

2011 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 12, 2011

February 9, 2011

March 10, 2011 - Cancelled

April 13, 2011

May 11, 2011

June 8, 2011

July 13, 2011

August 10, 2011

September 14, 2011

October 12, 2011

November 9, 2011

December 14, 2011

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2011 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 12th, 2011, 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: Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Teri Kouba (Proxy for Nancy Ellis), East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; 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; Matt Leal, GF/EGF Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Kyle McCamy, Bonestroo, Inc.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that, because there is someone new in the audience today, everyone please state their names and which organization they represent.

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

Lang referred to page one of the minutes, under the “Approval of the November 10th, 2010, Minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee...” heading, and pointed out that the heading itself states the meeting was held on November 10th, while the motion states it was held on November 8th. He said that he believes the meeting was actually held on November 10th, and the minutes should reflect that date.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2011**

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 8TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CORRECTION, AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MATTER OF 2012-2015 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE AND TRANSIT

Haugen distributed copies of a power point presentation he was giving, and reported that, just as we did for the North Dakota side, we will first note any changes made to those Minnesota projects already included in the T.I.P., and then we will note any new projects coming in.

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

Haugen explained that the MPO responsibilities are to ensure a project is consistent with our planning documents, and also that it is prioritized within its proposed funding program. He then referred to a map of the MPO study area, and explained that if any project is located within the gray areas on the map and has received federal funds, or, with our new T.I.P. policy, if it is a regionally significant project, regardless of its funding source, it needs to be included in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen stated that in the past our T.I.P. process took about six months to complete, but it is now a year long process, so when one T.I.P. document is completed, we begin working on the next one right away. He added that each year we are also encompassing more programs into our process as well.

Haugen commented that, as we discussed previously, we now have to include the “year of expenditure” for both sides, and this has been incorporated into this T.I.P. cycle. He added that we have also completed our scoring criteria process to assist in the prioritization of projects.

Haugen reported that the eligible programs we will talk about today include transit on both sides; transportation enhancements; safe routes to school; city sub-target; MN trunk highway sub-target; and county roads. He pointed out that the county did not submit any projects for consideration.

Haugen commented that on the transit side for East Grand Forks, what is essentially happening is just a continuation of their current T.I.P. projects, with the addition of those projects for FY2015. He explained that East Grand Forks only looks at the 5307 Program for it’s federal aid. He added that at the end of last year the Demand Response Service costs escalated considerably, so the estimates shown in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 reflect those costs. Haugen stated that, as you will notice, agenda item seven indicates we will be doing a Transit Development Plan update

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2011**

this year, therefore, because the estimates shown in the 2012-2015 T.I.P. are based on our current operation, once the update is completed there may be some differing cost estimates ensuing.

Haugen reported that for the Grand Forks side there are several different programs they apply for: 1) 5307 – Operations; 2) 5316 - JARC; 3) 5317 - New Freedom; and 4) 5309 - Capital, which they will use to renovate the Bus Barn.

Haugen commented that for the Minnesota side, we currently have Transportation Enhancement projects programmed out to 2014, and because of the uncertainty of future programming, it was decided, as an ATP, we would not solicit for projects in 2015. He stated that there are no projects being solicited for Safe Routes To School either. He explained that in Minnesota solicitation for Safe Routes To School is different than in North Dakota, in that is not programmed out as enhancements, but is done by a central process, and it is his understanding that they have not quite come to a final decision on how to change the process of soliciting projects for the Safe Routes To School, therefore we have no projects for consideration.

Haugen reported that there have been no changes made to the current T.I.P. non-transit projects; and the only new projects for 2015 are a couple of minor concrete repair projects, one on Gateway Drive and the other on Central Avenue, for the MN Trunk Highway Sub-Target program.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2012-2015 CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE DOWNTOWN GRAND FORKS PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks requested that we include this study in our work program, and we did, so we are now issuing the RFP. He explained that there will be two primary focus areas: 1) To look at the current formula used to assess the cost of operation and maintenance of parking spaces to the different downtown properties, as it has been deemed too complicated and requires too much administrative resources to maintain; and 2) To look at the current parking standards, as they have not been thoroughly reviewed for over 25-years.

Haugen referred to a map of the downtown area, and pointed out that there are two different assessment districts. He explained that there are some that are paying for the construction costs, but don't pay for the operation and maintenance of the parking structures; which others are paying for the operation and maintenance of the parking structures but not for the construction

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2011**

costs, so this study will try to come up with a common boundary for all types of assessments for the parking downtown.

Haugen referred to the study schedule, and stated that it is a pretty aggressive schedule. He explained that during the first part of March, March 1-4, proposals will be received, interviews will be held, a finalist will be selected, and contract negotiations will be completed. He stated that a notice to proceed will then be given to the winning firm on March 7; a draft report will be received on April 15, 2011; and a final report will be received on May 15, 2011.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE DOWNTOWN GRAND FORKS PARKING STUDY.

Bergman asked if 45 days will be enough for the consultant to complete the study, and what happens if they are not able to do so. Haugen responded that we will cross that bridge if we have to, but we always do have the ability to extend the completion deadlines if necessary. Williams commented that they do have striping plans for the diagonal parking should the consultants want them.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

Kouba reported that in 2011 the MPO is scheduled to start its Long Range Transportation Plan Update, and the Transit Development Plan is one section of that plan. She stated that they are looking at several aspects of the scope of work for this particular project, most significantly would be the funding because of the financial constraints we've been running into with our Dial-A-Ride and Senior Rider programs that just recently saw an increase in costs. She added that they are also running into some problems with our Fixed-Route Systems as well, with some routes not being on time, so we will have the consultants look into the operation of the whole system as well. She said that they are just looking at any other additions that are needed in the scope of work.

Williams asked if this will cover fixed stops. Kouba responded that some issues tend to be that we are stopping at 7th and at 6th and now at 5th, so we need to look at this, at the efficiency issues. Bergman commented that they will be looking at designated stops. He added that they have the areas where the majority of the people riding are located tagged, but sometimes it seems like they have to stop at every block, and that puts them behind schedule, so this needs to be addressed.

Brooks referred to page seven of the document, the Selection Committee, and asked if they were looking at adding another representative to the committee. Kouba responded that it would be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2011**

preferable to have a five person committee in order to not have issues with there being ties when voting on issues. Brooks stated that these types of committees usually consist of two members from Grand Forks, two from East Grand Forks, and one from the MPO, so it would appear you need another representative from East Grand Forks, whether from their finance office, or another area.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE, SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON THE SELECTION COMMITTEE.

UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Reports Available

Haugen reported that on the back table he has made available copies of three reports the MPO has received:

- a) Quiet Zone Study
- b) Mill Spur Study
- c) Signal Coordination Study

He stated that you can one of each if you wish, however they are all available on the MPO Website as well.

2. Update On 2011-2012 AUWP

Haugen reported that we have conditional approval on our 2011-2012 AUWP, however Federal Highway is now asking us to develop an indirect cost proposal. He explained that in the past we have always just directly billed everything in the work program, but now Federal Highway believes we need to bill some things such as administrative costs, supplies, rent, etc., indirectly, thus the need to develop an indirect cost proposal.

Johnson commented that he sat in on a couple of meetings with some of the other MPOs regarding direct and indirect cost allocations, and when they had their MPO Director's meeting last spring, Bismarck asked the promoters of the State Fair how they allocated costs, and it is really getting down the level of distinguishing everything that is federal money that is supposed to go to the MPO, and then the shared stuff, like rent, and allocating it out. He added that this isn't just a Federal Highway issue, but seems to be several federal entities that want to see this done as well, so they are having to visit with a lot of people around the state on how their cost allocations are going, consequently the need for these plans.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2011**

3. 47th Avenue Corridor Study

Haugen reported that there will be a meeting on the 47th Avenue Corridor Study next week if anyone is interested.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 12TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:00 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 9th, 2011, 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: Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Dean Rau, Grand Forks City Assistant Engineer; and Les Noehre, NDDOT – Grand Forks District.

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.

Guest(s) present were: Farshad Bigdeli, KLJ Consulting Engineers

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that everyone please state their names and which organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 12TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 12TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

MATTER OF URBAN ROADS MAP

Haugen reminded the committee members that in 2010 we submitted changes to our North Dakota Urban Roads Map, however NDDOT denied approval, citing objections to the proposed treatment of the ramps for the Columbia Road Overpass and the DeMers Overpass. He explained that in response, in November we agreed to approve a map that did not show the ramps, but did show the rest of the changes requested, and to continue to research and discuss how best to handle the ramp issue with NDDOT.

Haugen reported that we just received a response from NDDOT to our second request. He distributed copies of that response, and went over it briefly using a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Haugen referred to the 2010 Urban Road System Map, and stated that there are a couple of areas the NDDOT questioned, pointing out that these areas are shown within the circles. He explained that in order to be eligible for the Urban Roads program a roadway needs to be functionally classified.

Haugen referred to a copy of the 2010 Functional Classification Map, and pointed out that it covers the just the basic urban area for Grand Forks, however, the map insert does show the whole MPO study area, and possibly some of the comments by North Dakota might be addressed via this insert. He explained, again, that in order for a street to be classified with the Urban Program, i.e. making it eligible for federal funds, it needs to be functionally classified, so that is important to the Functional Classification map. He then referred to an enhanced slide of the map insert, and pointed out that it shows that we have functionally classified roadways beyond the Urban Aid Boundary.

Haugen commented that he would like to address some of the comments made regarding the fact that some of our Urban Road requests are for roadways that are not currently on our Functional Classification map. He pointed out that Mill Road is one of the areas NDDOT identified, however if you look at the insert you will see that we have classified Mill Road all the way up to the Urban Limit, and beyond, just as we did with North Washington and with 62nd Avenue, so we believe that our map request was accurate to reflect that they are on our Urban Road System, because they do show up on the Functional Classification map.

Haugen stated that there are some areas where non-functionally classified roads were included in our Urban Roads request, 27th Avenue was one of those areas. He explained that one of the issues with this roadway is that 27th Avenue is classified as a “future roadway”, but it is not currently an existing functionally classified roadway, so the map that we would ask for consideration today would not include this stretch of 27th Avenue as an Urban Road.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

Haugen reported that we also have some areas in the southwest part of Grand Forks, such as 47th Avenue and 62nd Avenue, which have similar issues as 27th Avenue. He referred to a map, and pointed out that what is shown are the ends of the functionally classified roadways. He stated that what we originally showed in the map, that we submitted to North Dakota, included the areas that are to be future functionally classified roadways.

Williams asked, if a road isn't shown on the Functional Classification map, how do we get federal aid to build them. Haugen responded that you can get federal aid to build only the portion of those roadways that are shown on the Functional Classification map. Williams asked, then, what the mechanism would be to build them past that point. Haugen responded that it would require that we update our Functional Classification Map to show them as converting from future to existing, and then once they are built we would need to add them to our Urban Road System Map.

Haugen referred to the Functional Classification map and pointed out that there are several roads, such as 47th and 62nd, that simply end on the Map, and he wonders why it was done that way. He explained that they are really pretty much the same from where they end all the way to the Interstate, and are Township Section Line roads. He added that they are shown on the Functional Classification map as future functionally roadways, to a point, and that point essentially is the extension of 38th Street south. Sanders asked if Mr. Haugen was saying that there are roadways there now, but that they aren't functionally classified. Haugen responded that that is correct, that they are Township Section Line roads, gravel roads. Sanders asked, however, if there was a similar road at 27th. Haugen responded there was not.

Haugen commented that the next area for discussion is 17th Avenue. He stated that the original map we submitted in November included 17th Avenue as an Urban Road, and it shows up on the Functional Classification Map as a future collector, but there is a portion of 17th Avenue that exists as a Rural Township Section Line Road, that we should perhaps consider as an existing functionally classified roadway if we are considering 47th and 62nd similarly. He added that the only real difference with 17th Avenue is that the right-of-way is within City Limits, while the right-of-way for 47th and 62nd is not.

Haugen stated that, basically this means that we weren't consistent with our functional class, we treated some roadways one way and others a different way, so what we need to decide is how we want to treat these section line roads, do we want to extend them as far as they go to I-29. Gengler asked if there would be any ramifications by doing that. Haugen responded that the one small thing it may do would be to increase the number of road miles. He explained that we try to stay within a certain percentage for each roadway classification, however, he doesn't think it would be detrimental to the whole proposal.

Consensus was that if there is a road there, it should be shown on the Functional Classification Map as such. Haugen stated, then, that we should extend 62nd, 47th, and 17th out to 38th.

Discussion ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

Haugen pointed out that the State is suggesting that we don't try to make the Columbia Road and the DeMers Avenue Overpass Ramps regional, but instead identify them as Local Urban Roadways. He reminded the committee that we were going to work with NDDOT to identify, state-wide, other cities that had this same issue, and it was found that there is only one, Minot. He stated that the ramp in Minot is similarly labeled as our ramps are on both our map, and the NDDOT map. He asked Denny Johnson if they had had similar conversations with Minot as well. Johnson responded that they had not.

MOVED BY RAU, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE CLASSIFYING THE TWO RAMP SYSTEMS FOR COLUMBIA ROAD AND DEMERS AVENUE AS LOCAL URBAN ROADS; AND INCLUSION OF THE EXTENSION OF 47TH, 62ND AND 17TH AVENUES OUT TO 38TH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK

Ellis reported that, currently a full intersection is planned to occur at the intersection of 5th Avenue Northwest and Highway 2 in 2014, however the City of East Grand Forks is now questioning whether or not they still want this intersection constructed, therefore they have requested that the MPO conduct a study of the Northwest Street Network for East Grand Forks to help determine whether or not this project should remain in the Long Range Transportation Plan, and if it doesn't, what improvements must be made to off-set the benefit it provided.

Ellis stated that the study will review current street corridors and identify possible future transportation corridors in northwestern East Grand Forks that will enhance connectivity and movement for the people in the area, as well as provide a vision for future planning, parks and recreation, and development.

Ellis said that they are hoping to hire a consultant to look at these different corridors to determine if there are improvements that would be necessary for existing and future roadways, as well as any multi-modal, bike/ped, improvements that might be necessary for that area. She stated that this study will help with the update to our Long Range Transportation Plan, so it will be more detailed in order to provide us with the necessary information for that update.

Ellis reported that there is currently a Transportation Enhancement project scheduled that was based on the full intersection being constructed at 5th and Highway 2. She pointed out that there is an off-ramp that comes off Highway 2, goes north to 8th and back to 12, that is currently the second downtown access, so if you are traveling west, and miss the Central, or DeMers Avenue turn, your next access to the downtown area is this ramp, so the construction of the intersection at 5th would allow for another connection to the downtown area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

Ellis stated that they hope to put the RFP out after the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next week; then advertise, interview, receive a draft document in October, and a final document in December. She added that they will be using ATAC to do some of the travel demand, and will also have to get some turning movement counts.

Bergman asked if there would be traffic lights at the intersection at 5th and Highway 2. Ellis responded there would. She added that there is currently only right-in/right-out movements at 5th, but we have an Access Management Plan that allows for lights at that location.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY SANDERS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF BRIDGE CLOSURE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packets, and reminded the board that we do have a Bridge Closure Traffic Management Plan in place. He added that, in terms of the flood forecast this year, he did include the most recent predictions for various cities, including Grand Forks, and it appears, at this time, that we will be closing the Point and Sorlie Bridges.

Discussion on bridge closure levels, etc., ensued.

Haugen reported that a couple of changes were made to the document itself, and are shown on the next couple of pages in the packet. He went over the changes briefly.

Rau referred to the Bridge Closure Contact List and pointed out that there are a couple of changes needed to the phone numbers. He stated that the City Engineer's number should be 746-2640 and the Public Works number should be 738-8740. Lang asked if the public works number was for the emergency line. Rau responded that it was not, that it is for the Public Works Department, but added that the emergency number may have changed as well. He said that he would check into it and let Mr. Haugen know if there was indeed a change to that number.

Noehre requested, as he did last year, that everyone please coordinate anything being done with the state highways, before it occurs, with him. He said that he isn't looking to get in the middle of the City's flood fight, or to give approval, but would like to be made aware of what is going on.

Sanders reported that the Thompson Bridge will close at 847.7 feet.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

MATTER OF ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATION FOR FY2010

Haugen reported that at the start of the calendar year we now have to try to identify what the actual obligated funds were for each of the projects for which funding was programmed. He said that he would e-mail everyone a spreadsheet on which they can identify the obligated funds for each of the projects listed. He added that each project should be under contract, if not completed, and should have a federal total amount shown, as well as any State or local monies awarded the project.

Williams commented that there was one Grand Forks project that she didn't know what to do with, Project #16, as the \$40,000 shown under State was not awarded. Haugen responded that if the State didn't contribute anything you need to put zero, and then show where the \$40,000 was picked up by.

Haugen referred to the tables included in the packet, and went over them briefly, pointing out that Grand Forks Project #7, Construction of 48th Street, is an example of a project identifying what the bike/ped provision will be for that facility, which is another thing we need to do in this Annual Listing of Obligation, specifically identify what bike/ped activity took place with each project, if any.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. South Washington Street Corridor Study Public Meeting

Ellis reported that a Public Open House is scheduled for February 23rd in the Grand Forks City Council Chambers, beginning at 6:30, with a presentation at 7:00, for the South Washington Street Corridor Study.

2. Columbia Road Reconstruction Project

Rau reported that they are in the process of getting the engineering estimate for the Columbia Road Reconstruction project.

3. Transportation Program Update

Haugen reported that by our next meeting Congress will have had to have done something with the Transportation Program, which is set to expire March 4th. He stated that he will try to keep everyone updated on what is happening with this as soon as he hears anything.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2011**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 9TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:34 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the April 13th, 2011, 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: Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division-Bismarck; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; and Teri Kouba (Proxy for 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; Drew Flanagin, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Matt Settingren, KLJ Consulting Engineers.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that everyone please state their names, and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 9TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Williams reported that the wrong minutes were posted on the web-site. Consensus was to hold approval of the February 9th, 2011, minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee to the May 11th, 2011, meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF TRAFFIC CHANGES 2000 TO 2010

Haugen introduced Drew Flanagin, MPO Intern, and explained that he has been working on the MPO's update to it's Long Range Transportation Plan; and with the new census data, along with some traffic counts, he will be giving a brief presentation on traffic changes over the past decade.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011**

Flanagin reported that because the GIS is not working at this time, he will have to rely on PDFs for his presentation today. He commented that in looking back on this past decade we can see changes that have occurred in terms of traffic patterns throughout the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks area. He stated that in addition to looking at the traffic pattern changes, we also looked at what factors may have influenced those changes; including both residential and commercial building permits, road improvements, and census data.

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

Haugen commented that what they are seeing in East Grand Forks is that while there was an increase in traffic during the last ten years, during the latter part of that ten-year period, looking at Bygland Road in particular, traffic actually decreased. He said that this same phenomenon occurred on the north end as well, and, in-fact, is a continuing pattern you will see throughout this presentation.

Haugen reported that in North Dakota an additional count year took place, so while we had information for Fiscal Years 2000, 2005, 2008, and 2010 in North Dakota, we only had information for Fiscal Years 2000, 2005, and 2010 in Minnesota.

Haugen stated that this is something that they are still working on, and gathering additional data for, so we may have a couple more presentations for this committee in the future.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY 2011-2014 T.I.P.

Ellis referred to Page 12 of the packets, and explained that it illustrates the City of East Grand Forks' 2011 T.E. project. She stated that it was originally a 2012 T.E. project that was moved to 2011, however it was designed and approved back in 2008.

Ellis reported that the project entails constructing a sidewalk along both sides of Central Avenue from approximately 6th Street to 14th Street N.W. She explained that this has turned into a multi-purpose trail within MnDOT's right-of-way, that mirrors the trail that is going to be built on the other side of the right-of-way.

Ellis stated that the reason for the amendment is because there has been a change in the scope of work, as well as the cost estimates and funding sources. She explained that between 2008 and now, MnDOT has been working on bringing all of their intersections into ADA compliance, so we did a design, and came to an agreement with MnDOT that we would make the intersection ADA compliant as part of this project so that we can do one bid for the whole entire project, and get it completed at one time rather than doing the improvements for the T.E. portion and then coming back and doing the intersection improvements.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011**

Ellis pointed out that she included what the funding costs will be for the entire project, as well as what we will be receiving for the T.E. portion, what we will be receiving from the State for the intersection improvements, and the local match. She stated, however, that she did not include the engineering soft costs, so the total project cost of \$235,000 will go up to \$294,000; the federal amount will remain at \$116,000, which is what we received as a T.E. award; and the State amount will go up to \$90,000 for the intersection improvements; and the local match will go up to \$88,000 to \$89,000.

Haugen commented that, as indicted, the public hearing on this amendment is scheduled to occur at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday. He explained that we received the request too late to be able to hold it at today's meeting, however we were able to get the public hearing notice published in time to hold it at the Executive Policy Board meeting next week.

Ellis reported that this was presented to the East Grand Forks City Council at their work session last evening, and they were in favor of the changes requested. She added that there are just a few construction easements that need to be worked out, but they are hoping to get the project completed as soon as possible, so we are anxious to move it forward to the Executive Policy Board for approval.

MOVED BY HANSON, SECONDED BY KOUBA, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2011-2014 T.I.P. SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE UPDATED COSTS AND FUNDING SOURCES DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Haugen reported that each year the T.I.P. cycle brings it own little nuances to the table; last year we had a separation of our Draft T.I.P. from the Minnesota side with North Dakota's being due closer to July; but this year we are back to a more normal schedule with both T.I.P.s being drafted about the same time.

Haugen commented that this year we have some Illustrative Projects, which are pending approval by different committees and task forces, and until a funding source is determined, will remain as such. He explained that he labeled these projects as illustrative so that in the event they do get awarded funding, people have already been notified that they are projects that we want to do once the funding is in place.

Haugen reported that back in December we reviewed all the projects, and at that time notified the committee and the public that projects were being adjusted to year of expenditure, so there were a lot of changes to the dollar amounts for projects that are even currently in the T.I.P. document, although their scope of works did not change.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011**

Haugen commented that, for the most part projects that were already in the T.I.P. remained in the T.I.P., with just those adjustments to the costs and federal participation being made. He added that there were no new projects added, nor were there any real projects dropped from the current T.I.P.

Haugen pointed out that in 2015, which is a new year to the T.I.P. document, transit is doing what it usually does each year, and the only other project on the North Dakota side that is showing up for the first time is work on DeMers Avenue, from Washington Street to I-29. He explained that the project entails work similar to that occurring on Gateway Drive this summer, which includes some concrete panel repair, some diamond grinding, etc., at a cost of \$3,000,000, with \$2,400,000 in federal funds.

Haugen commented that there are several other urban road projects that were pursued, but were not funded through the North Dakota Cooperative T.I.P. Development Process.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side there were little to no changes made to any project that was already programmed. He reported that in 2015 we continue the transit projects, but there were no new street or roadway projects added. He pointed out that there was a new project added in 2014, a state funded project that is part of a larger project description in the Draft A.T.I.P., in which work, again like that that will occur on DeMers Avenue, will be done on some portions of U.S. Highway 2 and 220 North. He stated that, as shown in the “remarks” section, the Gateway portion was estimated at just under \$600,000 and the 220 North portion just over \$300,000; and those are all state funds with no federal participation anticipated at this time. He added that this project was identified back in December as a 2015 project, with federal participation, but through the MnDOT process was moved to 2014 and was funded with state funds.

Haugen reported that the Illustrative Projects are requests that the City of Grand Forks made; one being the T.E. project on DeMers Avenue, taking the multi-purpose trail westward to the Interstate and up to 55th Street, but we are still waiting for an announcement on North Dakota’s T.E. awards. Hanson responded that the Director’s Task Force meets later this month, so an announcement should be forthcoming soon. Haugen commented that the other illustrative project involved our seeking Safety funds to modify the left turn lanes on South Washington Street, which we were not awarded, so it will remain illustrative at this time.

Williams referred to Grand Forks Project #12, and pointed out that the description states: “The project will construct a multi-purpose trail, or commonly called a sidepath, along the west side of South Washington from 47th Avenue South to 55th Avenue South.” She stated that there is no definition of sidepath in the MUTCD, although there are some other agencies using sidepath as a higher speed facility, and we don’t want to confuse the issue so we should just use the term multi-use trail. She added that the FHWA says it sometimes can be called a sidepath, but it isn’t commonly called a sidepath, so that term needs to be stricken.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011**

Haugen reported that there was one state system project that caught his attention; the I-29 CPR Grinding in both directions, and he did send an e-mail to Les Noehre, however he has not yet received a response. He explained that in our T.I.P. document it is shown as a \$900,000 project in both directions, but in the project guide sheet it appears to have blossomed into a \$7,000,000 project. Lang asked which project this was. Haugen responded it is Grand Forks Project #8. He added that in the S.T.I.P. document it is listed as two separate projects, and they total just over \$900,000, or roughly about \$450,000 each, but he noticed on the most recent status report from NDDOT, the cost estimate was up to about \$4,600,000 each. Lang agreed that that doesn't seem right. Hanson stated that she will check on this and get back to Mr. Haugen.

Haugen stated that the other appendix identifies what was actually obligated on projects, from the 2010 list of projects. He said that they have not yet received the Grand Forks Public Transportation projects, but there weren't any significant changes in what was programmed and what was obligated.

Haugen commented that he knows that the City of Grand Forks is contemplating another project to be included in 2015, which we may need to address next month, and we still have a few awards out there that we are awaiting the outcome on, so between this draft and the final document there will probably be a few additional changes to be addressed, but for now this is what we have for the next four year transportation funding program.

Haugen referred to a table, and pointed out that it shows that between the two sides of the river we are just under \$50,000,000 in total project costs, which includes transit operations as well as construction costs, and, if broken down would indicate that Grand Forks is hovering around \$10,000,000 a year, but on the East Grand Forks side there is a swing of around \$5,000,000 one year and \$500,000 another.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion, and no written comments were received prior to noon today. Haugen closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2012-2015 T.I.P. SUBJECT TO CHANGES AS DISCUSSED ABOVE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Congressional Budget Actions

Haugen reported that Congressional action is occurring, and a shut-down has been averted for the time being. He said that it is his understanding they approved a budget agreement that funds

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011**

all of the rest of Fiscal Year 2011, so, hopefully by the end of the week final action will have taken place so we know exactly what FY 2011 has in-store for us for the remainder of the year.

Haugen added that FY 2012 is also under great debate, and as part of the 2012 budget Congress is laying out some of their reauthorization levels. He stated that, in a nutshell, the Republicans are trying to take everything back to FY 2008 levels of funding, however the President has proposed a budget that has different numbers, and will be giving a speech today to explain how he would like to get the budget balanced, including a possible tax increase.

Haugen commented that it is his understanding that the NDDOT has approved their budget, and for the most part all the new monies will be going to the oil producing counties. Hanson responded that that is her understanding as well.

Haugen asked if Minnesota was still working on their budget. McKinnon responded that they were still working on their budget at this time.

2. Mid-Year Review

Hanson reported that they are planning on conducting the Mid-Year Review to coincide with the May Technical Advisory Committee meeting, which is May 11th.

3. Traffic Counts

Hanson reported that she talked to their traffic counting division, and they wanted her to share that the DOT recently purchased a Mio-Vision Traffic Data Collection System, which uses video capture technology in performing intersection and turning movement counts. She stated that staff will be going through a demonstration and training session at the end of April, and she is currently coordinating, with Terry, to see if there would be room to open that up to the MPOs and Cities, and will have information to that effect by the end of the week in the event someone from the MPO and/or City want to participate. Haugen asked if there was just one set-up, or multiple set-ups. Hanson responded that she doesn't know the answer to that at this time, but does have a brochure that explains what the system does.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 9TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:34 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the May 11th, 2011, 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: Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division-Bismarck; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Dean Rau, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division-Bismarck; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; and Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer.

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

Guest(s) present were: Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-Bismarck; Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT-St. Paul; Deborah Ellis, MNDOT-St. Paul; Bruce Fuchs, NDDOT-Bismarck; and Sara Aultman, MNDOT-St. Paul (via conference call).

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that, because there are some new faces here today, everyone please state their name, and the organization they represent.

FAREWELL

Haugen said that he regrets to inform the committee that both Matt Leal, MPO Planning Technician; and Drew Flanagin, MPO Intern have resigned their positions. He stated that, in fact, today's meeting will be the last for both men. He asked that Matt and Drew give a brief overview on their future plans.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 9TH AND APRIL 13TH, 2011,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Hanson referred to the April 13th, 2011, minutes and requested that her title be changed from “Planning Division” to “Local Government Division”.

***MOVED BY SANDERS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 9TH
AND APRIL 13TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUBJECT TO THE REQUESTED CORRECTION.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF TRAFFIC CHANGES 2000 TO 2010

Haugen reminded the committee of the presentation given at last month’s meeting on traffic changes from FY2000 to FY2010. He explained that Drew Flanagin, MPO Intern, had intended to give a GIS presentation at that time, however, because there were problems with the GIS system an abbreviated power point presentation was given instead. He stated that they have since solved the problems with the GIS system, but we now have some additional problems to present today.

Flanagins said that he would be going over traffic changes that have occurred in the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks area over the last decade. He stated that he would briefly go over the previous presentation information for those not present at last month’s meeting, and would then continue on with new information.

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

Flanagin commented that they did run into some problems when putting this presentation together. He pointed out that a lot of the population blocks changed shape, so they were unable to correct, or match things up with the proper GEO coding. He stated that this is all confusing, but he will try to illustrate it as best as he can for the committee. Haugen reported that this issue was discovered with their TAZ/TAD delineation software as well, and that in addition to this issue, they also found that there aren’t any population figures for Grand Forks for the Year 2000, so they are trying to work this out with the Census Bureau. Flanagin reported that they have also contacted the State Data Bureau concerning these issues as well, and it sounds like we might be one of the first people looking at a block-by-block comparison, however there is a lot of track-by-track comparisons available.

Presentation continued.

Flanagin pointed out that they used a little different number of years for East Grand Forks, mainly because the traffic counts were not taken in the same sequence as Grand Forks, so they used the Years 2009 to 2001, and 2009 to 2005. Haugen commented that the numbers shown are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

essentially 48-hour tube counts that are factored by month, year, day of week, etc., to give us the average annual daily traffic numbers. He said that they then compare those numbers to the data collected in 2000 and 2010 to see what the difference might be in Minnesota in 2001 and 2009. He stated that they are still trying to identify and get a better feel as to why there is so much red showing in the built-up areas as the housing units haven't changed, and they aren't seeing, at the aggregate level, a huge difference in the population information, but we do show a considerable increase in the percent of traffic volume on the streets.

Haugen stated that as we go into our next Street and Highway Plan Update, with our traffic modeling, we will need to take into account what has occurred over these past ten years on some of these roadways, and will need to work with A.T.A.C. on the model to see if it can reflect some of the past ten year history. He commented that because of the huge flood event in 1997, our data for the 1990's is skewed, so we will need to take that information with a grain of salt, however we do have 10-years of data, where the state's have provided us with traffic counts, and with the City's data bases we can now track where permits were issued, and if we can get this down to the block level we can start identifying whether or not there are significant changes to the persons per household to help us identify and track some of the changes.

Haugen pointed out where some of the changes have occurred that may have attracted traffic away from some of the areas showing a decrease, but, again, when we get into some of the areas showing an increase, there haven't been the improvements that would really warrant the increase. Sanders asked how this has affected the bus ridership. Haugen responded that it has been increasing. Sanders said, then, that transit could be taking that type of traffic away to some extent. Bergman reported that in April 2010 we had 23,000 riders, and in April 2011 we had 28,000 riders, and overall in 2011 we have already seen a 17% increase over 2010.

Williams asked if, in 2000, on Cherry, were there any estimates or percentages of trucks using that roadway because that would have been when they were doing the construction of the dike. She said that there would have been a significant amount of truck traffic, and every truck counts as two and a half cars, so that would have made a big difference.

Various scenarios that could affect counts were discussed, including gas prices, truck traffic, flood events, etc.

Leal stated that it might be good to explain that these are all percentages, so a percentage of four might be different as far as numbers go. Flanagan agreed, adding that these percentages can be misleading, so it might have been better if they had used raw numbers instead.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the three bridge crossings, and noted that each side treats the river crossings somewhat differently. He pointed out that the Kennedy Bridge shows that Minnesota indicates an increase in traffic and North Dakota a decrease; that the Sorlie, right in the middle shows an increase on both sides; and that the Point Bridge shows a decrease on one side and an increase on the other. Sanders stated that he would think that if the counts were done at the same time on both sides you would probably see either an increase or a decrease on both

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

sides. Lang asked what the time difference for counts is on the two sides. Haugen responded that North Dakota usually does them in the fall and Minnesota does them when they can.

Haugen stated that they would probably be asking for help from our DOT and federal highway partners on the census block issue, and if others are having the TAZ issue as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA JARC AND NEW FREEDOM APPLICATIONS

Kouba reported that they only received one application for JARC and one for New Freedom from the Cities Area Transit.

Kouba explained that the JARC application is for renewal of the operational grant for Route 12/13; and the New Freedom application is for funding of the new Mobility Manager position.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE JARC APPLICATION FOR CONTINUED FUNDING OF ROUTE 12/13; AND THE NEW FREEDOM APPLICATION FOR FUNDING OF THE MOBILITY MANAGER POSITION FOR TRANSIT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF MINNESOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION

Ellis reported that she would like to discuss two things today, the first is the announcement of the Minnesota Safe Routes To School solicitation for infrastructure projects only. She stated that at this time they are not soliciting for non-infrastructure projects. She commented that they have gone through one round, five years, of safe routes to school funding for both non-infrastructure and infrastructure projects.

Ellis commented that it is typically a fall application for both, but she thinks they are waiting to see how it will be funded. She stated that there is a deadline of June 15th for submittal of an application, and it requires the City, or some other type of governmental entity to sponsor any project submitted.

Ellis stated that East Grand Forks has been successful in having their projects funded in the past, and, in-fact, have had been awarded two infrastructure grants in those five years of project awards.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

Ellis reported that this year's application requires a more extensive evaluation component to the application. She explained that it requires a walk/bike survey that is sponsored by the National Safe Routes To School.

Ellis explained that the East Grand Forks School District, the City of East Grand Forks, and the MPO will work closely together to determine whether a project is worthy of an application; to prepare narratives, maps, and Minnesota Safe Routes To School applications; and to support the construction, maintenance, training and continued enforcement for any projects granted funding.

Ellis stated that at this time the City of East Grand Forks is looking at projects, notifying everyone that solicitation is open, so if anyone has any projects they would like considered, please contact her.

Ellis said that the second part of this discussion today is in regard to the Non-infrastructure Safe Routes To School Program, which, again, is not soliciting for projects at this time, however there is a possibility that they could do so in the fall. She added that on the North Dakota side, Mr. Haugen and herself participated in a conference call on May 5th, with NDDOT's Safe Routes Coordinator, and others present. She stated that North Dakota has only solicited two years of their non-infrastructure projects, so there is still funding available for other years, so part of the discussion was to try to figure out what makes a successful program, and how to evaluate those types of programs they previously funded. She said that they are looking at putting out an RFP for a consultant to look at the first year's program to determine why it was successful, and then comparing a program itself for other rural areas.

Ellis commented that we have a very successful Safe Kids Program right now, and it has received non-infrastructure funding. She said that they have been very successful in getting the bikepaths in, as well as getting other safety issues taken care of, so, from a City standpoint, we are more anxious to see the funding become available, than of seeing how a program is successful because we have a successful program already.

Hanson reported that Ms. Ellis gave a pretty good summary of the meeting. She stated that their Safe Routes To School Coordinator is currently working on preparing a summary of the meeting, as well as putting some information together from comments she received from the three MPOs, as well as from the Safe Routes Advisory Committee, and that information will be disseminated to the MPOs as soon as it becomes available. She added that, ultimately, they will have a document prepared for their Director so that they know how to move forward with the non-infrastructure program.

Haugen stated that the infrastructure solicitation for North Dakota took place last fall, so that is why they are not doing a North Dakota project solicitation at this time. He added that their Safe Kids Program is successful enough at the national level that they are participating in a webinar at the end of the month that will highlight how we can get bicycling integrated into the Safe Routes Program. He commented that if you look at the National Safe Routes website you will see that Patty Olson, a Grand Forks resident, is presenting along with other national bike names, so kudos

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

to our Safe Routes personnel in their ability to be recognized at the national level for what they are doing.

Ellis reported that the National Safe Routes to School Conference will take place in Minneapolis this year, and Safe Kids and herself submitted a proposal for a presentation at that conference to talk about the collaboration between government, engineering, and Safe Kids, and how we have such a successful program in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and how those entities work so well together.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROJECT CHANGES SINCE DRAFT 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that earlier this morning the MPO went through a Mid-Year Review, and this topic was discussed briefly at that meeting. He stated that we just want to identify and ensure that we are following the correct process required to amend the Draft 2012-2015 T.I.P. to include additional projects. He stated that in the past our practice was to wait until the draft Final T.I.P. document was processed for approval before adding in projects, and he wants to ensure that this is still the appropriate method to follow.

Haugen commented that we have adopted a Draft T.I.P. document, but since then we have been notified of that there are a couple of projects that need to be included in the Final Draft T.I.P. He stated that he just wanted to ensure that our past practice is still acceptable, or if there is a different method we should be using. He said that they came to the conclusion that the method we have been using is fine.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, shown in blue on the slide, they identified to us, after we approved the Draft T.I.P., that they were going to be doing some ADA curb cut ramps in East Grand Forks. He stated that this project shows up in Minnesota's Draft A.T.I.P., but does not show up in the MPO's Draft T.I.P., and it consists of \$120,000 in federal funds, and \$30,000 in state funds. He said that another project, entailing some minor concrete panel replacement on US Highway 2 and MN 220, had originally been listed as two but was then rolled into one, and the project cost changed, so it needs to be amended into the T.I.P. as such as well, but we will wait until July, when we start drafting the Final T.I.P., to do so.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side we have a project that is a little unusual, in that there has been a twenty-plus-year attempt to get a grade separation on 42nd Street. He said that they are currently doing an environmental assessment document on this project, and as part of some recent clarification from Federal Highways, it needs to be included in the T.I.P. so that they can address that document. He commented that the City of Grand Forks has subsequently requested that we include into our T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. documents the purchase of additional right-of-way. He stated that the question here is whether or not we wait for the final T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. to be processed and approved, which would be in October, or do we go ahead and make an amendment to our current T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. document, and then roll it in as a continuation of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

a project already included in the T.I.P. He said that his advice would be that, instead of having a new T.I.P. and Environmental Assessment hit everyone at the same time for approval, we address the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. issue in May or June, so that when they get the Environmental Assessment there won't be a question as to how it sits in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. He stated that, if he understood correctly, the consensus at today's Mid-Year Review was to do an amendment to get this project into our current T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., so next month we will process at least one amendment to our current T.I.P. to get this right-of-way project put in.

Hanson commented that her office does have a couple of concerns with this project as it was not included in prior requests for federal aid, so it is coming in at a time when they already have their programs set, and all of their funds programmed for projects. She added that when the City's consultant brought this project to them, they were never given a dollar amount to begin looking for funds, so when the Technical Advisory Committee packet came out it was the first time that they knew the cost of the right-of-way was \$300,000. She stated that a number of concerns were raised when their staff started looking at the project, one being whether or not they can program a project for right-of-way purchase but not have the project advance to construction in a timely manner. She explained that when they program money for right-of-way, they don't actually pay the funds out until the project goes into a construction contract, so she isn't sure this solution really solves the problem, but they didn't have time to coordinate this with federal highway. She added that some of these are state policies, and some are federal, but, again she isn't sure this is something they can actually accommodate, nor do they know if sufficient funding is available to be able to proceed as they have all of their dollars identified through 2015.

Haugen stated that, as he recalls his discussion with Mark Walker, Assistant City Engineer, their first choice would be to use federal funds as part of the Urban Road Program, but if that isn't feasible they are interested in putting this in with local dollars. He added that this will be identified in the project list as being done in 2014, which is the last year of our T.I.P./S.T.I.P. He stated that, as identified in the staff report from the City to the City Council, there was a 20-year repayment clause when they received the advance purchase right-of-way funds, and 2014 is that 20th year. He asked if Ms. Hanson could follow up with the questions they need answers from NDDOT on, staff will try to get answers for the questions they can answer. He added that he feels this is exactly why we need to try to get this T.I.P./S.T.I.P. issue resolved before fall when we are trying to submit a document for approval.

Haugen reported that one of the questions they need an answer for is whether or not they can use funding from the Rural Road Program to reimburse the feds for the advanced purchase of right-of-way when they know the construction won't occur in the near future. Hanson responded that her gut feeling would be that you can't use federal aid to repay a federal aid loan. Stephanie Hickman agreed that you cannot use federal aid to repay a federal aid loan. Haugen stated, then, that they will work on getting a TIP amendment prepared, and one way or the other, in June, it might be all local funds.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

MATTER OF STUDY UPDATES

Haugen explained that this is just an update on all the studies the MPO has going on; which include the Transit Development Plan, the South Washington Street Wellness Center Traffic Study, the 47th Avenue South Corridor Study, the N.W. East Grand Forks Street Network Study, the South Washington Street and Underpass Study, and the Downtown Parking Study.

1. Transit Development Plan Update

Kouba reported that back at the end of March, URS started in on our Transit Development Study. She said that they came out here the 25th, 26th, and 27th, and the 25th and 26th we were out on buses doing ridership surveys. She added that they had their kick-off Steering Commission meeting, with various Stakeholders for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, mostly to try to get an understanding of where some gaps are, where we're looking to focus in on what are the main problems that the shareholders are looking at as being problems, as well as establishing how one would take care of them. She stated that they kind of did a survey of what gaps they found are out there, and put together a combination of which ones were most needed, in everyone's opinion; of course everyone had a different one they felt was the most important, but it gives us a good idea, overall, of where we will probably be focusing out transit on over the next five years.

Haugen commented that some of the gaps identified by the stakeholders include: 1) more frequency; 2) better night transportation; 3) Sunday service; and 4) determine future funding. He stated that they are still sifting through the surveys, and will keep everyone updated.

2. 47th Avenue South Corridor Study

Ellis reported that they held their first public open house in March. She stated that they took all of the traffic analysis that the consulting group had and prepared a presentation that went over the analyses they have so far, specifically where we see concerns in terms of school letting out, turning movement counts, and level of service deficiencies. She added that they also looked at the bike/ped facilities, and as this is currently just a rural two-lane roadway with ditching on the sides, we looked at how we can urbanize it to address bike/ped traffic as there is a school, and large softball facility out there, and on the very eastern side of 47th is where the new Wellness Center is going, so we will need to accommodate that type of traffic.

Ellis stated that they are at the very beginning stages of this study; addressing issues and concerns, looking at where the traffic is moving, looking at the ADTs, meeting with the school district, etc.. She added that the consultants actually went into the classroom one day to get input from the students as well.

Ellis commented that they are waiting to begin the process of setting up recommendations as to how we are going to urbanize that roadway, and discussions have been held already with public works, and will continue on things like snow removal, etc..

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

Ellis reported that this study is tied with the South Washington Street Corridor/Underpass Study, as the Wellness Center will be located at the corner of South Washington Street and 47th Avenue South, so we will need to look at what the 2035 traffic patterns will be once the center is constructed.

3. South Washington Street/Wellness Center Traffic Study

Ellis reported that the Park District is planning on building a new Wellness Center, to be completed by 2013, at the corner of South Washington Street and 47th Avenue South. She added that also being proposed; on the very north-end of 40th, is an ice facility with two arenas that the Blue Line Club is raising money for; and a facility for Altru Health Systems, as well, although she doesn't know how far into the planning process for either facility they have gotten.

Ellis stated that now that they have received the site plans for the Wellness Center, it was time to look at the traffic patterns and do a traffic analysis. She said that they held their first public open house in late February/early March, and did obtain issues and concerns, visited with the facility across South Washington to the west, which is the Aurora Medical Park facility, and the multi-family units, to discuss how we can safely mobilize an ambulance to South Washington with traffic control. She stated that they also looked at transit routes because you have a wellness center that is going to be used by the community, and you have a hospital and clinic facility that will be, and is being used by the community, and transit will be a real key component for both.

Ellis commented that what was included in the packets are the first set of draft recommendations for not only traffic control, but possible bus routes as well. She stated that they will also be trying to collaborate with the Transit Development Plan. Hickman asked they would be looking at any sort of traffic operation study. She explained that their new Safety, ITS, and Traffic Operations Engineer will be on board at the end of May, early part of June, and this might be a good opportunity to get him involved. Ellis stated that that would be great, and they would certainly send the information to him once he is on board.

Ellis reported that their second open house will be next Wednesday, May 18th, at which they will discuss these recommendations. She added, however, that the comment period will be open until the end of June.

Discussion on recommendations ensued.

Ellis commented that the second public input meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 18, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. at South Middle School.

4. N.W. East Grand Forks Street Network Study

Ellis reported that a full intersection at the intersection of 5th Avenue N.W. and U.S. Highway 2 in East Grand Forks is currently programmed in our Long Range Transportation Plan, and in our T.I.P., however the City of East Grand Forks has asked that the project be revisited to ensure it is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

still a viable project. She stated that we will be looking at traffic analysis for the corridor itself in order to address traffic issues; improvements along the corridor; improvements at different key intersections; improvements at the large, four-pronged intersection so that traffic can enter and exit more smoothly.

Ellis explained that there are some issues that need to be addressed including multi-modal concerns; and the Transportation Enhancement project that is currently planned to occur based on a full-intersection being constructed at 5th; so whether we do or don't do it, or we do a combination of things, we still need to address the multi-modal need there, specifically transit.

Ellis reported that they hope to hold their first public meeting in June.

5. South Washington Street/Underpass Study

Haugen reported that the first public input meeting was held on May 5th. He said that there are a couple of key issues with this study; NDDOT and the City of Grand Forks asked that the MPO help them identify how to sequence some improvements that may be necessary along this corridor. He stated that one of the key things is the condition of the underpass structure, which will really be the foundation on which some of the other recommendations will be based.

Haugen explained that the underpass is actually two separate structures. He stated that there was a two-lane underpass built in the early 1930s, and the additional two lanes to the east were added in the 1960s, so there are two different aged structures combined into one.

Haugen pointed out that there are definitely some condition issues, but the question is whether or not it can be rehabbed and kept in place, which means we would be constrained by it's current geometry as well; or if there is an opportunity to replace it would we need to replace everything, or since there are two structures of different ages, could we replace one half and rehab the other.

Haugen reported that the real capacity constraint issues involve the southbound traffic, and fortunately the west half is the oldest half of the structure, so if we do have to replace that half we could also address some of our capacity constraint issues that lead to the DeMers/Washington intersection.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating all the access points along the corridor, and explained that they did spend some time with the public discussing access management, and what happens when you have too many driveways, and how it interferes with the functionality of an intersection, how it increases accident potential, etc..

Haugen stated that they are also looking at some off-set intersections, such as 8th Avenue North, that they are going to try to address by either better aligning them or closing them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

Haugen commented that there are also some ADA issues that need to be addressed. He explained that there are structures located in the middle of a sidewalk, condition problems, and numerous driveways along the sidewalk facility, as well.

Haugen stated that a key thing is what is the future of the underpass, if it can be rehabbed for x amount of dollars, a portion of it rehabbed and a portion replaced for a different amount of dollars, or totally replaced for even more dollars.

Haugen said that the last issue is the DeMers/Washington intersection and how much more capacity can we squeeze out, whether we are constrained by the current underpass or not, and if we can come up with a funding plan to show how all the recommended improvements can be sequenced in.

Gengler asked if the consultants have given us an idea of, in the case of a straight-out replacement of the underpass, how long the railroad would be shut down. Haugen responded that it wouldn't be shut down, and a shoo-fly would need to be constructed, at a cost as well.

Lang asked if a member of NDDOT was present at the public input meeting. Haugen responded that Arden Striefel was present at the meeting. He added that the Steering Committee has a representative from both Bismarck and our local office, who is Les Noehre.

6. Downtown Parking Study

Haugen reported that a survey was done for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and we found that there is an ample supply of parking, however utilization seems to be the problem. He referred to slides of graphs illustrating this, and went over them briefly.

Haugen stated that one thing we have been asked to do, when the City develops downtown they have a separate zoning code requirement for parking stalls required, is to look into this and try to update it. He added that this also ties into how the assess for upkeep and maintenance of the parking downtown, whereby they give credit to a business if they are able to meet any of these code requirements regarding their own parking spaces.

Haugen said that the draft report shows that we do have some blocks where there is some pretty intense usage as there is little off-street parking available. He stated that some of the recommendations are:

- a) to try to implement more pedestrian enhancement activities in the backways; and
- b) because the parking ramps aren't close to all the businesses we are trying to enhance the environment so that when people park their cars they become pedestrians; and
- c) we are encouraging more bike usage by providing a better and more secure method of parking bikes in the downtown; and
- d) we have our transit hub located in the downtown, thus our current transit system pulses out of the downtown every half hour so we are trying to get more people to utilize it; and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 11th, 2011**

- e) identify and update signage; and
- f) pump up enforcement as little effort is dedicated to the parking rules set.

Haugen commented that we do have some issues with our parking ramps. He explained that, although the City has invested some funding into upgrading the lighting and painting, there are still some structural problems that have been identified that we need to address. He added, however, that these additional costs have upset some of the business owners because they feel they are paying to something they don't use.

Haugen stated that another thing the City asked us to look at is their method of how they are paying for their parking. One suggestion is that the City convert to assessment based on property, not business.

Haugen reported that they are doing a similar study in East Grand Forks, with similar results.

Haugen stated that the final recommendations will be available next week.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 11TH, 2011,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:48 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 8th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:38 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division-Bismarck (via conference call); Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division-Bismarck (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Dean Rau, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer.

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

Guest(s) present were: Mark Walker, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit Transportation Manager; and Larry Zitzow, UND.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen introduced Bryan McCoy, MPO Intern, and asked that he tell a little bit about himself. He then introduced Ali Rood, Transportation Manager for Cities Area Transit, and asked that she also tell a little bit about herself as well. He then requested, for both Ali and Bryan's benefit, that everyone please state their name, and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 11TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 11TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011**

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR 42ND STREET GRADE
SEPARATION RIGHT-OF-WAY**

Haugen reminded the committee that this was discussed briefly at our May meeting in order to determine how we should proceed with several changes to our T.I.P. document. He stated that during the discussion there were some questions that the NDDOT had agreed to help resolve in order that we follow the correct procedure to proceed with these possible changes.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that it included a scoping worksheet and a copy of a presentation, which Mark Walker, Assistant City Engineer, will be giving today, that will give us an outline on where the 42nd Street Grade Separation study is currently at.

Walker reported that for some time the City of Grand Forks has been considering doing a grade separation crossing project at the intersection of 42nd Street and DeMers Avenue, however it hasn't been done yet due to the significant cost involved with doing such a project, as well as a lack of funding. He stated that what they are trying to do at this time, however, is to preserve the right-of-way that we would need to do the project in the future, in advance of development that is starting to occur out in that area so we don't have to impact those developments and properties when we decide to do the project.

Walker reported that the City has hired the firm of Kadmas, Lee, and Jackson Engineers, to do an Environmental Assessment Document in hopes it can help us with our choice of an option. He stated that the reason they are doing an Environmental Assessment Document, in lieu of a standard Project Concept Report, is because some of the options have a negative effect on 4-F land. He explained that there was legislation passed back in the 1960s that said that when right-of-way is required, it cannot be taken from land that has been designated for parks, golf courses, etc.. He stated, however, that recently those regulations have been relaxed a bit, so that if we have an option that involves the taking of some 4-F lands, and in this case it would be golf course property, we may be able to do so if we can mitigate the negative impacts to the satisfaction of the owner of those lands.

Walker commented that another issue, however, is that in order for Federal Highways to approve an Environmental Assessment Document, we have to have a project listed in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P., which is the reason they are asking for this amendment at this time, so that the project can be included and Federal Highway can either approve or deny the Environmental Assessment Document.

Walker stated that they have also included a repayment of some advance right-of-way that was purchased in anticipation of this project, and under that loan program repayment of the \$359,000 used for the right-of-way purchase, is due in 2014.

Walker reported that, as indicated before, KLJ is looking at a number of options for the project, and he will now go over each briefly. He stated, however, that as they looked at these different

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011**

options, they thought of different things that are of concern to them including cost, impacts to 4-F land, inclines of the roadway, misdirection of traffic, impacts to existing properties, etc..

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

Walker pointed out that the areas shown in yellow on these options indicates a depressed roadway, blue indicates an elevated roadway, green indicates a structure that is at-grade, and red indicates an elevated structure.

Walker commented that the fully depressed option is the best in terms of it causing the least amount of disruption, the least amount of new land we would need other than maybe a temporary easement, but it is the worst one when we look at potential snow and rain accumulation. He explained that back in 1997 they learned that having good access is important when evacuation of an area is necessary, and in this case you would have two state evacuation routes that could be blocked in the event there was excessive accumulation of water, or during a major storm event. He added that it would also have the most impact to the existing gas station, in that access in and out would be need to be relocated.

Boppre asked if there was a preferred option. Walker responded that they do have a preference, but have not officially selected one at this time.

Haugen commented that the question is what does NDDOT still need answered, and do they have any guidance on how to proceed. Johnson responded that they did visit with Federal Highway and they did give us some information, but wanted to discuss it further internally on how they would like this pursued. He said that he thinks they are holding a meeting to discuss this issue next week, so hopefully we will have an answer sometime next week. Haugen asked if there was anything further that we can provide that will help with their decision. Hanson responded that she thinks it is more a matter of their needing to work things out in terms of the timing of the project, such as years of federal aid, as, at this time we don't have federal aid identified for a project in the upcoming T.I.P. cycle and Federal Highway is just trying to make sure that if we add this project to the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. that they are able to still approve the Environmental Assessment Document and work through the process in order to get that document completed, and keep moving forward with the project.

Haugen stated, then, that we have done our part in the process, and we just have to wait for Federal Highway to respond back. Hanson responded that that is correct. She added that they are actually waiting to get information back from Federal Highway, and she thinks they are meeting on Monday, and once they get that information from them they will be able to determine how this needs to proceed.

Haugen commented that the reason he asked this is because of the payback time schedule of 2014, and to be in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. so that the Environmental Assessment Document can be considered. Hanson responded that in terms of the payback, she isn't sure what the question is, but if you aren't going to construction before 2014 and you need to pay back the loan, then that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011**

is something that just needs to happen. She stated that she believes that Federal Highway indicated that you wouldn't be able to use federal aid to pay back that loan in any event.

Walker stated that what they included in the T.I.P. amendment request was to include some small amount of money for the acquisition of additional property, and even if it isn't the repayment of the loan, the request is that they be able to utilize some federal money to do an advance right-of-way purchase at a better location. Hanson responded that she understands that, but the problem they are having right now is that all of their Urban dollars have been identified through 2015, so the next available fiscal year of funds would be 2016, which would be outside of the T.I.P. cycle, so that is what they are trying to work out with Federal Highways to see what all of their options are in order to proceed. Walker said that, at a minimum, maybe the dollar amount doesn't need to be significant. He stated that right now it is a pretty small dollar amount, so he would think that being able to find some funds to put into the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. could be accomplished. He added that he doesn't know what dollar amount has to be included in order for FHWA to consider the Environmental Assessment Document, but their first desire is to do what ever it takes to allow Federal Highway to give consideration to the Environmental Assessment Document, which they are anticipating will be ready for a decision sometime this fall. He asked if they put a small amount of dollars in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. would they not be able to find some funding to allow them to be in the T.I.P. so that Federal Highway could consider the Environmental Assessment Document. Hanson responded that that is exactly what they are trying to work out with Federal Highway, to determine if there is a certain minimum amount that would need to be allocated to the project, based on the lack of availability of funds, that would allow the project to move forward, and they hope to have answers to that next week.

Information only.

MATTER OF MINNESOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION

Ellis reported that last month she presented that MNDOT was soliciting Safe Routes To School projects for the years 2012 and 2013. She stated that they have about \$4.2 million available.

Ellis said that the City of East Grand Forks would like to submit an application for those funds. She commented that, based on the fact that these funds are available to projects that benefit Kindergarten through 8th Grade, and based on past infrastructure projects that we have done, we were limited to one project and that is to place a sidewalk on the west side of Bygland Road, from 6th Street to 13th Street.

Ellis referred to Page 23 of the packet, and pointed out that it shows where the sidewalk will be located. She stated that this sidewalk will not be located in anyone's back yard, but will instead be located in the front yards.

Ellis reported that there will also be two pedestrian crossings, one at 6th and one at 13th, with the one at 13th connecting to an existing sidewalk that leads to Southpointe Elementary School and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011**

to a sidewalk that is being built on the east side of Bygland that runs to the Middle School as well.

Ellis commented that a City Councilman did request that improvements be made to the pedestrian crossings, so at the time of submittal of this application, the cost estimate of the project was \$228,000, which includes that addition of approximately \$60,000 for in-pavement lighting at the two crossings. She added, however, that after discussion with public works and the City Administrator, it was found that there have been some maintenance issues with the current in-pavement lighting, and with the Safe Routes To School projects you really want to make sure the lighting is working well, so we may be reducing the cost estimate to \$200,000, but they would still like to do some enhancements for the crossings such as a pedestrian light and speed-minder sign to remind people to continue driving the speed limit.

Boppre commented that at a meeting yesterday with Lou, who is our new Minnesota District person in charge of school projects, and he said that at a full intersection they will not allow in-pavement lighting. He added that it is going to a full-traffic light intersection, but he did try to do that at 13th in conjunction with another federal project, but MNDOT would not allow it until traffic warrants it.

Ellis stated that City Council approved the application, but it needs approval from the MPO, as well as letters of support from the school district, the city engineer, and Safe Kids.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY REVIEW, PRIORITIZE AND APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RECENT T.I.P. PROJECT AWARDS/APPLICATIONS

Haugen reported that this item is just announcing some T.I.P. project award applications that have occurred since our May Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Haugen explained that, first, the NDDOT finally announced their awards of Transportation Enhancement projects. He said that the DeMers Avenue, from 42nd Street West under the interstate to 48th Street, was not awarded funding, however, as discussed back when this project was presented, NDDOT does have a project on DeMers Avenue that is in the T.I.P. for 2015, so we would expect them to do pedestrian accommodations with that project that will go under the interstate, so hopefully this will be taken care of with that project.

Haugen stated that the second thing was, with the banning of earmarks, there were some discretionary funds that had been earmarked by congressional members in the past, that were made available. He said that Federal Highway did a quick solicitation of projects for those

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011**

funds, and the statewide transit agencies got together and submitted the application they put in for FTA funds under the Federal Highway Program Transportation System Community Preservation Program, and that application has been submitted as part of the state-wide funding of capital needs.

Haugen asked if the above project was the only one submitted for the TCSP by the state. Hanson responded it was. Haugen said, then, that it is a top priority application out of the state for the TCSP program. He added that there was some other discussion on projects that didn't make the cut, or were not submitted, as well.

Haugen stated that these were federal highway funds, and federal transit will be doing a similar solicitation for all of their programs that had earmarked projects as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. N.W Street Network Study

Ellis reported that they will be holding their first N.W. Street Network Study Steering Committee meeting on Thursday at the East Grand Forks City Hall at 1:30 p.m. She said they hope to get initial comments and concerns from the committee members.

b. 47th Avenue Corridor Study

Ellis reported that they will holding their 3rd 47th Avenue Corridor Study Steering Committee meeting, and 2nd Public Open House on Wednesday, June 22nd. She said that the open house will take place from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the South Middle School. She stated that they hope to get recommendations on the urbanization of 47th Avenue South between Columbia and South Washington, as well as pedestrian improvements in and around the school area, as well as traffic control improvements.

c. Public Input Meeting For Columbia Road and Gateway Drive Intersection Project

Lang reported that a public input meeting for the Columbia Road and Gateway Drive Intersection project will be held tomorrow, June 9th, at 4:30 p.m.

d. Public Input Meeting For the 32nd Avenue Project And the 42nd Street Grade Separation Project

Lang reported that the public input meeting for 32nd Avenue Project and the 42nd Street Grade Separation Project has been moved to June 29th. He explained that originally there was to be two meetings, but they decided to combine them into one, and to move it to Wednesday, June 29th.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 8th, 2011**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 8TH, 2011,
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, July 13th, 2011
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 13th, 2011, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Dean Rau, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer.

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

Guest(s) present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit Mobility Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that everyone please state their name, and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 8TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Hanson referred to page 4 of the minutes, and pointed out that the statement "...Urban dollars have been identified through 2015, so the next available fiscal year of funds would be 2015..." is incorrect. She stated that the next available fiscal year of funds should be 2016.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 8TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO CORRECTION AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FY2011-2014 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that, as discussed previously, there were some potential amendments to our FY2011-2014 T.I.P. document. He stated that staff is now requesting that the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board consider an amendment to the T.I.P.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that it included information concerning these amendments. He pointed out that due to timing issues the actual public hearing will be held next Wednesday at the MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting at 12:00 noon, therefore you will notice in the staff recommended action we are recommending approval pending the outcome of the public hearing outcome.

Haugen explained that the amendment entails bringing in some transit projects as well as the 42nd Street Grade Separation project.

Haugen reported that the Cities Area Transit was recently informed by the NDDOT that their JARC and New Freedom applications were funded at the requested amounts. He stated that you will notice that for the JARC funds, which are about \$118,000, we have identified they will be used to continue operation of Route 12/13, which is the route that essentially operates from the Alerus Center to Columbia Mall to the Aurora Medial Complex, and back.

Haugen commented that the second award was for New Freedom funds, and that was a request to fund the Mobility Manager position for Cities Area Transit, and that was also funded at the requested amount of just under \$51,000.

Haugen reported that the JARC and the New Freedom projects are considered “programmed”, and the do have funding behind them, so, therefore, after the amendment is approved by the NDDOT and FTA, we can request those funds.

Haugen stated that the third project is being processed as an amendment to our Illustrative Project list. He explained that illustrative projects are those projects that we would like to see done, but that don't have a committed funding stream to them. He said that this project is identified as the future grade separation at 42nd Street. He added that by adding it to the Illustrative Project list it allows us to get it into the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. document which then allows Federal Highway to formally consider the environmental assessment document that will be submitted to them this fall.

Haugen commented that during discussions on this project it was also discovered an advance right-of-way loan was taken out back in the early 1990's, and that loan is due to be repaid by 2014, so, as discussed in the staff report, we will carry this illustrative project in our T.I.P. covering fiscal years 2012 to 2015, and will show a repayment of the advance right-of-way loan in the amount of \$350,000 in 2014.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. TO INCLUDE THE 42ND STREET GRADE SEPARATION ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT AND TRANSIT FTA AWARDS PENDING OUTCOME OF THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR SOUTH WASHINGTON
WELLNESS CENTER TRAFFIC STUDY**

Ellis distributed copies of the updated Executive Summary (copies are included in the file). She reported that the primary goal of the study is to make traffic improvements from 32nd to 47th to accommodate the new Wellness Center being constructed, as well as other businesses in that area.

Ellis stated that they divided the infrastructure improvements into 2013 conditions, which is when the Wellness Center will be operational, and 2035 conditions, which is our current Long Range Transportation timeframe, so we will have recommendations for both 2013 and 2035. Ellis pointed that there is an implementation plan included in the information provided that does include some mid-term improvements that should go in with the construction of the Wellness Center as well.

Ellis referred to page 3 of the Executive Summary document, Year 2013 Traffic Operations Recommendations; page 4, Year 2035 Traffic Operations Recommendations; and page 5, Multimodal Facilities Recommended Alternatives; and went over them each briefly.

Brooks asked, concerning the connections into the neighborhood for sidewalk, he knows that they set aside some money for some improvements, smaller things, is that something that we would be looking at to connect into Great Plains Court, and at a lesser degree into the townhome development. Rau responded that they had some discussion in their office and they would not recommend those two connections because you would be coming through a neighborhood that is already established. Brooks commented that he thinks they might be wrong in assuming there would be fear from the neighborhood in having this connection put in. Rau stated, that right now this isn't being considered. Williams added that that would create an access point they fear people would use to park and then walk to the facility. Ellis asked if they didn't think that some of the people not parking in the facility is because they don't want to pay. Williams responded that they were doing it long before. Brooks stated that there would be the events going on, and he thinks it is a good idea. He added that he was going to follow up on it with Ali, that instead of having Route 1 go through Great Plains Court you could have it deadhead through here and then quickly back out again into what he thinks will be the main generator of the Wellness Center, and ultimately the clinic.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

Brooks commented that he did discuss with Altru about how they are going to do their transit stop, and he thinks they will be talking with CAT about it as well. He stated that the route that currently goes through Great Plains Court, would make more sense to have it go over to the Wellness Center so we can at least get served by 12 and 13. Williams commented that she wants to see if a bus can make those turns in Great Plains Court, can the bus make those turns. Bergman responded that they are already doing that. He added that they are maxed out, at 7.2 miles in there right now, so trying to push it from going into Great Plains, the only thing it is doing right now is that it is a turn-around point. He stated that somehow you have to get the bus turned around and back onto the route, and that is why 12 comes along and meets up with it at the corner of 40th and Cherry, so if you move one you will need to move the other. Brooks said that that is why he is suggesting this connection, that in terms of at least giving those people living on Great Plains Court a connection. He stated that he doesn't think this is like an Alerus, it is a different facility, and he knows that the Wellness Center will be the main generator for the bus. Bergman reported that there are two group homes right on the corner that they do pick up at, so they would end up losing four rider right there. Ellis commented that she also knows that the townhome association wanted a connection as well. Rau said that in talking about this with Al Grasser, they would not recommend doing those two. He stated that where the turn-a-round is, the actual plan they have shows a snow storage area there, not a turn-a-round, but they have no problem putting a connection through there, but the other two, at this point, are not recommending being done. Ellis commented, however, that the townhome association really wanted a connection to the Wellness Center. Rau responded that if they really wanted that connection, they wouldn't have a problem putting it in.

Williams stated that she would be submitting some written comments on the draft document. She said that the turn-a-round was discussed, but the current plat doesn't show it so they probably should modify the drawing, as it is currently shown at a snow storage area for Public Works and she doesn't want anyone to get the idea that there is going to be a turn-a-round.

Williams said that there were some questions regarding the cost estimates, and the additional information helped, but they wanted to make sure that the cost estimate also included engineering and contingency dollars as well because sometimes when you start doing planning and stuff, and you start using dollars and run short, it can be because not all the dollars are included in some of these cost estimates, so she wants to make sure that doesn't happen. Ellis agreed, adding that those are things that can be changed.

Williams referred to page ES-7, and commented that item 1 under Washington Street Corridor states that we will install fiber optic traffic signal interconnect cable between 32nd Avenue and 47th Avenue, but it has already been done, so that needs to be corrected. She stated, however, that we do need to leave in the second item to install traffic signal coordination timing plans.

Williams stated that they want to make sure that it states somehow that there may be future studies that could cause more changes to these improvement lists, that these improvements are not set in concrete, as they don't want to get locked in and then find out that something needs to be changed. She added that where it shows future possible frontage roads, that area is unplatted

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

property, and they found that between 32nd and 40th, on the east side, the frontage road concept wasn't continued based on the plat that was submitted, so, on the west side it should be noted that frontage roads will be determined at the development stage. She stated that they aren't going to hold anyone to developing the frontage road concept at this time, and they would like a note to that effect added so that is clear. Brooks commented that if they leave in "potential" it should be fine. Williams agreed, adding, again, that they just don't want anyone coming in and pointing out that this is what the study says so that is what we have to do and we don't want that, so they just want it made clear.

Williams stated that they also mention the width of 11th, which is already platted. Ellis agreed that the right-of-way is platted for that street. Rau commented that they are planning on matching up with what is already existing on 11th now, to the south, which is a 37 foot, back-to-back, so that is what they are going to put in. Williams added that it is already in the design stage. Rau said that right now they don't plan on allowing any parking through there, so it will handle the three lanes if they chose to go that route, but right now they typically don't put a 41 foot wide roadway in a residential area. Williams stated that they could just word that to say a street wide enough to accommodate left turn pockets.

Ellis reported that, again, this document has not gone out to the committee members yet so they know there will be more changes, but it is nice to mark it up. She stated that Earl and herself saw a draft just last week, and this is actually an updated version from the comments they submitted on that draft, so we know there will be more changes as it is presented to Service Safety at the end of this month, to committee members at the end of the week, to the planning commission in August, and to City Council in August as well, so we will continue to see changes. Williams asked if she wanted written comments now or later. Ellis responded that they were just hoping that everyone was okay with what is here now, knowing that changes will be made as it goes through the process. She said that she would like comments by the end of August.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT (WELLNESS CENTER AREA STUDY).

Haugen said that he guesses, Mr. Brooks' comment about the two options they have for transit, the two options they have for transit shelters, is the Wellness Center one of them. Brooks responded that they are supposed to be working on doing some sort of connection, but he hasn't heard anything yet. Haugen commented that they probably wouldn't want two stops. Brooks responded that he thinks they both will want one. Rau said that there isn't a connection between the Wellness Center and Altru, the Clinic, but they have talked about some time in the far future doing a skyway. Brooks stated that he thinks they abandoned that idea. Rau responded that they are still make provisions for one, but it is so far off in the future they won't even talk about it, but they will build to accommodate one if it becomes possible to build one.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

Brooks asked if Mr. Haugen wanted a recommendation one shelter or the other. Haugen responded that we would have two stops servicing essentially one development area. Brooks stated that he would think the Wellness Center would make the most sense as the clinic will have limited services until they enhance their property to the north, and then we might look at another alternative shelter there. Ellis reported that at the last committee meeting that Ken Vein and Bill Palmascino attended it was her understanding that the Wellness Center wanted a facility on the building, and Altru didn't want to have to have their people walk across the street to wait in the Wellness Center shelter, so they thought that as long as the route didn't change much they would prefer to have a shelter in the Wellness Center and another for those visiting the clinic as well, which is why they are showing two shelters.

Haugen asked which route was being recommended, because if they are going to have the Wellness Center have a shelter, and we are going to use the route shown in green. Brooks said that he thought we were just granting preliminary approval of the draft, not making recommendations today. Haugen stated that ultimately a decision will need to be made on one or the other alternative, so before you have both trying to invest in shelters, the key thing is until we get the roadway in place we don't know if the bus can make this run with the loop. Ellis asked if the study has to make a recommendation on one roadway or the other. Haugen responded it is kind of a chicken and the egg thing, but meanwhile, if the bus can't make the green route we will have two stops within this site. Brooks asked if this couldn't be dealt with at final, after they get the public hearing and meeting with Altru and the Park District during that final phase, then that might be the time for transit to take a look at this. Bergman agreed that he doesn't think we should make a recommendation now, especially with URS doing their route studies right now. Brooks stated that his recommendation would be to continue on with both and wait until we get the public feedback, and feedback from those involved, and have a discussion at final.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS STUDY

Haugen referred to the packets, and pointed out that a copy of a presentation that was given to the Steering Committee at their June 30th meeting, was included. He explained that the full presentation is available on the MPO's website at: www.theforksmmpo.org.

Haugen distributed copies of a newsletter, and pointed out that the 2nd open house will be held on Tuesday, July 19th at 5:00 p.m. in Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers. He stated that the newsletter also highlights some of the issues the study has discovered concerning the underpass and the DeMers/Washington intersection.

Haugen gave a brief presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen pointed out that in addition to the alternatives already explored for the DeMers/Washington intersection, the consultants did come up with another concept that they are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

going to carry forward; the continuous/partial flow intersection. He showed a video illustrating how this type of intersection operates.

Williams commented that the only issue they have involves the Historical Society. She stated that they were going to request that the consultant write the Historical Society a letter explaining that the underpass bridge cannot be saved due to the rare reaction to the concrete that is causing it to deteriorate so badly.

Haugen referred to the newsletter, and reminded everyone that there will be an open house on Tuesday, July 19th at 5:00 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers for the Washington Street Corridor Study.

Lange asked if the new alternative for the Washington/DeMers Intersection would make the Leever's site more attractive for the Library. Haugen responded that he thinks that the most this project would do would be to make some of the accessibility issues with that site even worse.

Information only.

MATTER OF DISCRETIONARY GRANT OPPORTUNITIES

Haugen reported that the NDDOT, and fellow operators in North Dakota, had discussions about some of the FTA programs, Discretionary Programs, and the two that seemed to merit the most interest were the TIGER and the State of Good Repair grants.

Haugen commented that, as of last week, there is going to be a statewide request for the State of Good Repair grant with the exception of Fargo, who is planning on submitting their own request. He said that the other three Urban Properties, Minot being the third along with Grand Forks and Bismarck/Mandan, as well as the NDDOT, will submit their application for the State of Good Repair grant, which will basically be the same as the TCSP Grant we just notified this body of in May. He added that this was also their original 5309 Program Grant Request.

Haugen reported that in terms of the TIGGER Grant, since it has a little more emphasis on greenhouse gas reduction, through the City's energy audit consultant, Mr. Bergman has some concepts concerning putting in geo-thermal heat, etc., with the bus barn renovations. He added that there is still some question as to whether or not the TIGGER Grant will be statewide or if it will be individually applied for. He stated that the one thing about TIGGER Grants is that the projects have to cost \$1,000,000 or more. Williams asked if there was a local match required for the TIGGER Grants. Haugen responded that there is, that it is a sliding scale that depends on the project. Williams stated that they were looking at submitted the 42nd Street Underpass Crossing. Haugen responded that that project probably wouldn't be a good candidate for a TIGGER Grant, but added that there is another grant called TIGER, that might be more applicable for this project. He added that they have until October to get an application in for the TIGER Grant, but only until the end of July for the State of Good Repair Grant and the end of August for the TIGER Grant.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

Williams asked what it would entail for the City to apply for the TIGER Grant. Haugen responded that they would need to go the website and download the application. Williams asked if the MPO needs to be involved. Haugen responded that there are some questions that they would need to have the MPOs assistance in identifying whether or not it meets the Long Range Transportation Plan criteria, how it would fit into the T.I.P./S.T.I.P., etc., but it isn't like the TCSP Grant, at least not that he has seen, where it needs to be submitted to the Federal Highway Division.

Rau asked if there would be an 80/20 funding split with the TIGER Grant. Haugen responded that it also has a sliding match scale, specifically in the rural areas, where it is 100% funded. He added that TIGER Grant projects have to cost \$10,000,000 or more, so 42nd Street would meet that criteria. Rau asked, if they were to apply for the TIGER Grant, and get it, when would they need to spend the monies awarded. Haugen responded that funds are only available for obligation through September 30th, 2013, so you would have until September 2013 to obligate, but you wouldn't have to spend it.

Williams asked if anyone else was applying for this grant. Hanson responded that she knows that Williston has been discussing possibly submitting an application for a project, but she doesn't know if anyone else is, if Fargo is or not. Williams asked if Fargo wasn't awarded a TIGER grant a couple of years ago. Hanson responded that they did apply for a TIGER I Grant, but did not receive it, however Minot was awarded a TIGER II grant recently, but added that they submitted an application for a \$25,000,000 project, and were only awarded \$14,000,000, so they did have to come up with the difference. Haugen asked if the grant survived recession. Hanson responded that it has so far. Williams asked what process they used, did they submit through the MPO or through NDDOT to get that grant. Hanson responded that Minot does not have an MPO so they did have to work through the NDDOT.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. South Washington Street/Overpass Study

Haugen stated, again, that the public meeting for the South Washington Street/Overpass Study will be held on Tuesday, July 19th, at 5:00 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers.

b. Transit Development Plan Study

Haugen reported that there will be a Transit Development Plan Study Steering Committee meeting on Wednesday, July 20th at 6:30 p.m. in Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101.

c. Columbia Road

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 13th, 2011**

Rau commented that there has been discussion on reclassification of Columbia Road from 36th to 47th. He stated that he sent Mr. Haugen a cost estimate they received a while back, and he was wondering where this is in the process. Haugen asked if he was talking about moving the project from long-term to mid-term in the construction process. Rau responded that that was what he meant. Haugen stated that he has not received any cost estimates on this project. Rau stated that he sent in back in March, but he will resend it.

d. 1st Avenue North Declassification

Rau asked where the process is for the declassification of 1st Avenue North from 4th to 5th. Haugen responded that they need a request from the City to consider declassifying that stretch of roadway.

Haugen reported that he has discussed this with Mr. Brooks, and was wondering if the vacation has formally occurred. Brooks responded that it has, and that it was his understanding that Engineering was going to run it through Service Safety. Rau responded that that was done some time ago. Brooks stated that it was never done. He added that the vacation went through the committee, but Engineering needed to run the declassification request through and it hasn't been done yet. Rau said that he thought that he thought the staff report recommended doing the declassification as well. Brooks stated that he would resend the e-mail he sent out previously regarding this issue. Rau said that he would also check past staff reports because he thought the declassification was part of the vacation staff report. Brooks responded that if that was the case, then they would only need to send a letter to the MPO requesting it be declassified.

Haugen commented that they should probably look at the Functional Classification map and address some of those extension of two roadways, 47th comes to mind, and 40th perhaps.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 13TH, 2011,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:03 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 10th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:40 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; and Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Lisa Atkinson, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit Mobility Manager; Mike Anderson, Alliant Engineering; and Stephanie Hickman, ND Federal Highway Administration, Bismarck (via conference call).

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen introduced Lisa Atkinson, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician, explaining that she has taken over the projects that Matt Leal had been working on prior to his moving back to California. He asked that Ms. Atkinson give a brief introduction of herself for the committee, and that the remaining committee members please state their name, and the organization they represent as well.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen explained that until Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer arrives we do not yet have a quorum, therefore he would like to suspend the agenda at this time to discuss the item Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer, has under Other Business.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Grand Forks Quiet Zone Implementation

Williams reported that they are currently nine and ten days away from implementation of the quiet zone. She stated that on August 19th all of the quiet zones, at 12:01 a.m., will be implemented with the exception of the Glasston crossings. She explained that the Glasston crossings are those crossings that parallel 42nd, and they will be implemented at 12:01 a.m. on August 20th.

Williams commented that they are also in the process of preparing their request for reimbursement of funds from the grants we received from the State of North Dakota, so they are in the wind-down phase of the process.

Williams stated that at last evening's Service Safety meeting, Curt Kreun announced that there is another round of legislation taking place for some additional grant money. She said that he isn't sure we would be eligible for those additional monies, but we will be looking into it to make sure. She reported that we do have several crossings that are not within a quiet zone that could be, so the additional monies would be most welcome.

Haugen put up a slide illustrating where the different crossings are located, particularly those within the quiet zone, and went over each briefly.

Haugen referred to the slide, and commented that there is a railroad crossing signal project scheduled to take place at the Central Avenue crossing in East Grand Forks, but, because of the government shut-down Minnesota experienced this year, he was wondering if it would get down this year or not. Ellis responded that she has not heard anything one way or the other on that. She added that there was discussion on the possibility of the crossing on 3rd being brought in to the Railroad Safety program, but based on where they are at this time, it could be a while before anything would get done.

Gengler asked how much of a reduction people should expect in terms of the blasts of the horns. Williams responded that there will be no horns blown. She explained that there will still be lights and bells at the crossing themselves, but there will be no horns blown on the trains. She added, however, that the Mill Spur is not included in the quiet zone at this time. Haugen pointed out that the rail yard will also still have horns being blown to announce various rail activities.

Haugen reported that each train engineer is required, should he feels there is a safety concern, to sound the horns at any crossing including those in the quiet zone, so there will still be horns in the community, just not because a train is going through a crossing.

Information only.

Bail reported present.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 13TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JULY 13TH, 2011,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we had anticipated, and scheduled for a public hearing at today's meeting for consideration of approving the 2012-2015 T.I.P. document. He said, however, that via e-mail and phone conversations with Mike Johnson, NDDOT, we were made aware of the fact that because North Dakota just released their Draft S.T.I.P. a couple of weeks ago, and have not completed their comment period, we need to wait to approve our Final T.I.P. document until our September meeting.

Johnson commented that Mr. Haugen is correct, that they did hold conversations concerning the fact that, while the MPO can approve a Final T.I.P. document, they run the risk of changes occurring in the Final S.T.I.P. that would create a need for amendments to that T.I.P. document. He added that another issue discussed was that the Draft T.I.P. document was approved by the MPO back in April, at which time he was not yet part of Local Government so was unaware of that fact, and had not had the opportunity to review the document. He added that after he visited with Federal Highway staff about the draft document, he found that they had not received copies, so, of course, they had not had the opportunity to review it either, so copies were forwarded to them at that time. Hickman commented that she had been out of town three out of the last four weeks, so if it came in while she was out she did not see the draft, and has not had time to review the final document, and neither has Larry ???, who is the engineer for the Grand Forks area, and he needs to look at it as well. She stated that she will gather Federal Highway's comments and get them to Mike by the end of this week or the first part of next week.

Haugen stated, then, that we are looking at addressing any comments people might have regarding the draft that was put out for public comment, and he is aware of a couple of changes that need to be made, by the end of August. He said that we can then republish a notice, and schedule our public comment period for the revised T.I.P. document based on the comments we will hear today, and the comments we hope to receive within the next two weeks so that we can address the final document at our September Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Johnson agreed that that timetable should be sufficient.

Williams asked if this has anything to do with any funding that is being delayed. Hickman responded that that is not the case from Federal Highway's stand-point, it was just due to their being unable to review the document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

Haugen referred to Grand Forks Project #8, U.S. Highway 2 Landscaping Project, and explained that just recently NDDOT announced a significant funding increase on this project, an additional \$352,000, so instead of it being a \$200,000 project, it is now a \$552,000 project, and he was wondering what the funding split will be. Johnson responded that he visited with Ben Kubishta about this, and it is his understanding that the split will be 80% federal, 15% state, and 5% local, but he will check to make sure.

Haugen referred to Appendix 1, FY 2011 Project Status, Grand Forks Project #7, 20th Avenue South Project, and commented that back in April it was anticipated that the project would be bid in June, but that has now been changed to November 2011. Johnson stated that he has a PCN number for this project as well, PCN #19075.

Haugen stated that he had some questions for MNDOT concerning some of the East Grand Forks projects, Projects 6, 7, and 8; but, unfortunately they are not here today. He explained that he does not have any information for East Grand Forks Project #6, which involves work on Minnesota Highway 220 North; and the other two projects are projects that back in March/April, when we did the draft document, they were waiting for bid openings so it would be nice to know if they bid openings were held, or if they were delayed.

Haugen referred to Appendix 2, FY 2010 Listing of Obligations, and explained that this is an attempt to show the difference, if any, between what was programmed and what was obligated for each project. He pointed out that he needs this information for the transit projects for 2010.

Williams referred to Grand Forks Project #17, and asked if there was a State Project number for it. Johnson responded that he doesn't think so but that he would check into it. Williams explained that they are starting on the PCR for this project. She asked if it was still two separate projects because one is on a state highway and one is not. Johnson responded that he believes that is correct.

Hickman referred to Appendix III, GF/EGF MPO Self-Certification, and commented that, although she doesn't know what Minnesota's requirements are concerning self-certification, she only needs the signed statement. She said that a copy of the entire document should be kept in the MPO files, but it does not need to be part of the T.I.P. document.

Haugen reported that we did notice an opportunity for the public to review the document, and to either appear in person or to submit written comments on it prior to 12:00 Noon today, and no one is present for discussion, nor were any written comments received.

Haugen commented that we will schedule for final action to take place on this at the September Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and will update the document, so if anyone has any further comments, please get them to the MPO as soon as possible.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

**MATTER OF SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR WELLNESS CENTER
TRAFFIC STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mike Anderson, Alliant Engineering, was present for a brief presentation.

Anderson distributed copies of the Executive Summary (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly. He explained that this was all presented at last month's meeting, and not much has changed since then. He stated that the draft report has been available since mid-July. He commented that they began the study in January, and have held three study committee review meetings, two public open houses, and submitted the draft report for review and comment in July.

Anderson reported that the study area includes the South Washington Street corridor from 47th Avenue South to 32nd Avenue South, South 11th Street, 47th Avenue South (Washington Street to Cherry Street) and 40th Avenue South (Washington Street to Cherry Street). He stated that the goal and objective of this study is to prepare a plan to help the MPO prioritize projects, to service the traffic safety and multi-modal needs for the Wellness Center opening in 2013; and to prioritize mid-term and long-term improvements out to 2035 to correspond with the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Anderson distributed copies of the recommendations (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over them briefly. He explained that they broke the recommendations out into three components: 1) the 2013 recommendations which are those recommendations necessary to accommodate the Wellness Center site construction; 2) the 2035 recommendations which are intersection/road improvements that are necessary to accommodate vehicle demands; and 3) the multi-modal improvements that would correspond with the Wellness Center development as well.

Presentation ensued.

Anderson referred to the Implementation Plan and Cost Estimate tables, and explained that they have been organized to provide all improvements listed on the figures, as well as when those improvements need to be implemented; what triggers the need for the improvement; identifies the agency that will either be the lead or the responsible party for the improvement; and the preliminary cost estimates for each improvement.

Anderson commented that the draft report is available for review on the MPO web-page. He stated that they are in the final stages of the study and are looking for final comments in order to be able to finalize the report.

Ellis reported that there are a couple of things they have learned about since they wrote this. She explained that she was told at a meeting last evening that in terms of the three trail connections from the site into the neighborhood; the townhouse association is planning on building a fence, so they will not be approving a trail connection. She said that they will get more information on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

this at today's meeting. She added that they would like to get more input from transit, and asked if transit representatives would be attending this afternoon's meeting. Bergman responded they would be attending. Ellis stated that they would like to get more input on what the preferred alternative is, to hopefully get some shelters planned. She added that she did get a site plan for the Wellness Center, so they know it is going in the center of the property, so anything to the north to 40th or to the south to 47th does not have anything planned at this time, so any sort of connections or trails that go in those areas will probably be moved to mid-term or long-term time frames.

Ellis stated that there are a few other items they want to get clear, but, again, that was the whole purpose of the draft, and as they keep presenting it they get more and more information as to what will and won't work. She said that they will flesh those items out at the 3:00 meeting today.

Haugen referred to the staff report included in the packet, and explained that it discusses that this information was presented to the Grand Forks City Council Service Safety Committee last night. He stated that Grand Forks City Staff prepared a staff report, and they did have some comments on the draft study.

Williams briefly went over the comments made by city staff.

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks has submitted an FTA Livability Grant Application. He stated that the total grant is \$3.8 million dollars, and the Wellness Center is just a portion of that application. He said that the Mayor's Office is using his "Destination City" concept, and is trying to improve the multi-modal connections between his centers (the downtown, the University area, the Alerus Center area, 32nd Avenue area, and now the Wellness Center area), so there was an application submitted for \$3.8 million dollars. He commented that the Wellness Center site itself was seeking funds to do all the trail/sidewalk systems in that area, including putting in some bus shelters, the paving of 11th Street to allow for the bus to get into the site, etc.. He stated that should the grant be awarded, a good portion of the recommended improvements would be covered by those funds.

Information only.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Haugen reported that in our work program we have an activity set aside to process an amendment to our Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that the City of Grand Forks desires to advance the construction of four lanes on Columbia Road from 6th Avenue to the mid-term period rather than the long-term period.

Haugen commented that both city and MPO staff looked through our listing of projects to ensure we maintained fiscal constraint by moving this project up. He added that they tried to identify a project to swap with, one that was already in the mid-term and that was close in cost, and that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

project ended up being the 17th Avenue Overpass Project. He stated that Service Safety is recommending that the City Council approve the project swap, if that should occur then a formal amendment process will need to take place.

Information only.

MATTER OF UND CAMPUS SHUTTLE STUDY

Kouba reported that back in mid-July URS Engineering came up and held a series of meetings with UND. She said that they created a steering committee made up of staff, students, transit, and MPO, and came with a perspective of what the priorities are for their shuttle service. She stated that they gave us some ideas on how it can be tweaked in order to make it run more efficiently.

Kouba referred to a power point slide, and pointed out that the areas shown in red are the high priority areas, which includes Odegard, along University and the Hyslop areas, which is where a lot of people get on and off and need to get from one end of campus to the other. She stated that that is exactly what staff at UND were saying, that they were having a hard time getting people from one end of campus to the other in a reasonable amount of time, especially on really nice days when people like to walk.

Kouba pointed out that there are also some barriers, on 42nd they are crossing the railroad tracks twice when doing their northern loop, which goes around the Ralph Engelstad Arena, along 6th Avenue, south or north on 42nd, and then to University Avenue. She added that in the middle of campus, east of the coulee, there is high pedestrian traffic, a great amount of classes held in that area which creates a lot of student crossings, so the amount of people traffic can be considerable.

Kouba referred to a slide illustrating the timing issues with the shuttle, and went over it briefly. She explained that there is a minimum of two minutes to travel from one end to the other, but sometimes it takes over ten minutes so it can be a considerable problem when a student needs to get to class on time.

Kouba commented that many things were discussed. She said that there is definitely slight route changes that could occur, one being to continue to do an express route along the south end, from Campus Road to the parking lot across from the football stadium, which would help get a lot of students from Odegard to the Hyslop area. She reported that these particular traffic routes would allow a lot more buses along University, but it is still going to be congested along University.

Kouba stated that the parking studies that have been done for the University have suggested lot assignments, and that suggestion was put out there to help prevent a lot of the lot hopping that happens. She explained that a lot of students, those that have a lot of time between classes, will drive their vehicle from lot to lot instead of using the shuttle or walking.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

Kouba said that another suggestion in some of the other studies was to have a more focused pedestrian crossing, which it is hoped would create a more group type crossings rather than single crossings at various locations.

Kouba reported that this basic plan was the one that everybody in the steering committee felt would work the best until they can get a road through there, to keep the same routes they currently have.

Williams asked if manual counts were done on University. Kouba responded that they used what we had. Haugen added that when NDDOT did their 48-hour tube counts we asked them to keep increments of 15-minutes, so when the University area was done, it was done that way so we have counts every 15-minutes. Williams asked if they could ask them to break off the truck traffic from the other traffic. Haugen responded that they could do that. He added that they also, when doing turning movement counts, counted all the intersections in this area for turning movements, also using the 15-minute time frame. He stated that they also have the bike/ped counts separated from those turning movement counts.

Haugen reported that for the shuttle system itself, they don't keep accurate tabs of how many students are riding, so we are basically meeting with the drivers that were available to get their perception of how many students they felt were loading and unloading on the shuttle system itself.

Williams commented that every time she has been down at the University during the day, there are trucks that don't need to be there, so she is wondering if prohibiting trucks during certain times of the day would help.

Haugen reported that the last slide in the packet illustrates some implementation that can be done immediately if they want to address the issue they heard about the problem of getting from the Hyslop area to the Odegard area, and that would be to split their southern routes in half, so one bus focuses on University Avenue and the other dedicated to Campus Road. He stated that on the north half the routes they are running are serviceable routes, just on the west end, as Teri mentioned, crossing the railroad track they do get caught by trains, and the road that she mentioned is a connecting of two parking lots that serve their married student housing area, which is something they are looking at but that probably won't get done this fall.

Haugen stated that it appears that Option B is the favored option if they can get a connecting roadway in place, with the splitting of the route on the south half and having two different routes operating on the north half.

Haugen said that a draft report was submitted to the steering committee, and they are waiting for comments. He added that URS will again review the operations when they come back once fall semester begins so that they can physically observe and ride the routes to see what the operations are, and what the conflicts are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

Haugen stated that the end result was that the current route structures aren't really that bad, and there really isn't an easy solution other than splitting the south routes in half and have one bus focus on Campus Drive to get those students with time constraints to get from one end of the campus to the other.

Sanders commented that he thinks there will be a lot of flack if they put the proposed road in there. He stated that there is family housing in three of those quadrants, and that is about the only green space they have. Kouba responded that there have future plans of doing something different in that area, where the family housing is, specifically about removing it and doing something different. Haugen added that they are also trying to identify ways to make sure it is just a campus connection, not a through city street facility. He stated that in absence of that there really isn't anything that gets them except for having to cross the railroad tracks twice and potentially being stalled by trains.

Haugen reported that the other thing they worked with UND on was the fact that they are using 40-foot Bluebirds, or school buses, which limits a lot of their ability to get into some of their streets and areas. He stated that they worked with them, as part of the State of Good Repair Grant, on trying to get them 30-foot replacement vehicles, similar to the City's, in order for them to have better access to some of the areas of concern.

Information only.

MATTER OF GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Haugen commented that this last presentation is the result of our working with the Grand Forks City on updating their Land Use Plan. He said that a presentation was given to their Planning Commission, and it was felt it would be appropriate to give it to this body as well so that you are aware of where we are at on this Work Program activity. He pointed out that a copy of the presentation was included in the packets.

Atkinson reported that the web-site link is listed on the first slide. She said that her presentation will be a quick overview on what has been accomplished with the update, where we are in the process.

Presentation ensued.

Williams asked how this fits into the Long Range Transportation Plan, is this the first step in updating that plan as well. Haugen responded that it was. He explained that the Long Range Transportation Plan will be based on what both cities are saying in their Land Use Plans, where they plan on growing, etc.. He added that both cities have a tier system, so we know we shouldn't be planning for huge developments in Tier 3; and with the 9% growth in Grand Forks and the 1.2% growth in East Grand Forks we can allocate housing stock and employment out into our traffic analysis zones based on what they are telling us they expect their land uses will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2011**

be out in those areas, and we will use those to help model our travel demand forecasting, and to help set up our transportation system.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Memorandum On Declassification Of 1st Avenue North

Williams stated that she was wondering what the status is on the declassification of 1st Avenue North as they are looking at updating their map. Haugen responded that he needs to meet with city and DOT staff to go over any other functional classification changes that might be anticipated. He stated that once that occurs it will be up for consideration at next month's Technical Advisory Committee. Williams stated that she would be the contact person for the city.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 10TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:04 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 14th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; and Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 10TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 10TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF STATUS OF SAFETEA-LU

Haugen reported that he has been trying to e-mail everyone all the updated information available concerning SAFETEA-LU since the agenda packet went out. He stated that last Friday both the House and the Senate leaders agreed to a six-month extension of the Surface Transportation program by attaching and combining it with a four-month extension of the Air Transportation Authorization bill.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

Haugen said that the House passed, via a unanimous consent vote, the bill, as a stand-alone bill. He explained that this bill provides authority, up to the end of March, for surface transportation, and also extends the gas tax. He stated that the authorized funding levels are the same as those for Fiscal Year 2010. Haugen reminded everyone that this is not an appropriations bill, so Congress will still have to act on that for Fiscal Year 2012. He added that this extension will allow them to spend up to this level until they appropriate an amount.

Haugen reported that the Senate's rules are somewhat different than the House's, who were able to work their rules in order to garner a unanimous voice vote of just those house members physically present in the chamber at the time of the vote. He explained that under the Senate's rules, one senator can place a hold on legislation requiring that there be 30-hours of debate on a bill. He stated that a senator from Oklahoma did this as he wanted this bill amended. He said that the reason for this is because, on the Senate side they combined this bill with a couple of other things going on in the Senate that they felt were hot topics, or topics that would garner strong approval. He explained that one of the things they attached to the bill has to do with sanctions against a middle-east country, and the other has to do with hurricane relief funds, so the senator decided he wants to try to amend the bill and the only way to do this is to place this hold on it. He added that the amendment deals directly with surface transportation, and involves eliminating the requirement that the 10% set aside for enhancements has to go towards just those activities.

Haugen commented that this means that right now, today, the Senate cannot act on this bill until the 30-hours of debate have been completed. He added, however, that they can do something called "Cloture", but they need 60 senators to approve closing the debate prior to the 30-hour timeframe.

Haugen stated that the Federal Aviation Act is actually expiring Friday, so when they pass these two together, it forces them to take some action by Friday. He commented that initially the hope was that they would be clean extensions, six months for surface and four months for aviation. He stated that it went through smoothly on the house side, but there was a hiccup on the Senate side, so we will have to see what the debate brings.

Haugen reported that the other amendment the senator wants to do concerns hurricane relief. He explained that he wants to find an offset for the cost of hurricane relief, which is a touchy and difficult thing for the Senate to try to dispense of, but they have to allow the senator his time.

Haugen stated that this is the latest information he has on the status of SAFETEA-LU; adding that there is still some disagreement with the House on a future six-year bill, and the Senate is still trying to work on a two-year bill. He said that the funding levels are quite a bit different in both chambers as well; and now the best guess, at least from the Association of MPOs perspective, is that this will put things right in the middle of the presidential debate, so they feel it will just be kicked around until after November of 2012 before a resolution will be reached.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

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

- a. Public Hearing**
- b. Committee Action**

Haugen reported that we initially thought we would approve the T.I.P. back in August, however because there was still an open comment period for the Draft North Dakota S.T.I.P., we were unable to act on it until now. He stated, however, that he did note in the staff report that since our last draft there have been two significant changes made to the document; the first one was the landscaping enhancement project on U.S. Highway 2 by the Airport, which more than doubled in cost, thus requiring an amendment to the document; and the other was a Minnesota project whereby MNDOT awarded a Safe Routes To School project to install a sidewalk on the west side of Bygland Road down to 13th Street. Haugen said that these two projects are now reflected in the program list and we have reconciled all of our T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P.s on both sides of the river.

Haugen stated that we did advertise today's meeting as an opportunity for the public to make comments through 12:00 noon today. He said that no comments were submitted, and there is no one present today, so, he would now like to open and close the public hearing.

Williams asked if the repayment of advanced right-of-way for the BNSF Railroad Crossing at 42nd was included in the T.I.P. Haugen responded it was, and pointed out that it is shown on Page 30, Project Number 21. Williams asked if the construction portion of the project was listed as an illustrative project. Haugen referred to Page 30, and pointed out that Project Number 21, repayment of advanced right-of-way is a programmed project; and that the construction of a grade separation project at 42nd is shown as an illustrative project on Page 47.

Lang referred to Page 49, Project Number 8, Landscaping between Airport Road and North 55th Street, and reported that the bid letting has been changed to February 2012.

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL FY2012-2015 T.I.P. SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Haugen reminded the committee that last month we discussed that we were anticipating, both in our Annual Unified Work Program, and seeing a City staff report, that we would have a formal request from Grand Forks to consider amending our Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that currently we have South Columbia Road in the outer years of the document, and in order for it to be eligible for being placed into the S.T.I.P. program in the near future we had to shift it to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

the mid-range of the Long Range Transportation Plan, which in turn meant we needed to identify a project to move out.

Haugen commented that, in working with the City of Grand Forks, we have identified that the 17th Avenue Overpass project is essentially the same cost in 2007 dollars, so we flipped-flopped those two projects in the plan, and the fiscal constraint is relatively unchanged, therefore we are asking this body to give approval to amending the Long Range Transportation Plan to flip these two projects. He added that the rest of the Long Range Transportation Plan will remain unchanged at this time. He reported that these two projects are currently identified to be utilizing urban roads funds so this change will not cause any other jurisdiction to make changes to their funding status.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS DISCUSSED.

Lang asked what the project was that was being moved up again. Haugen responded that the project we are requesting be moved up in the plan is the South Columbia Road Project, south of 36th Avenue to 47th Avenue South.

Williams said that they are doing 17th on the west side, up to the Interstate, but she was wondering if 17th was also already on the map from the Interstate, east to the existing 42nd, is it included in the Long Range Transportation Plan map. Haugen responded that the overpass at 17th Avenue is, and will remain included in our current Long Range Transportation Plan.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen reported that the next step will be to process this amendment through the City Planning and Zoning Commission, and then through the City Council. He stated that it will probably be November before it is brought back to this body for final approval.

MATTER OF APPROVAL SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET WELLNESS TRAFFIC STUDY

Haugen pointed out that figures from the Executive Summary were included in the packets. He stated that this has been well discussed at our last few meetings.

Ellis stated that because we have already had several discussions on this item, she will not be giving a presentation at this time.

Ellis reported that all the changes requested by Engineering, as well as those made at the last committee meeting, have been executed into the final document. She added that in addition, changes were made to the cost estimates to make them more fiscally constrained, as well as the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

addition of some right-of-way engineering work, some environmental work, and some other things as well. She commented that they also added the possibility of a Livability Grant, as well some changes to the multi-purpose paths. She stated that this has been presented to the Park District, and they are going to continue to move forward to work with transit on where the shelters are going to be as well as what the actual bus route will be as well.

Ellis stated that at this point the final has been presented, with those changes, so staff is now seeking approval from the Technical Advisory Committee in order to move it forward.

Williams said that she has one concern, and that is that the last finding and analysis said: “The document should be adopted as a future framework plan for the South Washington Street Corridor and Wellness Center Area”. She stated that they had discussed that there is a lot of good information in the plan, but in recognizing that they are going to be starting into our Long Range Transportation Plan next year, they would like to amend that statement to say: “ This document should be approved and forwarded to City Staff as being consistent with the existing Long Range Transportation Plan and T.I.P. objectives and the best available information for this area”.

Williams reported that the reason for her request is that, if it should turn out that in the Long Range Transportation Plan we find that the area is growing faster or slower than we anticipated, it would allow us the flexibility of adjusting dates in order to accommodate the growth, or lack thereof.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET/WELLNESS CENTER STUDY SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE AMENDMENT, AS DISCUSSED.

Brooks asked what difference this amendment makes. Ellis responded that her understanding of the amendment is that she is just making it clear that it is approved instead of adopted. Haugen asked if this changes anything in the document itself. Williams responded that it does not change anything in the document itself. Ellis added that it changes the findings and analysis on her staff report.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR SOUTHWEST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK STUDY

Ellis reported that we are just moving along further east of the Interstate with this study. She stated that she is presenting an RFP today for the committee’s review and approval, adding that it is their hope that they can begin the study for the Southwest Grand Forks Collector Street Network in November.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

Ellis referred to a map of the study area, and explained that the situation is such that we have Kiwanis Park, which is located in the center of the study area which is bordered by South Columbia Road to the east, by 32nd Avenue South to the north, by I-39 to the west, and by 47th Avenue South to the east. She stated that they are hoping to provide something that the Park District and the City Engineering Department can agree upon as to how they are going to establish our north/south and east/west collectors in the future. She said that this will be helpful to the Planning Staff in that they will then have something they can use to help developers determine where the roads are going to be located. She added that it also helps provide for right-of-way, and it helps clear up the fact that we have a number of different plans, and agreed upon situations as to where the roads will lay.

Ellis pointed out that 38th and 34th run north/south, and we need some way to get that connected down to 47th. She stated that with the drainway being there, as well as Kiwanis Park, there has been a number of different ideas and plans as to how the roads will run through there, how they will run down to 47th, but each we come to an agreed upon layout, someone changes their mind and we have to start all over again, so our hope is that this study will help by looking at current conditions, what our current planning is and what our future planning might be. She said that they will be looking at various scenarios that could affect the layout of future collectors including commercial centers, doing a permanent drainage study in order for us to keep the stormwater management in mind when we do propose the street layouts, and the consideration of a possible future interchange at 47th, and how those north/south collectors would be laid out if that were to occur.

Ellis stated that this will be a true transportation study as we won't be doing any landscaping or anything else particular to the area, just looking at the street layout and making sure that we provide adequate right-of-way, and that we come to some sort of agreement as a committee between the Park District, Engineering, and the developers out there. She added that they intend to have three or four developers sit on the committee in order to accomplish this. Brooks commented that we just want to nail them down on the location of where they want to be without anyone backing out again. Ellis agreed that this was the intent. She stated that this study has been in the MPO's Annual Unified Work Program for several years now. She explained that they intended to complete the study, and then they thought they had something between the Park District and others that everyone could agree upon, but then it fell apart, so it is now time to move forward with the study to get everyone together and formalize the study area with the affected parties.

Ellis commented that the RFP being presented today is the first draft, and since the packet was sent out Engineering staff has provided comments, and she has included them into an amended RFP. She briefly went over the comments received:

1. How are these alignments going to affect Ruemmele Road, and what are the mitigations?
2. How are the collectors South 34th Street and South 38th Street supporting the future needs of the area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

Brooks asked when they had that committee, and had three developers on it, did they also have a neighborhood representative on it as well. Ellis responded that they did not. Brooks stated that he forgot that with Reummele Road there probably should be a neighborhood representative on the committee as well. Ellis responded that she would check into getting a neighborhood representative on the committee.

Ellis reported that they are going to discuss how the proposed street system is going to support the land use in the area; whether or not there are any mitigation measures needed; and how to address the bus alignment. She explained that we have a current alignment with the future I-29/47th Interchange, so we will look at the concept drawing for that interchange and see what needs to be done.

Ellis stated that she actually took the questions from Engineering and put them directly into the RFP so that they know some of the things we want them to consider as they are moving forward with the study. She then referred to the timeline and went over it briefly.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE SOUTHWEST GRAND FORKS COLLECTOR STREET NETWORK STUDY RFP.

Haugen asked if one of the outcomes from the study was to designate an official map for this area. He stated that there was discussion on identifying the street network, and holding people to that, and it would seem that the tool to do that would be an official map. He pointed out that there is kind of already such a map with the quarter/quarter reservations, but he is wondering if that is something that we want to identify in the RFP; that we want to officially map the major right-of-ways. Brooks responded that that is something they would need to discuss further, but it is a possibility. Williams added that, once again that would be something that is based on the best information available at the time. Haugen commented that you already have your quarter/quarters; 40th Avenue is already reserved right-of-way; 34th Street north and south to the unplatted areas is already reserved right-of-way; and with the plat you have for the Kiwanis Park area that is where 34th is kind of skewed a little bit to the west. Brooks agreed that this may be beneficial, especially since we keep having to deal with someone backing out and changing their mind, and once a map is developed that buries it. Williams agreed, but added that this is something that needs to be looked at further before putting it into the RFP.

Brooks asked if they would need to actually get a survey document to do this, adding that he isn't sure this is something that actually needs to be in the RFP as it might be something that the City would then have to take on rather than the consultant. Haugen commented that you might want to consider adding language that informs the developers on the committee that the intent of this is to nail down where the right-of-ways are going to be. Williams agreed that this should be included in the RFP. Ellis stated that she could add this to the Scope of Work, pointing out that the last sentence in the first paragraph of the Background section now states: "Therefore, this study must assist both entities in reaching a conclusion as to how the street pattern in this study

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

area should be developed”. She said that she could modify this to say: “Therefore, this study must assist both entities in reaching a conclusion as to how the street pattern in this study area should be developed with the intent of establishing future right-of-ways via a conceptual map”. Haugen suggested it might read better to say: “... future right-of-ways that may be used as an official map”. Ellis agreed, adding that under the scope-of-work she would add language requiring that they prepare a map that establishes future right-of-ways that can be used in future development. Johnson suggested that along with that you might want to mention access control as well, not just right-of-way as you might want to limit access along the roadways.

Haugen asked if the above discussed modifications were okay with Mr. Brooks and Ms. Williams. Both agreed.

***MOTION, WITH THE INCLUSION OF THE ABOVE DISCUSSED MODIFICATIONS,
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

MATTER OF 47TH AVENUE SOUTH STUDY PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION

Ellis pointed out that a copy of the Executive Summary was included in the packet, and explained that the presentation she will be giving today will just elaborate on what it says. She added that this presentation will also be given to the Steering Committee members tomorrow at 1:30 at the Mark Sanford Center, and that there will also be a public meeting on this at South Middle School tomorrow evening at 6:30 as well.

Ellis reported that the study covers South Columbia Road to South Washington Street, and explained that so far we have analyzed existing conditions, held two public input meetings, examined the alternatives, and are now developing recommendations and estimated costs.

Ellis e said that they will be presenting preferred alternatives from the zero to five year, or the short-term period; including recommendations for improved signage for the crossing at 20th and 47th, which is the main entrance to South Middle School. She added that with the Long Range Transportation Plan amendment we had today, they should show that South Columbia Road will be a four lane roadway in 2015. She stated that stated that the long-term recommendations, from six to fifteen years out, show a divided two-lane roadway with median right and left turn lanes. She said that at this time she did ask them to change that because that hasn’t been established yet as they do still have a plan that shows a three-lane, no median with a center left-turn option as well. She said that a signal at 47th is planned; a roundabout at 47th and 20th is a preferred option; an extension of the trail on the south side is planned; construction of a multi-purpose trail on the north side is planned; show placement of some bus pull-outs; and show placement of a Hawk Signal for pedestrians.

Williams asked where they were planning on placing the Hawk Signal. Ellis responded that it is shown as going in at 20th, right before the roundabout. Williams stated that it is her understanding that Hawks cannot be used at an intersection, which is what she was told by the State, that they can only be used at mid-blocks. Haugen responded that they can be placed

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

within a certain distance from intersections. Williams said that the fact is they cannot be used at a driveway like that because it doesn't control the traffic. Ellis pointed out that it is shown before the driveway, where there is already a crossing there. Haugen stated that it has to be 600 feet away from an intersection. Williams said that she doesn't think it meets that criteria either, so they will have to look at this closer. Ellis agreed, and reminded everyone that this is a draft, that there will still be steering committee meetings, so they have time to look into these issues.

Ellis referred to the presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over the roadway sections; intersection, transit, trail pedestrian, and landscaping alternatives/recommendations:

- A) 2-lane divided section with a raised median, right turn pocket and left turns. The reason for the raised median is because it is safer for more pedestrians and drivers and allows for a little bit of landscaping. Right turn lanes at key intersections, again, are for safety purposes. It also shows a painted center line, which we want to keep in in the event the cost becomes too high for the raised median to be implemented, we would have two cost estimates.
- B) 47th and Columbia Road – the signal is a preferred option for intersection control. They did look at a roundabout, but with speeds coming in from the south and farm vehicles using the roadway, it wasn't as good an option as a signal.
- C) 47th and 20th Street – a roundabout is the preferred option. It does provide a safer crossing for pedestrians and it does slow traffic down considerably, but it does not stop traffic so you would continue to have through movement when school isn't in session or there isn't a lot of traffic volumes.
- D) 47th and South Washington – a signal is already existing. This carries over the recommendations from the South Washington Street Corridor study. It does address some of the access changes for the Aurora Medical Center as well as adds some turn lanes.
- E) Bus pull outs – there were some concerns regarding the existing bus stop on South 20th. They would like to be able to provide bus service closer to the wellness facility as it would be easier for students if they don't have to cross so they are recommending bus pull outs on both the north and south sides of 47th. The one south of 47th would provide direct access to the property.
- F) Multi-Model Improvements – one is to add a new trail on the north side of the road, extend current trail on the south side of the road, and adjust the trail where the drainage is.
- G) Add Hawk Signal – will align with the front door of South Middle School. They have been finding that most kids want a direct connection, whichever door they see that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

where they are going to cross the road, it doesn't matter if there is a pedestrian crossing further to the west, they are just going to cross the street, so they recommend putting in the Hawk Signal so that it connects with the sidewalk that leads directly to the front doors.

Brooks commented that it doesn't seem like the Hawk Signal aligns with the front door. He asked if it should be moved to the east. Williams responded that the front door is actually down below there, so it doesn't need to be moved to the east. Ellis added that the sidewalk leads directly to the front door. Williams said that the bike racks are right down in that area, but she doesn't think the signal will meet the spacing requirements. Brooks commented that they can have the consultants check on the spacing. Haugen asked if the at-grade crossing was being given any consideration. Ellis responded that it should be looked at further into the study. Haugen commented that that is mid-block. Ellis said that this may be where they are recommending the underpass be located. Haugen said that he recalls the underpass being connected with the bus pull outs.

- H) Landscaping still needs to be considered by public works as it can often times affect snow removal, etc..
- I) Estimated Costs – these figures do not include engineering, right-of-way impacts, or construction inspection costs. These are the estimates they have, but there is a different estimate from a scoping document from the city, so we will need to get a more fiscally constrained and accurate cost estimate in the final.

Ellis stated that there will still need to be discussions on the intersection improvements, the roadway sections, the pedestrian improvements, and the transit improvements to ensure they meet the needs and meet code.

Williams commented that she isn't ready to accept the draft document at this time. She stated that she feels there are still too many things that need to be worked out and it hasn't even been to the steering committee for their review and comments yet. She said that she does feel it was a good idea to bring it to the Technical Advisory Committee at this point, but she just isn't ready to accept the draft at this time.

Johnson reported that it is his understanding that there is a new requirement that we no longer use the term "preferred", but should instead use the term "feasible" in our corridor studies.

Brooks asked if this document needs to come before the committee twice. Williams said that 47th isn't scheduled until 2016, so it isn't time urgent. Ellis stated that after the steering committee meeting and the public input meeting tomorrow night she can make some adjustments to the document before she presents it to the Planning Commission, and then can bring it back here after that so any comments from the Planning Commission can be implemented as well.

Consensus was to continue this item to the October Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

MATTER OF SOLICITATION FOR 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen commented that even though we just completed the 2012-2015 T.I.P. process, we now have to begin working on the next T.I.P. document. He referred to the packet, stating that the schedules for both North Dakota and Minnesota are included, and pointing out that there are some discrepancies between the two schedules. He went over both schedules briefly, stating the main difference between the two is that instead of the November deadline North Dakota has, Minnesota's deadline is January 4th.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side there were also some changes to the matrix, which he hopes everyone is familiar with. He stated that the matrix tries to identify all of the federal funding programs available, the central federal/local match, ratios, how we come up with the amount of funds available in a T.I.P. cycle, how the projects are solicited, how the projects are selected, what the division is within the NDDOT, and the federal program.

Haugen stated that the big change to the matrix is due to the fact that some large projects previously solicited by the NDDOT are now being solicited by the MPO. He said that the main programs the MPOs will now be soliciting projects for are the HSIP Program, the Recreational Trails Program, and the Bridge Program. He added, however, that there is a matrix in our T.I.P. manual on the Minnesota side that didn't change.

Haugen reported that there are letters ready to mail out to the City Engineers, the District Engineers, and the County Engineers identifying the T.I.P. cycle for the projects they typically deal with. He stated that included in that will be our MPO study area in the event someone isn't sure how far out beyond the Federal Urban Aid Boundary our study area goes.

Haugen commented that the application forms will be available just as they were last year. He stated that the cover letters will have a paragraph included that discusses the difficulty of identifying future funding. He added that we are now progressing with pretty much a status quo assumption on revenue, meaning that we don't anticipate any increases whatsoever through the length of this T.I.P. cycle, however we still have to address year of expenditure, so we will be utilizing a 4% inflation per year increase for expenditures so if you are scoping a project in 2016, and you are using 2011 estimates, you need to plug in the 4% inflation per year increase to come up with year of expenditure.

Information only.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED UPDATE TO FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND
URBAN ROAD MAPS**

Kouba reported that the City of Grand Forks requested that the MPO amend the functional classification map due to vacating 1st Avenue North, between North 5th and North 4th Streets. She added that some of the other areas that we noticed with the functional classification map was on the west side of the interstate. She explained that South 48th Street is going to go all the way

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

down to 32nd so we can include it, west of 17th Avenue South, which is now in there. She pointed out that along 47th Avenue South we extended it out as far as it can go to meet up with what will be 38th Street in the future.

Haugen explained that several months ago they had good discussion about these section line roads that are physically in place, but they are rural design, and we are not consistent in our treatment of them (he referred to a map and pointed out how this affected 47th Avenue South). He stated that in lieu of that discussion we have extended 62nd Avenue South out to where it physically connects with our current future 38th Street alignment. He then referred to 17th on the map, and pointed out that that roadway exists, and so we converted the future dashed lines to solid existing lines.

Kouba reported that on our Urban and Regional Maps these same changes were made as well.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE NORTH DAKOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND URBAN ROADS MAPS AS DISCUSSED.

Haugen commented that the other change occurring on the Functional Classification Map involves the section of South Columbia Road, south of 62nd Avenue South to the Merrifield Road, and reclassifying it as a County Major Collector. He stated that this was approved by the Grand Forks County Board about a year ago, and since we are updating our map we need to include it as well.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Public Meetings

Kouba reported that they will be holding two public meetings:

- a) The first public meeting will take place this evening in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers at 6:30 p.m. to present information, as well as to gather information, for our Transit Development Plan.
- b) The second public meeting will take place tomorrow evening in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room, also to present and gather information for our Transit Development Plan.

Kouba commented that this evening's presentation will be televised on Channel 2 from 6:30 to 7:30 p.m.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 14th, 2011**

Ellis reported that in addition to the public meetings already discussed there will be two additional meetings on September 29th for the N.W. East Grand Forks Street Network Study:

- a) The first public meeting will be held on Thursday, September 29th at 1:30 p.m. at the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room.
- b) The public open house will be held on Thursday, September 29th from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the East Grand Forks Senior High Library.

Haugen stated that tomorrow at 5:15 p.m., here in A101, the Washington Street/Underpass Steering Committee will meet. He added that on Tuesday, September 20th the Northside Property Owners meeting will take place in the old Blockbuster building in the morning; then the Southside Property Owners meeting will take place at the Italian Moon Restaurant in the afternoon; and then at 6:00 p.m. an open house will take place in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers.

2. Long Range Transportation Plan Update

Williams asked if staff could give an update on the Long Range Transportation Plan that is going to be starting next year, specifically the timeline of when things might happen. Haugen responded that the MPO's current work program tells that information, but he would be glad to go over it at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 12th, 2011, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Kirby Becker (Proxy for Joe McKinnon), MNDOT-Statewide Multi-Modal Planning St. Paul (via conference call); Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks; and Ali Rood (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Cities Area Transit.

Guest(s) present were: Nancy Wills, Bonestroo/Stantec Consulting.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; and Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because we have a new member in the audience today he would request that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIMANS, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF DRAFT MINNESOTA GO-VISION

Kirby Becker, MNDOT, stated that he would like to give a brief presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) on the Draft Minnesota GO Visioning Process.

Becker commented that the Minnesota Department Of Transportation started about a year and a half ago to work with a bunch of stakeholders, like the MPO, to create a long range vision for transportation for the State of Minnesota. He stated that once the vision is approved, hopefully by the end of October, it will be directly included into an update to the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan.

Becker reported that the vision was created to include some guiding principles that will help prioritize transportation policy, or direction for the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, which is supposed to be a kind of statewide focus. He stated that it was guided by a 31-member Steering Committee that was made up of a diverse group of stakeholders.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen asked why they identified the ages of 8 years old and 80 years old, why not use “cradle to grave” or something, because what are we doing for those younger than 8 and older than 80. Becker responded that he actually posed the same question to Mr. Schaffner, Project Manager, when the vision was developed, because there are kids that are five and six years old that are walking to school because of the Safe Routes To School initiative, and the reason he gave was that if you look to some of the research and information that was initiated in Europe, and brought over to the United States, it was initiated using the age range of 8 to 80, so it was felt we would use the same age range as well. He added that it was discussed at several meetings, and other alternatives, such as using the term “young to old”, were explored, but it was determined that we would continue with the 8 to 80 range. Lang commented that to him this isn’t really an issue, that they aren’t singling out anyone, your just saying that any 8 or 80 year old can use it, not that anyone younger or older can’t. Becker agreed, adding that if you look at the bike/ped community, and a lot of the initiatives that are going on there, they use this “8/80” rule quite a bit as a standard for the young and the old. Haugen stated that it just seems to negate a lot of the Safe Routes education promotion because that has been, so far, primarily aimed at the elementary schools.

Haugen commented that, another, probably broader topic, a more germane one, would be that the vision doesn’t make a lot of statements or implications about trying to get more resources to accomplish what we are envisioning to do. He asked if it would be fair to say that, or would you point out to him where it might have statements that talk about searching new resources, primarily revenue, to reach our vision. Becker responded that Mr. Haugen is correct, and explained that the idea of including financial resources for achieving the vision was purposefully left out, as it was the direction of the Steering Committee, after much discussion, that it not be included so as to not cause an issue with fiscal constraint, but it is something that will need to be addressed in the plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

Haugen asked who would be giving the presentation on this to the MPO Executive Policy Board next Wednesday. Becker responded that Mark Nelson would be attending both the GF/EGF MPO Executive Policy Board meeting and the FM/COG meeting to give a presentation. Haugen stated that MPO Staff is still trying to formulate comment to offer to our board to consider. He asked if this would be the same material for the MPO Executive Policy Board's packet, or will there be anything new added. Becker responded that it will be relatively the same material, with little to no changes.

Information only.

MATTER OF CONSIDERATION OF COUNTY PROJECT FOR THE 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that in our T.I.P. schedule we identified that county projects on the North Dakota side needed to be submitted to the MPO by October 3rd. He stated that Grand Forks County did submit a project for consideration that is essentially a mill and overlay of DeMers Avenue, extended west of 55th Street, or the Amtrak Depot, out to Airport Road, or County Road 5. He said that this is essentially a ¾ of a million dollar project, with \$500,000 federal and the remaining county funding.

Haugen commented that Grand Forks County did submit a narrative and ranking score sheet that he did not include in the packets. He added that it is the only project for consideration, and they are requesting funds for 2013, which also happens to be when NDDOT is doing a project on DeMers as well, which would mean that DeMers would be done out to the west side ramps, so in 2013 we would have a project on either side of DeMers Avenue between the ramps and 55th Street.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF GRAND FORKS COUNTY CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDIES

Haugen reported that this agenda item involves reviewing and approving the Scope-of-Work for the School Safety Studies for Valley Middle School, Schroeder Middle School, and South Point Elementary Schools.

Ellis stated that this will be the last School Safety Study that we will have A.T.A.C. perform for us. She said that after these three schools are done we will have completed eight studies for all of the public elementary and middle schools in the MPO area, as well as some of the parochial schools.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

Ellis reported that the Scope-of-Work has not changed, they will still be analyzing the existing conditions, looking at safety issues, and will come up with short-term and long-term improvements. She reminded everyone that this is not a Safe Routes to School study, but is literally a school safety study so they will be looking at everything including pedestrian safety, roadway and parking characteristics, traffic control and pavement markings, traffic circulation, etc., and will propose both short-term and long-term improvements for each school.

Ellis commented that these evaluations will need to coordinate with the study completed by Ulteig Engineers, Inc., which looked at city-wide uniform traffic control devices for all Grand Forks and East Grand Forks schools and provided strategies for the appropriate devices at certain areas or situations.

Ellis stated that they have budgeted \$15,000 for A.T.A.C. to do these studies, and typically their estimates have come in around that amount, but if there are any additional costs it will be negotiated, or they will use technical funds to cover any differences.

Ellis reported that they have already held their first initial meeting, simply because they want to be able to get started at the beginning of the school year in order to get evaluations done before it gets too cold, or conditions change.

Williams asked if they normally use all of the funding allocated to these studies. Ellis responded that that they do. Williams stated that she was just thinking that it seems to just come up time and time again that there is a confusion where funding might come from to pay for some of these improvements, so she was wondering if they might want to ask A.T.A.C. to include in the Scope-of-Work to provide something on funding sources that might be available to help with those costs. Ellis responded that they do provide cost estimates, so maybe when we go over the draft we can ask them to provide some funding opportunities.

Haugen commented that one item going on with A.T.A.C. right now is that they are in a staff change-over, and are advertising for a new staff person to lead this project. He said that until someone is hired, Tim Horner has been leading the study, but they hope to have someone on board by December. Ellis added that the study will go into the next year, but with the likelihood that we could still have snow on the ground when school ends, it is always nice to get started early in order to be able to get an idea of what is going on at the start of the school year, get the observations done, and get the evaluations completed. Williams asked if this was to be completed this fiscal year, or do we need to approve carrying it over to the next fiscal year, in terms of the budget. Haugen responded that we are in a two-year work program, so carrying it over will not be a concern, and we did actually identify that we would initiate this in the fall in our work program, so there shouldn't be any problems.

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR THE SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FOR VALLEY
MIDDLE SCHOOL, SCHROEDER MIDDLE SCHOOL, AND SOUTH POINT***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, AND HAVE A.T.A.C. BEGIN SUCH STUDY, SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF A.T.A.C. PROVIDING FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE STUDY REPORT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC CIRCULATION STUDY

Ellis reported that, as already discussed previously, this study will look at the intersection of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W.. She added that it will also look at what they consider somewhat of a confusing intersection, with large right-of-way; 12th, 17th, and River Road, as well to address some safety concerns, to revisit the Central Avenue Corridor Study to make sure all of the traffic improvements scheduled to be done between now and 2035 are still valid, and then address our multi-modal needs.

Ellis commented that they have prepared alternatives for two intersections, as well as for a transportation enhancement project that we have that is based off of a full intersection being constructed at 5th and U.S. Highway 2.

Ellis reported that two studies have been done for a full intersection at 5th and U.S. Highway 2, or access management along U.S. Highway 2 with a full intersection both in 1994 and 2006. She stated that there is again some concern as to whether or not a full intersection is necessary, so we are revisiting the issue again in order for us to have a general agreement with the City, and some plans in place before we go into our Long Range Transportation Plan Update next year.

Ellis then gave a brief presentation on the various alternatives available (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Ellis concluded by stating that this is all still a work in progress.

McCoy asked what the reason was for 10th Street N.W. and U.S. Highway 2 to be so close. Haugen responded that 10th is a local street, mainly for the residents, and U.S. Highway 2 is a National Highway connecting from coast to coast, so one is meant to be more of a high speed, minimal access roadway and the other a more low speed, local access roadway, so 10th Street was probably in place before 1969 when the Kennedy Bridge was built, and U.S. Highway 2 was relocated from the downtown to this neighborhood. Brooks added that the relocation of U.S. Highway 2 just kind of wiped out the grid at that time. He said that they were told that East Grand Forks was kind of sacrificed to get that bridge in. Williams pointed out that if you kept that little piece on the ramp it could be made into a bus turnaround in the future as well, because there is a nice long area to turn out and then get back, so you could just remodel the west end to get back in again.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

Ellis reported that, just to let you know, they did go back and look at the Central Avenue Study again, and it matched up with the original study so there aren't any problems with that. She said that they were asked to look at some rear-end crash concerns with the right-hand turns coming off Central onto Gateway, heading westbound; and turning right onto Gateway, heading eastbound. She explained that people are easily getting into the right turn, but then if they stop to look the people behind them are still moving at a forward motion so there have been some rear end crashes occurring, which is why they were asked to look into the issue along with MNDOT.

Ellis commented that they were also asked to look at ADTs. She stated that the concern is always, why would we open 5th Avenue N.W. if the traffic volumes aren't there, which is a kind of "chicken before the egg" issue, because they want to open it to handle traffic during a flood event, but when there isn't a flood event there may not be as much traffic, so we want them to get the ADTs out to 2035 so we can take a look at them. She added that opening it would positively impact the Central Avenue/Gateway Drive intersection.

Ellis stated that the next Steering Committee and Public Meetings are scheduled for November 10th, and they are hoping to get the alternatives whittled down to just the most feasible, and to complete the study by the end of the year.

Lang referred to the slide showing a ¾ turn and full signalized intersection, and pointed out that it looks like a cul-de-sac on either side on 10th Street, is that correct. Ellis responded it is correct. Lang asked what the access would be like for those three properties beyond that point, on the east and west. Haugen responded that the alley there would remain, so on the East side access should be fine. Ellis added that there has been some discussion on maybe doing something to allow those residents to be able to park in front of their homes, maybe putting in a long driveway or something like that, and the one on 5th has access to the alley as well.

Lang asked if there was resistance from those properties. Ellis responded that the one on the northeast corner attended the public meeting, and his biggest concern was possibly losing some parking on 5th, because that is where he likes to park his cars. Ellis added that the owner on the other corner, and the one on the south side of 5th are going to sit in on the Steering Committee meeting, so they will hopefully be more informed.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON WASHINGTON STREET/UNDERPASS STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet were combined presentations that were given to property owners along the corridor. He explained that in late July a public input meeting was held on our access management information, and last week further discussion was held on overall corridor traffic operations and cost estimates, so the first few slides of the presentation are just addressing access management concepts.

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

Haugen referred to Figure 4.13A, and pointed out that all the X's are current driveways that they are proposing be closed, and those businesses have access off the intersecting street right-of-way or the alley. He stated that on the north side almost all properties have the benefit of having either an alley or street, or both available.

Haugen stated that on the south side, they are suggesting that 9th Avenue be vacated, and 10th Avenue be relocated so it aligns on both sides of the corridor. He added that there are many driveways along the corridor that could be removed, and either relocated or create a shared driveway between two businesses.

Haugen reported that not all driveways can be eliminated, such as the Dairy Queen's for example, so they will have to remain which means there will still be some direct access onto Washington Street.

Haugen pointed out that there are areas shown in yellow, for which they are looking at different street cross-sections. He stated that a basic one would be replicate what is currently out there, and the other would be the standard, recommended cross-section includes a six-foot berm separating the sidewalk from the driving lanes. He said that the final option would also have a six-foot berm, but would also have a six-foot median installed as well. He pointed out that when it comes to berm and median options, those buildings shown in yellow are getting encroached upon with the right-of-way needed to complete the cross-section, and on the south side, even though they appear to be really close to the right-of-way, there is ample room, but on the north side that is not the case, and that is where we have the majority of our properties that become in jeopardy of changing the right-of-way to accommodate berms and medians.

Haugen reported that we have talked about the continuous flow intersection option for the DeMers/Washington intersection, and, referring to the illustration of the continuous flow intersection, stated that if we did this type of intersection we would impact the fire station by needing to close off the current access back into the firestation; plus we would impact access for Xcel and the two additional properties there as well.

Haugen briefly went over some cost estimates, pointing out that the continuous flow intersection option would be quite expensive to construct, however it would still be considerably less than any type of interchange that has been proposed at this intersection in the past.

Haugen commented that they did look at the underpass structure; which is essentially two separate structures, one built in the 1930s and the other in the 1960s. He stated that the entire structure is deteriorating considerably, and while some repair work could be done, it is questionable as to how long that repair would last before reconstruction would be necessary as those repairs would not actually fix the issues, just delay the inevitable need for extensive reconstruction.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

Haugen reported that a signal at 2nd Avenue North is not warranted by volume any longer, so there may be some consideration to remove that signal, however in order to do that you will need to go through all the federal highway requirements.

Haugen stated that University Avenue has some movements that are causing concern, but a continuous flow intersection would eliminate a lot of the backlog at DeMers and Washington so the intersections would operate better, however they are still suggesting some interim improvements at University Avenue; 1) have left turns at some areas; 2) introduce a flashing yellow light rather than a sign that says left-turn vehicles may go on green, there is a yellow flashing arrow instead to indicate they can still turn but with caution.

Haugen commented that at 8th Avenue North there is a new warrant, under the MUTCD rules it states that there has to be signals railroad crossings, this meets that requirement so they are suggesting that we install a signal at 8th Avenue North and Columbia Road.

Haugen said that, as with any project, streetscaping is required. He briefly went over some of the suggestions for streetscaping for this project.

Haugen reported that the consultants are proposing the implementation strategy split the corridor into five phases. He said that their highest priority would be to replace the underpass, however they also suggest that if the underpass is replaced, the continuous flow intersection at DeMers and Washington should be constructed at the same time.

Haugen stated that mid-term we would be looking at reconstructing the south side of the corridor, where we have all the driveways to help curb the accident problems we are experiencing; and also to extend the pavement life on the north side by doing a mill and overlay.

Haugen said that long-term we would basically do the reconstruction of the north side of the corridor.

Haugen reported that on October 27th a presentation will be given to upper management at the DOT in Bismarck. He added that, based on the input we are receiving, and continue to receive, sometime in November we will have our draft report for the committee to review, and the final report in December.

Lang asked what advantage there is to realigning the intersections at 8th and 10th, wouldn't that encourage even more crossing of Washington, and increase the issue of conflict points. Haugen responded that it would eliminate a large number of conflict points. Williams added that they would probably need to signalize 10th. Lang stated that that would make sense, otherwise it wouldn't. He asked if it was common-place to actually get across Washington at a non-signalized intersection. Williams responded that 10th is actually about halfway between 13th and DeMers, so she is fairly certain they would have to signalize it. She added that that is part of the problem at 13th and Washington, that everyone goes down 12th to cross at 13th, which is why there is such a long que there in front of the school. Haugen stated that another reason for the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

alignment is to eliminate driveways off Washington and put them on those side streets, which would remove a lot of conflict off of Washington. He added that there is also a cross-walk there, which he didn't show, but there is an existing painted cross walk, and depending on what they do it might be a consideration to add some enhanced crossing tools. Williams reported that that cross walk is actually going away. She stated that the signs were pulled up several years ago, and the paint is wearing away and won't be repainted as it isn't a good location for a crossing.

Williams asked, at University and Washington, and 2nd Avenue North and Washington, one was recommending the possible removal of a signal and the other the protected left turns, in those costs can we check to make sure they are including the cost of redoing the signal coordination plan as any changes made to the signals would require that be done. Haugen responded he would let them know that. Williams added that any future changes to any of the signals will need to include that cost.

Johnson asked, when you speak of a 6-foot berm, are you talking strictly separation or will it be 6-feet above the road. Haugen responded it would be just separation. He added that another thing; and he will need to get clarification from Stephanie Hickman, FHWA; but sometimes it sounds like you can get away with just one technically feasible alternative, but then it sounds like she is saying technically feasible alternatives to carry through into the environmental phase so that the environmental document can analyze them, so he needs to verify this with her and will get back to you. Haugen asked if there wasn't something supposedly coming out on this next Tuesday. Johnson responded that he isn't aware of that. Haugen stated that it was his understanding the Everyday Count Committee was working on this, and will be holding a committee meeting on the 18th to finalize their draft report, which will then be circulated. He added that the Everyday Count, or Planning Environmental Linkage, is trying to bring some of the NEPA stuff into the planning phasing of things, with the real intent behind all of it to eliminate the duplication of the public involvement process. Johnson agreed that it will probably be addressed in that document.

Haugen reported that we are currently soliciting for projects, and last year Les Noehre submitted the full replacement of the underpass as a suggested regional project for 2016, and he is expecting that that same request will be made again, however it will have more in-depth information available, including cost estimates, this time. He stated that once we get past that a lot of these implementation plans in this presentation will be subject to change.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update On FY2012 Appropriations

Haugen reported that since our last meeting, Congress has authorized the extension of surface transportation until March, however they also had to address funding, so we now have funding in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 12th, 2011**

place for FY2012 through November 18th, at which time they will again need to address the issue.

Haugen stated that for now enhancements are still eligible for the 2012 funding, although they have all been pretty much selected and programmed for 2012 anyway.

2. UPWP Section On Updating Long Range Transportation Plan

Haugen stated that, per Ms. Williams request for an update on the Long Range Transportation Plan Update, he included a copy of that section of our current work program that discusses the update process. He said that we are currently doing the TDP, and in 2012 we will begin working on the Street and Highway segment. He added that the Land Use Plans are also an important component of the plan as well, and we are also working with A.T.A.C. for maintenance and assistance with the travel demand forecasting software and products, and in 2012 will complete an update to the traffic model.

Williams asked with the modeling will begin. Haugen responded that it will start in the spring. He added that they will also be doing turning movement counts at all signalized intersections in the spring, and will also be intersecting traffic on the bridges like we did in 2001 as well.

Haugen reported that the RFP will go out in January.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY WILLIAMS TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 12TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 9th, 2011
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 9th, 2011, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks; and Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Teri Kouba (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Cities Area Transit.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Lisa Atkinson, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because we have a new member in the audience today he would request that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 12TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 12TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 9th, 2011**

MATTER OF DRAFT GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Atkinson reported that staff has been working on the update to the 2040 Land Use Plan for some time now. She pointed out that the draft report can be viewed on the City of Grand Forks' Web Page at: www.grandforksgov.com/landuse. She stated that she would be giving a brief presentation/overview on the revisions made to the document (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation/Overview ensued.

Haugen commented that the draft report has been given preliminary approval by the Planning Commission, and will be presented to the City Council on November 21st. He stated that it is hoped that final approval will be given by both the Planning Commission and the City Council in December, after which the MPO can then give its final approval in January 2012. He added that with that the MPO staff will then begin updating its Long Range Transportation Plan and try to forecast travel demand based on these updated land uses.

MATTER OF DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen commented that when Federal Highway, and NDDOT and MNDOT did their mid-year reviews with the MPO, one of the items they identified as needing updating was our Public Participation Plan. He stated that there were some typos found in the document, Federal Highway wanted a couple of things reviewed to ensure they are being done, and the 2010 Census results were available and needed to be implemented into the plan to ensure the latest census information is included.

Haugen reported that the Public Participation Plan is a requirement by the feds. He stated that it is a unique document in that once we give it preliminary approval there is a 45-day comment period. He pointed out that most documents have a much shorter timeline for comments, however federal law dictates that the Public Participation Plan need to be available for public review and comment for a 45-day period.

McCoy then gave a brief overview/presentation of the revisions made to the draft Public Participation Plan (a copy of the draft document is included in the file and available upon request).

Overview/Presentation ensued.

McCoy referred to a slide of the updated Environmental Justice map, and pointed out that it indicates where there are larger clusters of minorities or lower income citizens. He noted that the average percentage of minority or lower income areas is under 8%, while the area shown is at 25%. He added that the area is Tract 8, and is south of DeMers. Haugen commented that in the previous plan, the area west of UND and the Interstate was where we had our Environmental Justice area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 9th, 2011**

Haugen reported that Environmental Justice is how we identify where there is a higher concentration of minorities, or low income citizens. He explained that if there is a high concentration of them in your area you need to identify them, and then when you do any transportation projects in or near your area you have to ensure that that population is not harmed in any way, and if they are, we have to do mitigation efforts similar to what is done with endangered species.

Haugen commented that the Environmental Justice regulation doesn't identify or define what a "concentration" is. He stated that this was first put into place in the 1990s, and at that time the MPO adopted the philosophy that if it is three times the average, then we have a "concentration". He added that this "concentration" was always located near the UND area in the past, but that has now changed. He explained that in the past they were always able to use actual census data from a survey that we all have to fill out every ten years, but now the decennial survey is narrower in scope, so these findings are based on American Community Survey Data, which is done annually, although we are using five-year data. He asked if East Grand Forks was included. McCoy responded it was.

Boppre asked if this changes anything with the Minnesota Avenue project at all. Brooks asked if it was on the list before. Ellis responded it was not. Haugen added that it wasn't identified as an Environmentally Justified concentration. Boppre asked if it changes the formula at all, or the project at all. Haugen responded that when they go through the project development stage they will have to determine if there is an adverse impact to that population by doing the project. He added that if the answer to that is yes, then they will have to do mitigation, if the answer is no then nothing else needs to be done.

McCoy reported that the only other changes involved some different wording at the end of the document, and some legislation citations.

Haugen commented that since this map is newer than what was distributed to everyone earlier, we will delay action on this until the December Technical Advisory Committee meeting in order to allow everyone to review it more thoroughly.

Haugen reported that there are several other documents referenced in this document that you will see updates for next month as well. He stated that one is a separate document that we must produce called an "Environmental Justice" document, which will show more of a full analysis, as well as different maps indicating where our minority populations, and poverty concentrations are by percentages.

Haugen commented that we are also required to do a Title VI document, and included with that document there is a Limited English Proficiency plan that we need to produce as well. He explained that this allows us to determine where we have blocks of LEP, and ensures that if we do projects in those blocks we are not prohibiting their participation by not having other languages available. He added that under Title VI we are required to use a more in-depth sign in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 9th, 2011**

sheet that asks for gender, disability, etc., information, which we were not required to do in the past.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks asked us to look at two issues with their downtown parking. He stated that one is their current requirements for how much parking is needed by land use, whether or not it is adequate or needs updating; and the other is the method in which they charge businesses, or properties in the downtown to help offset the cost of operation and maintenance of parking in the downtown. He commented that the MPO hired the firm of Rich and Associates, who gave us feedback on those two issues, but also provided quite a bit more insight and recommendations concerning the parking in the downtown area.

Haugen gave a brief power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen commented that some of the things illustrated in the presentation are already being implemented. He pointed out that one of the things identified was that the parking ramps have some structural problems, and with this study we were able to verify those problems, and come up with some cost estimates for repairing them, which allowed for the City to set aside the funds necessary to make those repairs, as well as some additional improvements, including the lighting. He added that with this the City also started a capital reserve fund in order to have funds available for future issues.

Haugen referred to the presentation, and briefly went over the recommended changes.

Haugen reported that an open house will be held at the Corporate Center 2 for the downtown property owners in order for them to be able to get a little more information as to what is going on.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 9TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 1:10 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 14th, 2011, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck; Kim Adair, NDDOT/Local Government Division – Bismarck; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Joe McKinnion, MNDOT-Bemidji; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Bill Troe, URS; and Jon Markesen, Kadrmas, Lee & Jackson; Mike Bittner, Kadrmas, Lee & Jackson.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Mitchell Kasdan; GF/EGF MPO Intern; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that since there are some new people in attendance he would like to request that everyone please state their name, and the organization they represent. He then introduced Mitchell Kasdan, the MPO's newest intern, and asked him to tell a little about himself.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 9TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 9TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Haugen reported that this is an amendment that was given preliminary approval back in September by the Technical Advisory Committee. He added that it was also presented, and received approval from the City of Grand Forks as well.

Haugen stated that this essentially takes a project from our current mid-range time period; the 17th Avenue Overpass of I-29, and swapping it with the South Columbia Road conversion from a two lane to a four lane urban road, which is programmed in the long-range of the LRTP.

Haugen pointed out that the changes have been noted in the current document, both to the projects lists and to the financial tables as well. He stated that no other changes have occurred to either project.

Haugen commented that both the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the City Council have granted preliminary and final approval of this amendment. He added that during those processes public hearings were held, and now the Technical Advisory Committee is being asked to forward their recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve this amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF CANDIDATE NORTH DAKOTA PROJECTS FOR THE 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this agenda item discusses the North Dakota candidate projects for the 2013-2016 T.I.P. He explained that the NDDOT has set a deadline of December 16th for project funding requests, which is why the MPO Executive Policy Board will be meeting tomorrow rather than next week as was previously scheduled. He explained that in prior years, typically the NDDOT had different deadlines for the different programs, but this is the second year that all programs have the same deadline, and that is December 16th.

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

Haugen commented that our responsibility, as it is every year, is to look at each candidate project to ensure it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and then prioritize the projects within the program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

Haugen reported that one thing that occurred this year was a decrease of \$2 million dollars in revenue. He explained that when we began our T.I.P. cycle last year we were informed we could use a 3% per year revenue inflation, but this year we were told we needed to hold our revenues flat. He added that last year we were also not informed that our program was going to be set at the obligation limit, this year we were told it was, so by having 0% revenue growth we lost roughly \$800,000, and by going to the obligation limit we took an additional \$400,000 hit, thus a decrease of \$2 million dollars to start off with, however our inflation for expenditures was still at 4% per year.

Haugen briefly went over the programs being looked at, explaining that on the Urban Regional side it is always plus one additional year added to the four years in the T.I.P. cycle. He stated that in terms of the current T.I.P. projects, this is where some of the revenue loss is coming into play, with the current cost estimates coming in roughly \$2 million dollars higher than what is currently in the T.I.P. for those projects. He said that they are addressing that issue, in order to be fiscally constrained, by showing the projects in the top half as they currently are programmed, and those in the bottom half, the illustrative projects, with the new cost estimates and federal requests should the funds become available.

Haugen stated that as they move forward with the new S.T.I.P./T.I.P. cycle development, if other projects across the state drop or have significant scoping changes, and additional funds should become available, and/or if congress were to act and allows for more federal funds to become available in North Dakota, we could have these illustrative projects program amounts in play rather than just those in the current T.I.P.

Haugen reported that on the Regional side there is one new project being proposed, for FY 2013, a project on South Washington Street, or Business 81 from Hamerling to 32nd Avenue South.

Haugen stated that many of the other Regional projects in the current T.I.P. had decreases in their cost estimates, and also, as shown in red, their scope of works were changed slightly.

Haugen commented that the City of Grand Forks re-submitted a couple of TE projects that they submitted in the past, with some minor changes to their scope of works. He said that their top priority is doing the multi-use path along South 20th Street, from 40th Avenue South to 47th Avenue South. He added that this project was submitted three or four years ago for funding, and it's original scope extended the project up to make a connection to 32nd Avenue, but it was re-scoped to just include the section from 40th Avenue South to 47th Avenue South. He stated that the other project they submitted was DeMers Avenue, which was the City's top project last year, at which time it was a two phased project, however it is now one phase.

Brooks referred to the DeMers Avenue project, and stated that he sees they get to DeMers and 55th, but if they were to go north is there a facility at University and 55th that could be connected to. Haugen responded that there is a facility at which they stop at University on 55th, and it goes a little east on University Avenue, but is not a full facility all the way across University Avenue. Brooks asked if this was something that should be included in this. Haugen responded that the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

cost was prohibitive for the program already, and adding another \$100,000 to do this would really be a problem.

Haugen stated that the Safe Routes To School project is essentially to upgrade all of our existing ped/walk crossing beacons, replacing them with LED, and relocating three of them. Williams reported that the three beacons they want to relocate are: 1) Belmont and 3rd to 13th Avenue South near Hugo's; 2) University Avenue at Oxford/Princeton to 6th Avenue North/Princeton; 3) West University near State Street, currently there are four existing beacons, will move one and remove two.

Haugen reported that 2016 is the new year added to the T.I.P. process. He said that the local project would be the Columbia Road Urbanization project that we just amended into our Long Range Transportation Plan mid-range period. He stated that the other project was identified by the NDDOT. He said that the project is a bridge rehabilitation project for the Kennedy Bridge, at a cost of \$10 million. He added that MNDOT will be the lead agency, and there will be a 50/50 funding split. McKinnon commented that currently, this project is still planned to be a rehabilitation project, and \$10,000,000 is still the estimated cost. He added that right now there is actually another border bridge on Minnesota Trunk Highway 1 in Oslo that is scheduled for 2013, so they are doing some last minute evaluations on that bridge in order for them to get everything wrapped up as the project will be starting sooner than the Kennedy Bridge project. He stated that after they are done with the Oslo bridge they will then begin looking further at the Kennedy Bridge project, anticipating that it will happen sometime in mid-2012, to determine if it can be rehabbed, or if more extensive work will need to be done.

Haugen stated that beyond 2016; on the Regional System, North Dakota, again, asked that they be identified; and in 2017 the District has submitted the possibility of replacing the Washington Street Underpass. He added that, as everyone is aware, we are doing a study on that structure, in addition to the entire corridor right now, and the draft report is up for public comment tomorrow evening, so it would not be covered in our next T.I.P., but would be included in the one after that, so in 2017 the District is hoping to get reservation of funds to accomplish that project. He stated that in 2018 they are identifying the replacement of the Sorlie Bridge, with North Dakota being the lead agency.

Haugen referred to a summary of the project list and went over it briefly.

Brooks referred back to the Safe Routes To School projects, and asked, now that they are looking at changing school boundaries, while he agrees that all three being taken down need to come down and be relocated, but should additional changes come up will they be able to look at this later. Williams responded that they would have to take any changes back to the state to get permission to reallocate the monies, they would have to go through the amendment process.

***MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AS***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AND THE TITLE VI PLAN

McCoy reported that all three of these documents are a requirement of the U.S. Government in order for us to be eligible for federal funding.

McCoy referred to the Public Participation Plan document, included in the packet, and explained that it was last updated in 2006, so it was definitely time for it to be updated again. He then briefly went over some of the changes made to the document.

McCoy referred to the Environmental Justice Procedural Manual, included in the packet, and reported that, it too, needed to be updated this year to reflect the results of the 2010 Census, and the most current American Community Survey data. He pointed out that it includes several updated maps, and went over them briefly.

McCoy referred to the 2005-2009 ACS Data map, and pointed out that the only area below the poverty threshold, that really qualifies for environmental justice consideration is the area shown in blue, near the University of North Dakota. He explained that this area has three times the size of minorities, and three times the average of people below the poverty level.

Williams asked how you qualify that area as it is owned by the University of North Dakota. Haugen responded that the population there is protected underneath the Environmental Justice document. He stated that it isn't based on the fact that they are students, that they are male or female, it is based on whether or not they are below poverty levels and if they are of minority status. He said that when the Environmental Justice executive order first came out there was no definition as to what was a high concentration, so we established, back in the 1990s, that anything three time our average indicated a high concentration. He added that with every update done to our document, 1990, 2000, and now 2010 it has highlighted this one particular area of our community. Haugen reported that if we have a project, or an ongoing study, and it is near this area, we then have to take the next step in the manual and that is to determine whether or not it impacts this area, and if it does then we have to identify how high an impact it is, if it adversely impacts the area and if it does then we have to do mitigation.

Williams commented that her questions is really, how can you quantify students' income in this as they aren't available to be earning a normal income. She added that they wouldn't be included in unemployment figures because they aren't available to work full time, so she would think that you would only include those people who are available for full time work. McCoy responded that he got the figures from the U.S. Census, and he used the "head of household" income as his base number for setting the poverty levels, so apparently the Census Bureau counts

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

that area towards their figures. Williams pointed out, however, that it is State property, so why would we include it. Haugen responded that property ownership isn't a characteristic we evaluate with our Environmental Justice process. He added that Title VI takes on those characteristics, but we don't with the Environmental Justice process.

McCoy referred to the Title VI and Non-Discrimination Plan document, included in the packet, and went over the changes briefly.

Haugen commented that, since this is all-encompassing of the Public Participation Process, the action we are seeking today is to give preliminary approval of these three documents so we can open up the 45-day comment period we are required to hold under federal law when dealing with the Public Participation Process.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AND THE TITLE VI PLAN, AND RELEASE TO 45-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Johnson asked if the plan was to include the State and Federal review in the 45-days as well. Haugen responded it was, adding that there will be a host of people that will receive a special letter as part of the 45-day comment period process, notices will be published in our local newspaper, and a notice will be added to the MPO website.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH WASHINGTON WELLNESS CENTER STUDY

Ellis reported that they are now at the final stages of the study, and the final document has been reviewed by Engineering, and all changes have been implemented. She added that they did present the Final Report to the Service Safety Committee, City Council, Planning Commission, and the MPO Executive Policy Board, and received preliminary approval from all, and are now seeking final approval as well.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET/WELLNESS CENTER STUDY FINAL REPORT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

MATTER OF UPDATE TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Bill Troe, URS, was present for a brief presentation on the update to the Transit Development Plan.

Troe reported that he just wants to bring everyone up to speed as to where they are at with the overall process on the update to the Transit Development Plan. He stated that they will be holding public meetings tonight and tomorrow night, at which they will be talking to the public about some of the ideas they have come up with to address gaps in service, those low production areas within the fixed route program.

Troe stated that he will be talking about, relative to the gaps in service, are things such as capacity, safety, operations and condition of pavement, etc.. He said that with transit, one of the main things they will be looking at is on-time performance; are the buses getting to the stops within a relatively concise window of when we anticipate they will get there, or when we schedule them to get there; and is there enough lay-over time, or recovery time when it gets to the end of the run for it to allow for the transfer of passengers between the different routes. He added that they will also look at the performance of the route, what is, essentially, the ridership on the route relative to the investment we are making on that route, the dollars we are spending on providing service in a particular area versus the return in revenue from ridership.

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

DISCUSSION:

Bergman asked if the \$200,000 includes the Dial-A-Ride/Senior Rider as well. Troe responded it does not. Bergman said that he may want to make note of that. Troe explained that he was looking at it as, they are not expanding the service area so the demand response service wouldn't change dramatically. Bergman agreed, but added that the cost would still need to be included if you add Sunday service. Troe agreed, stating that he didn't think of that.

Williams referred to a slide illustrating the expanded route servicing the area west of Columbia, and pointed out that most of the apartments there are UND housing. She added that the apartments along 34th Avenue South, west of the Mall, are also UND students. She asked if they had looked at trying to get a route up to UND from that area because that is the problem with ridership there. She explained that she lives near the mall, and if she was to try to get to UND from there it would take her an hour and twenty-five minutes. Troe responded, however, that she may be able to get home in 30-minutes. Williams commented that if the yellow route, someday or other could be changed, and she isn't sure why it is running all the way over to the east where you have it anyway. Troe responded that the way they set this up, in thinking about UND to the south, is, while they desire a route from there all the way to UND, there isn't enough time to do so. Williams stated that it doesn't need to go through the mall, it just needs to go through that residential area. Troe responded that they just don't have the luxury, in a community of this size, to bypass something like the mall. He added that they also don't know what percentage of those

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

residents are university students, 50%, 70%. Williams responded about 80% are students. Troe asked, then, what if the remaining 20%’s trip demographic is entirely different, in a community this size it is difficult to say; “well, we are providing more express service between the users in the apartment areas” and then what about those other areas where students live, or in East Grand Forks where students live. Brooks added that if they were to cut that out, you would have no campus to mall, which would cut out those people living in the dorms that currently use the yellow route to get to the mall. Williams commented that there is no yellow route right now. Troe stated that you would use the purple route to get to them all. Brooks said that he guesses that that would be a gap right now, the direct route from the campus to the mall. Troe stated that that is the one that they were talking about, it isn’t exactly direct, it is in one direction, but not the other. Haugen pointed out that Route 8/9 should be getting people from the mall to the campus in 30-minutes, so he isn’t sure what schedule Ms. Williams is working on that takes an hour and twenty-five minutes. Williams responded that it is because you have to change buses. Troe commented that the purple route is all continuous, but you do have to ride it a little longer. Haugen stated that if she were to use Route 8/9, right where she lives, she would be back where she started in an hour, and it would take her through UND campus twice.

Troe reported that there will be a public open house tonight at 6:30 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Council Chambers. Haugen added that it will be televised on Channel 2. Haugen stated that there will also be a public open house at 6:30 p.m. tomorrow night in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room.

Haugen stated that the above meetings were highlighted under “other business” on the agenda. He added that tomorrow evening there will also be an open house in the Grand Forks Council Chambers on the Washington Street/Underpass Study at 7:00 p.m. to present the draft report.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Additional \$500,000,000 Transportation Funds For North Dakota

Haugen commented that it is his understanding that North Dakota just announced that it is receiving an additional \$500,000,000 for transportation, and he was wondering if either Mr. Johnson or Mr. Lang could identify if that will help the S.T.I.P. funding finances. Johnson asked if the funds were through the state legislature. Haugen responded they were not, that it is federal funds. He added that a large chunk is for emergency use, but not all of it. Johnson responded that he is not aware of this additional funding. Lang added that he isn’t either.

2. MNDOT 50-Year Vision

McKinnon commented that the next step beyond the 50-Year Vision is the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, or the 20-Year Plan. He stated that they have begun the process of updating their 20-Year Plan, and beginning in January there will be some open houses held in various areas of Minnesota. He said that there will be an effort made to keep the plan small and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011**

easy to read and understand. He stated that as they get more information he will continue to share it with the MPO.

3. Request Consultants Give Overview Of Changes Made To Their Studies

Williams requested that when any updates/changes are made to future studies, the consultants put together a brief overview of those changes made. She explained that she knows where to go to find her revisions, but she doesn't always know what changes other people made to the study, so it would be helpful to get an overview of all changes. Ellis commented that a memo was sent out that listed the changes made to the 47th Avenue Corridor Study. Williams said that that is what she is talking about, something similar to that for all studies.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 14TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:05 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager