflation. He pointed out that, what you can see from the curve is that this does not allow them to maintain the current service levels. He added that, as part of their highway performance classification system there are guidelines to which they would like all the state highways to perform, so they would need, just to maintain how things are currently, as you see in the latter years, \$1.7 billion dollars; and then to get everything back up to the highway performance classification system guidelines, they would need another \$815 million dollars to be able to upgrade things. He stated that, as part of the input process, people suggested upgrading certain roadway classifications from district collector to statewide collector, or some of those other terminologies, and in doing some other improvements, they identified they would need an additional \$1 billion dollars, bringing the total up to \$3.5 billion dollars.

Haugen commented that, getting back to the budget and the legislative session coming up, this was an attempt to identify that we can't do our current system because it isn't sustainable, so at a minimum, just to be able to maintain what we have we need to somehow come up with \$1.7 billion dollars, and if we want to achieve what the highway performance classification system suggests, we need even more, so ultimately we need to either find a way to accomplish this or we need to evaluate our plans to see if our guidelines are too aggressive or our expectations too high.

Haugen stated that the last couple of pages in the packet are specific to the input meetings held in Grand Forks, and more information is available on the UGPTI website.

Information only

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

GRAND FORKS CITY ENGINEERING PRESENTATION

Rau stated that he would like to give a short power point presentation today. He explained that the same presentation was given to the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee last evening, and it is basically an informational item for both them and the Technical Advisory Committee.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Rau reported that, as you know, the DOT programs out several years, and with the current funding situation between federal and city funds, we could be coming into a shortfall and may not be able to fund all our projects.

Rau stated that the focus of the presentation are on three projects that need to be done as soon as possible: 1) Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor, from Cherry Street to the Point Bridge; 2) 47th Avenue; and 2) South Columbia Road, from 36th Avenue to 47th Avenue South.

Rau explained that South Columbia Road is currently a two lane roadway, and has a considerable amount of traffic using it, and the projects indicate that those numbers will only increase in the future, so we would like to get it widened as soon as possible in order to accommodate the increased traffic.

Rau stated that the City's current fund balance is near zero, and there are projects currently in the cue that will bring it down even further, so in order to be able to do these three projects we would need to save up for many years, and not do any projects in the interim, and now with other states complaining that they don't want to continue to be "donor" states any longer, our funding may be cut even further, so there are some definite unknowns for our future projects.

Rau reported that they did get some additional funding that allowed us to do some maintenance on some of our roadway, including panel replacements, overlays, etc.. He stated that there has been some discussion that with the new highway bill we could get an influx of monies for a couple of years, and then it would trail off, so there are just a lot of unknowns out there right now, and it appears that we could have some funds through 2013, then we aren't sure how things will be.

Rau commented that some new developments and concerns are that: 1) a significant amount of Granitoid has been de-listed from the National Register, which has opened up some new possibilities concerning the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor; 2) pavement cross sections have been developed; and 3) a traffic growth graph has been developed.

Rau referred to a map illustrating where the Granitoid is located, and explained that everything highlighted is on what was the old register, and what is shown with green cross-hatching is what will be on the new register, so quite a bit has been de-listed, with only one block, from Cottonwood to Walnut, will still remain on the register.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

Rau reported that the current traffic counts indicate that there are about 6,000 vehicles traveling this corridor daily, however those numbers are projected to increase to about 13,000 by 2035. He said that the current level of service on this corridor is sufficient, but with the projected increase in traffic that will no longer be the case.

Rau stated that, without changing the footprint of the roadway, and the road is only 31-feet wide, what they are looking at now would be to just do a mill and overlay on the area from Cherry to the levy, except for that one block of granitoid, however a lot of negotiations will still need to be done before this could be accomplished. He said that they would not do anything with the curb and gutter, except to replace those areas that are severely damaged, but this would definitely give us a better ride on that roadway, while allowing us time to do more investigative work. He added that all areas with newer concrete, including the intersection of Minnesota/4th and the area past 4th Avenue, would not be touched at this time.

Rau reported that some of the estimates they have to just do a mill and overlay on the areas shown in black on the map, indicate that it would cost about \$150,000 adjusted for the year of construction, which would be 2012. He said that the city would pick up the full \$643,000, so adjacent property owners would not need to be assessed. He added, however, that any additional amenities; such as the round-about, additional pedestrian lighting, landscaping, medians, etc., would have to be assessed, and would be included as an option that the property owners could vote on.

Haugen asked how the mill and overlay would address the rideability with all the cracks and heaving. Rau responded that once the roadway is milled, the unevenness would be removed, so you would get a smoother ride. Haugen said, then, that this will entail a heavy milling. Rau responded that they will be removing between two and three inches from the roadway, so a good chunk of the existing granitoid will be removed. He added that there is currently seven inches of concrete there, with an inch and a half of granitoid wearing surface, and then seven and a half more inches of concrete under that, so they would be taking a good chunk of the existing profile out, and then put it back with asphalt in order to get a much better ride. He stated that as far as the crack issue is concerned, there are options out there including putting a geo-textile fabric between the layers, which stops the majority of the cracking from reflecting through the asphalt, however they haven't determined a final design at this time.

Haugen asked if this would be a concrete overlay. Rau responded that it would be an asphalt overlay. Haugen asked if concrete was considered. Rau responded that they have not looked at doing a concrete overlay at this time, but it could be considered since they are leaving the curb and gutter alone, however there are some drawbacks with a concrete overlay because you would not be able to use that geo-textile fabric so cracking would come through almost immediately, but they can look into it further.

Rau stated that the one block segment of granitoid that would remain could be dealt with a full reconstruction, meaning they could do some historical mitigation on it. He pointed out, however,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

that just doing that one block area would cost about \$190,000, but could go higher if additional historical measures are required.

Rau reported that to do a full reconstruction of Minnesota/4th, without any historical measures included, and adjusting the cost to 2015, the cost would be about \$4.4 million dollars; and if we include the historical options, again projecting it out to 2015, the cost would be about \$7 million dollars, and that would take a tremendous bite out of our budget.

Haugen asked what the difference was between 2a and 2b. Rau responded that it is basically the historical and context sensitive items, pointing out that stamped concrete adds an additional \$600,000 to the overall budget. Haugen commented, however, that he thinks you will find that two big costs are stamped concrete and the curbing, adding that it is his understanding that the curb itself has not been de-listed, just the pavement. Williams responded that she specifically asked that question, and both the curb and the granitoid were de-listed.

Rau stated that, again, this will all have to go through negotiations with the Historical Preservation Board to make sure it is okay with them. Ellis said that that is what concerns her. She explained that she was involved in the study, and thinks that our agreeing to replace the granitoid with stamped concrete probably weighed heavily into their agreeing to de-list so much of the granitoid, and now if we come back and say “thanks for de-listing it”, but we are just going to mill and overlay it, she would be curious to see what their response will be. Rau agreed, adding that this isn’t set in stone, this is just something they are looking at to try to get the best ride out there, the quickest way possible. Ellis reminded everyone, however, that the last time we did a study on this corridor, and then tried to do things, the whole neighborhood got together and got it put on the historical register because they didn’t want things to change.

Rau referred to the cost summary, and went over the cost options briefly. He pointed out that Item 2B shows the costs of including the historical and context sensitive solutions, and explained that the numbers shown are assuming we would receive the full \$4.9 million in federal funds, and since we don’t know if there might be any additional monies available for mitigation, this is just what we know. He said that when you look at the assessment cost of \$1.2 million, we, as a city cannot pick up that amount in addition to the City’s costs, so it would need to be assessed to the neighborhood, which could result in their protesting the entire project out. Williams added that that was the point of suggesting doing a mill and overlay, as a mill and overlay would be paid almost entirely by the city, while doing anything more would result in assessments, and would be protestable, which brings us right back to doing nothing again, so that is why they are going through all these scenarios.

Rau stated that the next item is Columbia Road, from 36th Avenue to 47th Avenue. He said that this is currently a two-lane roadway, and there is a lot of traffic out there, and even though it has been posted with a lower speed limit, traffic is exceeding that considerably, so it is becoming difficult for vehicles to enter from 47th and 40th, as well as for vehicles to enter onto Columbia. He commented that there is an estimated 6,000 vehicles traveling this roadway daily, and in 2035 that is projected to increase to almost 25,000, so it does need to be dealt with soon.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

Rau reported that they are looking at two different options; one is a five lane with a common left turn lane in the center, and the other is a four lane with a median and turn lanes.

Rau explained that the main drawback of a four lane with a median is that you would need a wider footprint. He stated that they could do a five lane section using 65-feet compared to 74-feet or more for a four lane with a median.

Rau referred to a slide illustrating the pavement cost estimates, and pointed out that to do a five lane with a center turning lane it would cost about \$10.5 million dollars; and to do a five lane with a median it would cost about \$11.1 million dollars. He added that the main reason for the higher cost of adding a median is that we would need to acquire additional right-of-way.

Ellis asked if, when the 47th Avenue South study is being done, they should consider these proposed improvements. Rau responded that they should.

Rau referred to a slide listing the recommendations made to the Service Safety Committee, and went over them briefly. He stated that Al Grasser is planning on presenting this to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their meeting next week.

Haugen stated that he did express to Mr. Grasser this morning, when he asked that it be added to today's agenda, that timing is the main issue with this recommendation. He explained that Columbia Road is not in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan for this time period, and if we are going to move it to this timeframe, we have to move something out in order to meet our requirement to be financially constrained. He added that projects need to be submitted to us by December 1st in order to be able to amend our Long Range Transportation Plan, so we most likely aren't going to be able to achieve that because we still need to go through the public input process in order that we make sure we are trading off the right projects to include these projects.

Haugen explained that the whole federal field of funds is predicated on our Long Range Transportation Plan, and we went through a multi-year process with public involvement, approval from the Technical Advisory Committee and City Councils, to sequence and timeframe projects, so that is the issue we have with this, that it puts us in an uncomfortable position of not having enough time to accomplish what is being recommended.

Haugen stated that he would prepare a staff report for this item for the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, and asked if there would be a City staff report as well. Rau responded that they could use the one, with modifications, used for the Service Safety Committee meeting last night.

Lang asked how they came up with the projected traffic growth for 2035. Rau responded that he believes it came from the 2035 transportation plan they have, but since he wasn't the one that developed the graph, he can't say for sure. Williams added that they just did a straight-line projection. Rau explained that they used the current, and the projected, and just drew a straight line, so it may not be exact but at least give us an idea of what the future traffic might be out

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

there. Haugen asked if the volumes were based on the recommended plan network, or are they based on the future baseline. Rau said he wasn't sure. Haugen stated that that would be a big difference as well.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Title VI Audits

Hanson stated that she would just like to comment on, mostly for the City's benefit, their Title VI plan the DOT has been working on. She explained that as they have been working on their Title VI compliance effort within the department, they have also gone out, over the summer, and conducted audits on four local jurisdictions with regards to their Title VI compliance. She said that the audits all wrapped up either the end of September or the first part of October, and some of the local jurisdictions did have some work to do in order to maintain their Title VI compliance, or to be in compliance, and they all did achieve that, or will shortly. She commented that this is something that will continue to be done on a regular basis, so just a heads up that this is something that will be coming here sometime soon.

2. MnDot Announcement

Haugen asked if there might be an announcement from MnDot concerning the fact that they received an end-of-the-year funding bonus of monies that other states couldn't spend, as was the case with North Dakota. Aultman responded that she thinks there might be something like that coming the end of the week.

Haugen stated that there was also an indication during a discussion held before this meeting, that there may be a couple more announcements regarding some additional program funds as well. Aultman agreed, explaining that it is primarily due to the Department of Employment Economic Development doing a solicitation for projects that promote economic development. Aultman had provided Haugen with the info.

Information only.

3. Agenda Packets

Haugen announced that since the entire agenda package is now available on the MPO's website, and in our effort to go green, the agenda packets will no longer be mailed out. He added that instead an e-mail will be sent as soon as all the information has been posted on the website. He stated that this will also be the case for the MPO Executive Board meetings as well.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY JOHNSON, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 13TH,
2010, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:15 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 10th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Ryan Brooks (Proxy For Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Guest(s) present were: Farshad Bigdeli, KLJ Consulting Engineers; Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer; Justin Roeder, UND Law Student; and Larry Zitzow, UND.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present, everyone please state their names and the organization they represent.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 13TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 13TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2011-2014 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that these amendments are transit related projects. He referred to the staff report, and pointed out that the public hearing will actually be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday. He explained that he had to delay the public hearing until then in order to meet the ten-day meeting notice requirement, but the notice has been published and they are asking for written comments until November 17th.

Haugen commented that essentially what is happening here is that there have been some additional JARC and New Freedom monies included into the document; and, as part of the 5309 Grant, the City of Grand Forks has now identified how they would like to spend their share of those monies as well.

Haugen explained that the JARC and New Freedom projects are being processed as Administrative Modifications, which means that we are just modifying the award amounts in the T.I.P. document. He added that they 5309 Funds are actually an amendment into the T.I.P. document.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the actual changes being made to the T.I.P. tables, and explained that originally the 5309 Grant was over \$1,000,000, and as you can see we are now just programming roughly \$390,000 in federal funds; and we originally requested about \$100,000 in JARC funds, but are now programming only \$40,000; and for New Freedom we originally had \$33,000, but are only programming \$27,800.

Haugen reported that the JARC/New Freedom projects are shown in Fiscal Year 2009 and the 5309 projects are shown in Fiscal Year 2010. He added that we are still hoping to receive Fiscal Year 2010 and 2011 awards, and if awarded they will need to be amended into the T.I.P. as well.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE FY2011-2014 T.I.P. AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF RECONCILING THE NORTH DAKOTA 2011-2014 S.T.I.P. WITH THE
MPO 2011-2014 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is actually a discussion item. He explained that when the North Dakota S.T.I.P. came out there were some discrepancies with some of the cost estimates between it, and what we showed in our T.I.P.. He stated that through e-mail exchanges between Mr. Noehre and himself, they have been able to identify what needs to occur in order to take care of most of the discrepancies.

Haugen went over the four projects affected as follows:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010**

- 1) Gateway Drive – I-29 to the Red River: Haugen stated that it is their belief the S.T.I.P. should be amended to reflect what the T.I.P. shows. Hanson agreed that the plan is to amend the S.T.I.P. and have the T.I.P. remain as is.
- 2) I-29 Northbound CPR Grinding: Haugen stated that it is their belief the T.I.P. should be amended to reflect what the S.T.I.P. shows. He pointed out that the cost estimate has almost doubled from what is shown in the T.I.P., as has the award, and that needs to be reflected.
- 3) I-29 Signing Both Directions: Haugen stated that it is their belief the T.I.P. should be amended to reflect what the S.T.I.P. shows.
- 4) FTA New Freedom: Haugen stated that it is their belief the S.T.I.P. should be amended to reflect what the T.I.P. shows. Johnson responded that he will need to check on this to make sure that really is the case.

Haugen summarized by saying that the MPO will need to go through an amendment process next month to reflect the differences between the S.T.I.P. and the T.I.P. for Project 1, and the State will need to go through the process for Projects 2 and 3. He added that we will need to do further checking to determine who needs to amend their plan for Project 4.

MATTER OF STATUS OF URBAN ROADS MAP

Haugen reminded the committee that they approved an updated Urban Roads map a couple of months ago, after which it was submitted to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval, and then to the NDDOT for their review and approval. He pointed out that a copy of a letter from the NDDOT stating that they could not approve the 2010 Urban Roads System Map we submitted was included in the packet, as was a copy of the updated map. He asked that someone from the NDDOT please go over the reason why the map was rejected

Hanson responded that basically the rejection has to do with the request to add the various ramps to the Regional Highway System. She explained that the NDDOT is not adding additional miles to the Highway System at this time, therefore, because it was all encompassed in one request, they did reject the entire map. She stated, however, that the changes made to the Urban Road system could be resubmitted for approval.

Haugen stated that neither of them have the ramps on any map that shows their status as either regional or urban local. He asked if both the Columbia Road ramps and the DeMers ramp were not able to be approved for the Regional System, or just the Columbia Road ramps. Hanson responded that they would have to either be on the Urban Road System or a local road. Haugen asked if this was true even though the current project on DeMers is going to do work on the DeMers Avenue ramps, you don't want them on the regional system. Hanson responded that that would be correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010**

Haugen asked what the Technical Advisory Committee would like to do on this issue, do you want to amend the map to show the ramps as local roads, or have further discussions to try to make the NDDOT change their minds.

Boppre asked if there was an urgency to get this approved. Haugen responded that there are a couple of projects that are going through PCR processes, so it would be good to get the map approved soon.

Brooks suggested that they could separate the ramps from the rest of the map, and submit two separate requests, thus allowing us to have further conversations regarding the ramps. Ellis stated that she would agree with this suggestion, as it would allow us to move forward with the other requested changes to the Urban Road System.

Rau commented that the biggest issue would be 20th Avenue South, because, if the map isn't approved, that road would not be eligible for federal funds.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE REQUESTING STAFF DEVELOP TWO SEPARATE MAPS; ONE SHOWING PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FEDERAL URBAN AID BOUNDARY; AND ONE SHOWING THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RAMPS AT COLUMBIA ROAD AND DEMERS AVENUE.

Brooks asked if, in the meantime, could we find out whether or not other cities include their ramps as well. Haugen asked if Ms. Hanson and Mr. Johnson could assist with this. Hanson responded that all of their maps are on their website, so she could send a link to Mr. Haugen as to where he can find the maps for all thirteen cities, and then you can see how their urban systems work. Haugen stated that he knows where those maps are at, but he was hoping they could do the legwork in identifying whether or not other cities include their ramps on their Urban Road Systems. Hanson responded that she isn't sure many cities do, but she will look into it further, as well.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RESULTS OF DAR/SENIOR RIDER RFP

Kouba reported that, basically, some of the costs were a little higher than they expected, so they decided to negotiate with Grand Forks Taxi to have them provide the drivers and additional vehicles, as needed; then the City of Grand Forks will take over the reservations and the maintenance and fueling of the City owned vehicles only. She stated that they were able to negotiate that specific price with Grand Forks Taxi for \$11.45.

Brooks asked if those vehicles have to be dedicated just for that service now, because he knows in the past they used them both. Bergman responded that they do have to be dedicated. He explained that with the last Tri-Annual Review, the prior contract they had with Grand Forks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010**

Taxi had them pay the local match for the vehicles, and FTA said that that will not happen again because you can't have one specific agency or group pay the local match, so the City will now have to pay the local match, and then when we get ready to dispose of them they will have to be put out for bids.

Bergman commented that the cost of this service went from \$8.64 to \$17.00 a ride, which is quite a jump, but we were able to negotiate that cost down to \$11.45 by taking on the vehicle maintenance, fueling and scheduling.

Haugen commented that, as noted in the staff report, this really creates an imbalance with our fiscally constrained plan for transit services. He stated that we were fortunate enough to have lower costs the last five years so that we were able to build up a surplus of funds, close to \$500,000, so we will be able to cover this increase for a while, but that won't be the case forever. He pointed out that because of this, the staff report does indicate that we will need to include an activity to update the TDP in our next UPWP in order to determine a plan of action as to how we can get the plan fiscally constrained, and still maintain our level of service.

Bergman stated that, ultimately, this year will be ugly for everybody. Kouba added that it is also why we will be doing a one year contract, with negotiations occurring each consecutive year for the next four years. Brooks asked if, with the TDP update, they would be looking at possibly doing this service in-house again in the future. Bergman responded that that will be one option they will look at, but added that it will also allow us to get a better handle on both our expenses and theirs.

Haugen reported that there were a couple other changes made as well. He stated that they are increasing the age of senior rider eligibility from 55 to 62; and are shortening the hours for taking reservations, which hopefully will prompt people to make their reservations 24-hours in advance. He added that one thing they could do with their analysis next year would be to have different fare amounts for same day services versus advance service.

Haugen pointed out that there is also a suggested fare increase shown as well. He stated that between now and the first of the year we will need to hold some public hearings to determine how and if that is an appropriate suggestion. He commented that the outer year increases are more academic, and are not actually be proposed, but are simply to show that as costs increase, fares may need to increase as well.

MATTER OF DRAFT REPORT FOR 2010 A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY

Ellis commented that we usually conduct an A.T.A.C. School Safety Study every year for two or three schools, and this year we looked at Wilder, Winship, and St. Michaels. She explained that there has been some confusion as to whether or not this is a Safe Routes To School type of study, but it isn't as this study addresses bus, vehicle drop-off and pick-up, as well as pedestrians and bicyclists.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010**

Ellis reported that the main objective of the study was to evaluate pedestrian safety, review roadway and parking issues, review traffic control and pavement markings, evaluate traffic circulation and provide short and long-term improvements for each school.

Ellis referred to the staff report, and went over the recommendations as listed.

Ellis commented that the last recommendation was to do three “bump-outs”. She explained that this would entail removal of a portion of the right-of-way to allow room for buses, day care vans, and additional pick up areas. She cited Wilder as an example, and pointed out that it is located on a one-way street, and parents will sometimes stop in the driving lane and drop off their children, so if they were to have an area that they can pull into to drop the children off it would hopefully eliminate that practice from occurring, and allow for the safe drop off of children. Brooks asked if there were any concerns with the re-entry of vehicles from the bump-out location. Ellis responded that it would be a little awkward for drivers, but it is the best opportunity available to what they are currently doing.

Kouba asked if the buses for St. Michaels will be informed if a bump-out is done on 5th Avenue instead of 5th Street. Ellis responded they would, that the principals of each school is informed of all recommendations and changes, and are responsible for passing that information on if they decide to implement any of them. Kouba asked if this would include drop offs in the mornings as well. Ellis responded it would.

Ellis reported that a meeting is scheduled for next Thursday at 9:30 a.m. in the Grand Forks Planning Conference Room with the principals from the three schools, representatives from Safe Kids, staff, and others, including Mark Aubol, who will be involved with any sign or pavement marking changes necessary. She stated that they will be going over all the recommendations to determine whether or not they are viable.

Ellis pointed out that they did provide some cost estimates, as well as indicate whether the change is short term or long term. Haugen stated that the report is available on the MPO website for review and comments.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update On Additional \$60,000,000 FY2010 Funds

Hanson reported that he did ask Ms. Hanson and Mr. Johnson to provide us the latest information they have concerning the additional \$60,000,000 in FY 2010 Funds the State has been awarded. Hanson responded that they had been attending a Project Development Conference the DOT put on the past couple of days, so were out of the office and did not get the request in time to visit with the appropriate staff. She stated that she will look into this and get back to Mr. Haugen with an update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2010**

Haugen commented that MNDOT also received some additional funds as well, and he did send out a similar request to MNDOT staff. He stated that there is a local component and he isn't sure how the ATP or State Aid have responded. Boppre responded that Lou Tassa, MNDOT, was out of the office this past week so he has not heard anything on this issue.

Bergman asked if the North Dakota funds include any monies for transit. Haugen responded that it is his belief this is all highway dollars, and will not be flexed. Hanson added that the dollars they did get came from the Federal Highway Administration, and she doesn't believe that there were any additional dollars coming from transit. Haugen added that MNDOT is reporting that their funds are funds that would otherwise have been earmarked in the new reauthorization bill, but since there is no new bill, there are no earmarks, but they are continuing the funding from the past.

Hanson stated that she will visit with their management folks to see if she can get an update on this.

2. Update On South Washington Street RFP

Ellis reported that they received proposals on November 1st, reviewed them, and interviewed three consulting firms on Monday. She stated that all three firms did a very good job with their interviews, but they did end up choosing Alliant Engineering, and based on their cost proposal and our budgeted amount of \$45,000, through negotiations, it appears we will be entering into a contract with them to do the South Washington Street Study.

Ellis added that the 47th Avenue Study, and the South Washington/Underpass Study will be up for approval at our next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2010, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:20 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 8th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 8th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:31 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MATTER OF DRAFT 2011-2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that this item involves the 2011-2012 Unified Planning Work Program for the MPO. He stated that in 2011 we are doing certain items that we need to do, and then we are also doing some discretionary items as well.

Haugen commented that one thing we will be doing, and we talked about this at our meeting last month, is to update our Transit Development Plan. He stated that in looking at the entire transit system, and creating a five-year program, some operational changes will be made. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 8th, 2010**

another thing we will be completing will be our Bike/Ped section, which, in 2012 will lead us up to completing our update of the Street and Highway portion of our Long Range Transportation Plan, thus, by the first quarter of 2013 we will have a complete multi-modal Long Range Transportation Plan available for consideration and final approval.

Haugen reported that we also had a couple of requests for some additional studies that we will be doing in 2011. He stated that the City of East Grand Forks' number one priority is to have us re-look at the proposed full intersection project at 5th Avenue N.W. and U.S. Business 2, which is currently a south right-in/right-out intersection. He explained that we have already done a couple studies on this intersection, and it was programmed to be constructed this year, however some City Council members have been rethinking whether or not they want to commit to a full intersection at that location. He pointed out, however, that if a full intersection is not done there will be other ramifications, which we did not document well, basically because the 5th Avenue N.W. intersection was thought to relieve most of them. He added that the 5th Avenue N.W. intersection has been part of the Long Range Transportation Plan for over ten years, and we didn't realize it was such an "iffy" proposition, but in any event, the City of East Grand Forks has asked us to re-examine the project, so we did include it in our work program in 2011.

Haugen stated that the number one request for Grand Forks is to do a downtown parking analysis. He explained that the study is two-fold: 1) first, under the City's zoning code they have parking standards they need to follow, and they want us to look at these standards to make sure they are still viable; and 2) second, the City has an assessment policy for operation and maintenance, for which they use a fairly difficult formula in order to determine parking assessments for downtown businesses, and they want us to hire a consultant to assist in determining whether or not this policy needs to be modified in any way.

Haugen reported that this fall we received funding for four additional studies, which will be carried over into 2011. He stated that most of our work program in 2012 will involve the Street and Highway portion of our Long Range Transportation Plan; however we also received a request to update our Signal Coordination Plan, to do another bridge traffic intercept survey, and to consider UND's Climate Action Plan's temporal closure of University Avenue.

Haugen briefly went over the financial breakdown, and appendices for the work program.

Boppre asked about Task 300.7, GIS Development and Application, and whether or not it is just for MPO staff. Haugen responded it was. Boppre asked how much of the GIS information the City of East Grand Forks has. Ellis responded that she has access to all of the GIS information, and uses it to provide maps for any City department requesting one, to provide property information for public hearings, etc.. Boppre asked if just property information is available on the GIS. Haugen responded that it also includes pavement management information as well. Kouba added that they also have some utility information, such as light poles and other GPS information, but there is still considerable work left for this area of the GIS. Boppre asked if, by street poles you mean traffic lights. Kouba responded that it does not mean traffic lights, just

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 8th, 2010**

light poles. Boppre asked if the MPO had someone gather this information. Kouba responded that they did not, that Mr. Bail sent the information to her.

Haugen commented that he did receive an e-mail from Stacey Hanson, NDOT, stating that Federal Highway has some comments pending on the work program. He asked if Mr. Johnson knew what those comments might be. Johnson responded he did not. Haugen stated, then, that whatever action is taken today will need to include a statement in the motion to include any forthcoming comments from Federal Highway.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2011-2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF ANY COMMENTS OR CHANGES SUBMITTED BY FEDERAL HIGHWAY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA PROJECT SUBMITTAL FOR 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that December is the annual time in which North Dakota T.I.P. projects are submitted for consideration. He stated that he does have a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) that will highlight the projects submitted.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen pointed out that there a couple of new things we are incorporating this year, year of expenditure and project scoring. Noehre referred to the "New Process This Year" slide, and asked if the 3% increase in revenue per years is the CFR. Haugen responded that it is not, that it is the agreement the MPOs and the NDDOT reached in regard to our financial year of expenditure approach for the T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P.s. He cited the example of the urban allocation to the Urbanized Area, which is just under \$3,000,000 for 2010, and that for the future we would increase that amount by 3% each year. He added that the cost is 4%, so we aren't gaining any ground, and are in-fact losing 1% each year. Noehre commented that he just finds this confusing, that we have continuing resolutions, but are staying the same or less even though we are increasing revenue, it seems backwards to him. Haugen responded that he can see Mr. Noehre's point, however when they finalize FY2010, there was an increase in funds even though it took several continuing resolutions, but when they did finalize the budget it was at a higher level than FY 2009. He added that it does sound as if they are going to do a continuing resolution for the rest of the year, and are not going to actually pass an individual budget, thus freezing everything at today's dollars.

Haugen reported that there were three enhancement applications; however in the summary list, and he needs to verify this with Ms. Williams, in 2012 they are only submitting Phase 1 of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 8th, 2010**

DeMers project. Williams responded that it is her understanding they are all 2012 projects, but she will have to go back and check to make sure. Haugen stated that the summary list shows them as separate years, but they are all completed as 2012 applications. He explained that because the DeMers project is lengthy and costly, they felt if they submitted it as one project it would not be funded, so they split it into two phases, with the first phase including that portion from 42nd to 48th, and the second from 48th to 55th. He added that eventually there will be a phase 3 that will connect it up to the system on 55th and University Avenue.

Haugen went on to report that the third application is for the construction of a multi-use trail connecting the Lincoln Drive Trail to the Greenway Main Trail.

Haugen reported that he didn't notice anything new on the Regional side, as far as cost changes and what is in the T.I.P., so he did not do a similar table for the regional projects. He stated that for the new year of the T.I.P., 2015, there are three projects: 1) Local - 47th Avenue South; 2) Regional - Washington Street Underpass; and 3) Regional - DeMers Avenue Rehabilitation from I-29 to Washington Street. He pointed out that we also show regional projects one year beyond 2015, or for FY2016, and those projects include: 1) Washington Street from Hammerling to 8th Avenue North; and 2) Kennedy Bridge Repair

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY 2012-2015 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FINAL REPORT

Ellis reported that she presented the Draft A.T.A.C. School Safety Study report for Winship, Wilder, and St. Michael Elementary Schools to this body in November. She said that a final Stakeholder meeting was held after the November Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and they did come up with a few changes, which have been incorporated into the final report.

Ellis referred to the report, and went over the changes briefly.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FOR WILDER ELEMENTARY, WINSHIP ELEMENTARY, AND ST. MICHAEL'S ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN GRAND FORKS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 8th, 2010**

MATTER OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDS FOR FY2011

Haugen reported that Minnesota received \$95,000,000 in additional federal funds, and North Dakota received \$60,000,000 in additional federal funds.

Haugen stated that when he wrote the staff report he had been asking North Dakota for an update on the status of their funds, however still has not received an update. He commented that since then, Minnesota has shared the news that MnDOT will receive \$71,000,000 of the additional funds, and that their local partners will receive \$24,000,000, which will be split 50/50 between Metro and Greater Mn. He stated that this means that District 2, of which we are a part of, will receive \$6,100,000, and that MnDOT will advance the 2014 project on TH11 from Greenbush to 3-miles west of Roseau for a September 2011 bit letting and will advance a 2015 project (yet to be selected) to backfill into 2014. He said that in addition, State Aid for District 2 has selected 2 projects for their portion of the funding; 1) resurfacing of various streets in Thief River Falls for \$475,000 and 2) resurfacing of Beltrami CSAH 8 for \$1,585,000.

Haugen commented that the MPO Directors in Minnesota are communicating with MnDOT upper management about how these funds were not solicited through some of the normal public involvement processes that are required. Ellis added that at the RDC meeting, she knows that the counties were also discouraged that they didn't have the ability to submit projects for this funding as well. Boppre stated that on the city side of this, they have four cities – Bemidji, Crookston, Thief River and East Grand Forks, and the decision on where the funding would be programmed was based on who got some previous federal funds, and Thief River did not receive any so they were the recipients of these funds.

Haugen commented that one thing MnDOT stressed is that there is a definite time-line for letting projects in Minnesota, and if that is the case with North Dakota, the longer they take to make a determination on where to program the funds, the less projects there will be available for funding because of the letting time.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 8TH, 2010, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:13 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager