

2012 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 11, 2012

February 8, 2012

March 14, 2012

April 11, 2012

May 9, 2012

June 13, 2012

July 11, 2012

July 26, 2012

August 8, 2012

September 12, 2012

October 10, 2012

November 14, 2012

December 12, 2012

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 11th, 2012, 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: Paul Benning (Proxy for Michael Johnson), NDDOT/Local Government Division- Bismarck (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT – Bemidji; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Molly Soeby, Park District; Jon Markusen, KLJ; and Mark Bittner, KLJ.

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.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because we have some people 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 DECEMBER 14TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 14TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

MATTER OF MINNESOTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that last month we discussed the North Dakota projects, and this month we are discussing the Minnesota projects for the next T.I.P. cycle.

Haugen commented that for the existing years for the T.I.P. there are no changes to the projects as they are currently scheduled. He stated that one thing to note is that a 2012 project in the current T.I.P., which is an enhancement project in East Grand Forks connecting the underpass on U.S. 2 to the River Heights Trail Head will not be constructed, adding that this will be discussed further with Ms. Ellis' agenda item later in the meeting.

Haugen stated that the next thing we need to do is to add the 2016 projects. He explained that MNDOT has identified two projects, and asked that Mr. McKinnon go over them briefly.

McKinnon reported that the first project is located in U.S. Trunk Highway 2. He explained that the west-bound lane from Highway 220 to near Fisher, Minnesota will be resurfaced with either concrete or bituminous materials. He added that about six miles of this stretch falls within the MPO study area.

McKinnon said that the second project is the Kennedy Bridge Rehabilitation project, which, at this time is still being considered a rehabilitation project. He stated that North Dakota submitted this project with their submittal last month, and Minnesota is keeping with that by submitting it with our projects at this time. He commented that the estimated cost of this project is \$10,000,000 to rehab the deck and one pier that is significantly moving, however a more in-depth analysis will be done, which, although slim, could result in this project becoming a total bridge replacement project.

Haugen reported that as part of this solicitation with the ATP, they are looking for enhancement projects in 2016, and East Grand Forks does have a project they are submitting for these funds. He asked the Ms. Ellis go over the project briefly.

Ellis stated that East Grand Forks is really trying to get to some of those areas that don't currently have very good multi-modal connections. She said that one of those areas is the northeast side of East Grand Forks. She explained that they have done some past work that has gotten them from the downtown area, across Highway 2, and up into the northeast and northwest corners, but they would really like to fill in the sidewalk gap on the northeast side. She reported that one option to accomplish this is to construct a sidewalk within the DOT's Highway 220 right-of-way on the east side using transit funds. She explained that this they have a paralleling trail on the other side, so this would allow them to connect both sides of the highway with the commercial businesses and the Technical College. She added that this project will provide a sidewalk on the north side of 20th Street S.E.; which will allow for students to get to the college, connect people to the transit shelter, and provide a connection over to 5th where they have multi-family housing and a mobile home park. She said that that sidewalk will then continue along the north side of 20th Street N.E. and head down the east side of 5th Avenue to 15th. She explained

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

that 15th will be reconstructed this year with state aid funds, and one of the things the City Administrator has moved forward on was using state aid monies to put in sidewalks, so there is a proposed sidewalk for the north side of 15th as well.

Ellis referred to the application, included in the packet, and pointed out that there is one typo on page 6. She explained that it states that the project will run from 23rd St. N.E. to 15th St. N.E., however it should state 20th St. N.E. to 15th St. N.E. instead. She said that this will be corrected.

Haugen commented that they had originally hoped to have transit information distributed out, however were unable to do so. He explained that essentially, other than adding FY2016 estimates for operating the public transportation services, the City of Grand Forks will also be submitting FY2013 requests for the FTA 5309, 5316, and 5317 grant programs; and the City of East Grand Forks is submitting its estimated FY2016 projects.

Haugen stated that Polk County did not submit any requests.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013 TO FY2016 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING .

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that staff is proposing amending our FY2012 Work Program to include continuing our Transit Development Plan Update into the first quarter of 2012. He explained that we hired URS to assist us in completing the update to the Transit Development Plan, with an original completion date of December 2011. He stated, however, that because of some unforeseen additional work needing to be done, URS was unable to meet that deadline, and an extension is required. He pointed out that because our current 2012 Work Program does not include work being done on the Transit Development Plan, we need to amend it to show that there will be some work done on the plan in 2012, however we need to note that this is only a time extension, that no additional funds are necessary as the funds programmed for the update in 2011 will be carried forward into 2012 as well.

Haugen commented we also need to add a new project to the 2012 Work Program, an update to our aerial photo, which was last flown in 2009. He explained that we try to follow a three year update timeline to our aerial photos, so it would seem appropriate to do so now. He added that this will give us a more up-to-date snapshot of the development that has occurred since 2009. He stated that the funds we will use for this activity are the funds that we had reserved for the Southwest Grand Forks Grid Network Study that was not carried forward.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

Haugen reported that last year the MPO was required to begin accounting for indirect costs in our billing of our work activities, which shows up in Appendix 3 of our work program. He explained that each year we will need to propose a new indirect cost rate based on the past years actual costs, however we were unable to calculate the new rate in time for this meeting, but will have those figures for the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next week.

Haugen summarized the amended 2012 work program, and added that the main project we have identified for 2012 is an update to our Long Range Transportation Plan, primarily the Street and Highway portion. He explained that the bulk of the work will be done in 2012, but the final document will be completed during the first part of 2013.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AND TO AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT WITH URS TO COMPLETE THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FINAL DRAFT OF THE 47TH AVENUE SOUTH STUDY

Ellis reported that this body was given the final draft at last month's meeting for review and comments. She stated that all comments and recommendations were included in the plan, and a memorandum listing those changes was distributed. She said that this is something that Ms. Williams has requested be done with future studies as well.

Ellis stated that the Final Draft is now available on the MPO website, and it has gone through the entire approval process, and staff is requesting this body forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve it as well.

Haugen referred to a graphic, and pointed out that it highlights what the various recommended concepts are. Ellis went over the concepts briefly. Haugen commented that the cost estimate is shown as \$3.5 million in construction costs; and then once you add in contingency, PCR, PSE, and other costs it totals \$5.1 million.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 47TH AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT AS PROVIDING THE MOST ACCURATE INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF THE STUDY, AND BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN
STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT**

Haugen reported that a copy of the Draft RFP was included in the packet available on the website. He stated that staff would like to release the RFP after the MPO Executive Policy Board has acted on it at their meeting next week so that proposals can be received by 12:00 Noon on March 2nd. He added that they would like to have a consultant on board by the end of March.

Haugen commented that a basic background description of our current Long Range Transportation plan was included in the RFP. He explained that some of the current studies we just completed provided some modifications and additional information that needs to be considered during the next update to the plan.

Haugen reported that we are continuing to work with A.T.A.C., as our modeling experts, and there should be at least two updates to our model that will be in place. He stated that the first one deals with our socio-economic data by TAZ. He explained that in the past we used the housing unit type, such as single family or multiple family, but we are now going to use persons per household in the TAZ to do our trip generation. He said that we believe this will do a better job of replicating the actual trips being generated. He stated that the second thing is that Fargo/Moorhead is doing a OD study right now, and our current model is based off a couple decades old OD, so we are expecting that with their OD study we will be able to simulate that data to update our OD data for our trip tractions.

Haugen said that the RFP has a scope of work that is traditional for a Long Range Transportation Plan, and includes: 1) existing conditions; 2) identification of issues; 3) providing alternatives; 4) narrowing down alternatives to a recommended plan; to include a financial constraint plan; and 5) providing public participation opportunities at each step of the update.

Haugen reported that there are a couple of sub-studies identified in the RFP as well. He said that one of the first tasks the consultant will do will be to determine whether or not our new data will require that our signal timing plans be updated. He stated that the second task, based on a request from UND, will be to consider either complete closure of University Avenue or closure during certain times of the day. He added that complete closure would have a pretty serious impact on our network as University Avenue is an arterial roadway that carries upwards of 10,000 vehicles a day.

Haugen stated that one of the first things the consultant will need to assist us with will be a vehicle interrupt survey at the three bridge locations. He explained that this was done about ten years ago, and people were asked where they were coming from, where they were going, what is the purpose of the trip, how often do you make this trip, etc.. He said that this data will help them calibrate a computer model they will use to forecast future traffic volumes.

Haugen commented that one of the things they identified in the Draft RFP was the possibility of doing the same type of vehicle interrupt survey on I-29, but the NDDOT has indicated that this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

will not be allowed. He stated that they still have a desire to somehow better capture the traffic patterns of our north/south traffic, so some kind of external station survey is still being considered.

Haugen reported that the budget for this update is \$175,000.

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE UPDATE TO THE STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT OF THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF N.W. EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC STUDY DRAFT REPORT

Ellis reported that they are in the final stages of the Northwest East Grand Forks Traffic Study. She explained that they were looking at the possibility of a full intersection at U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W. in East Grand Forks. She stated that they are also looking at improvements to the awkward intersection at River Road/12th/17th; and a multi-modal trail along 8th and connecting to their existing greenway trail, which needs to be considered if a full intersection is not constructed at U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W.

Ellis stated that she would like to briefly go over the recommendations that came out of their public hearings and Steering Committee meetings.

Ellis commented that she provided a copy of the Executive Summary in the packets, and stated that she will briefly go over the recommendations that came out of their public hearings and Steering Committee meetings (a copy of this information is included in the file and available upon request).

Ellis pointed out that the short-term recommendations, 0-5 years are: 1) leave the 5th Avenue N.W./U.S. Highway 2 intersection as is and install interconnect and updated timing plans for the signals at U.S. 2 and Highway 220, Highway 220 and 14th Street N.W., U.S. 2 and 5th Avenue N.E., and place trailhead or directional signs for the downtown amenities; 2) realign River Road N.W. and create a typical right-angle stop controlled intersection for River Road/17th Street/12th Avenue N.W. intersection; 3) if U.S. Highway 2 ramp (to 8th Avenue N.W.) is closed, place a multipurpose trail in the right-of-way from the underpass to 8th Avenue and then follow the toe of the dike to reach the trail head on 12th Street N.W.; and 4) if ramp remains open the trail must share the road from the underpass to the ramp/8th Avenue intersection. She stated that the long-term recommendations, 5 to 25 years are: 1) construct full access intersection at U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W. if traffic volumes, crash rates, or signal is warranted; and 2) make improvements along Highway 220 (Central Avenue), which are carried over from the EGF Central Avenue Corridor Study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

Ellis stated that the report was submitted to the Steering Committee for comments, and she has not received any comments from them at this time, therefore staff is recommending preliminary approval so that it can be submitted to the East Grand Forks Planning Commission and City Council for their review as well.

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE FINAL DRAFT REPORT FOR THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK STUDY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 11TH, 2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 8th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 8th, 2012, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT – Bemidji; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Jon Markusen, KLJ; and Mark Bittner, KLJ.

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.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

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

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that it discusses three proposed amendments to the 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the first amendment is involves FTA 5309 monies the City of Grand Forks received. He explained that we have already taken some action on this, and are now looking at the final request for these funds.

Haugen referred to the detailed spreadsheet in the packet, and explained that it identifies all the projects included in the requested amendment. He pointed out that those projects include: two coaches, three demand response vehicles, and associated shop equipment.

Haugen stated that the other part of the amendment is to reconcile some differences between the final MPO T.I.P. and the final North Dakota S.T.I.P. He commented that there were a couple of projects that had changes to their scope-of-work.

Haugen reported that one project specifically deals with U.S. Highway 2, from 55th Street west, and involves both the scope-of-work and the cost estimate; and the second one involves a request from the NDDOT to add in a district wide signage project that will touch the MPO study area.

Haugen stated that staff finds that this amendment is consistent with their planning documents, and recommend that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the amendment.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO FORWARD A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P.***

Lang referred to the project list and commented that he sees that the signing project is highlighted, but doesn't see that the other project is. Haugen responded that the other project was not highlighted in the e-mail received from Mr. Johnson. He added that it is included on a separate page, the second page of the S.T.I.P. document, and is an annual element, and is a 2012 project; while the project that is highlighted is listed in the future years out list. He stated that he included what he received from Mr. Johnson. Johnson commented that is actually on there, but he just didn't highlight it. Lang referred to the list and asked which project it was. Johnson responded that it is the fourth project down.

Williams said she would like to amend her motion to include highlighting the second project as well.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC
STUDY FINAL REPORT**

Ellis reported that she did go through this at last month's meeting, however, after last month's Technical Advisory Committee meeting they opened it up for more public comment, but did not receive any, so she is now requesting final approval of the study with the following recommendations:

- 1) Consider the interconnect and the signal timing plan for Years 0-5.
- 2) Consider reconfiguring River Road/17th/12th to include the 90-degree angle improvements.
- 3) Move the 5th Avenue full-intersection to Years 5-25 for consideration and inclusion in the Long Range Transportation Plan if signal warrants or average daily traffic get to the point where it is necessary.
- 4) Consider moving forward the Central Avenue Corridor Study recommended improvements for the intersections to Years 5-25.

***MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS NETWORK
STUDY REPORT.***

Williams asked about the interconnect, and whether or not there had been any discussion about having remote capability for the State look at it with a modem, or something similar, and does the Technical Advisory Committee need to support that to give it more weight. Ellis responded that they apparently have remote capabilities for Highway 2 and 220 already, so she would think that they can make sure it is considered.

Williams recommended that the committee supports any type of remote capabilities, whether it is internet, or something else.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR/UNDERPASS STUDY

Haugen reported that he included the Executive Summary document in the packet, and pointed out that consultants from KLJ are present today.

Haugen stated that staff gave a presentation to the NDDOT upper management back in October, presented the report to the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee a couple weeks ago, and copies of the draft report were distributed to members of the Steering Committee for their review and comment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

Haugen added that the final report does include all comments received. He stated that both the City and the NDDOT recognized that there were some bigger improvements that needed to be made between 8th Avenue North and South 17th Avenue, including improvements to the street pavement; that the underpass has some conditions that we were asked to look into and give a recommendation on; they asked that we look at the capacity problem at the intersection of DeMers Avenue and South Washington; and they asked that we look at multi-modal issues along the corridor.

Haugen stated that, along with assistance from KLJ and their sub-team; a steering committee was formed with representatives from businesses along the corridor, the city council, the planning commission, BNSF, and DOT from both districts and Bismarck, they were able to draft up these recommendations.

Haugen referred to a power point presentation and went over the recommendations briefly.

Williams asked how the TIGER Grants work, what type of funding is it. Haugen responded that a TIGER Grant is from the Department of Transportation, and it is more or less mode neutral, not mode specific, so a transit project can be submitted, a vehicle project can be submitted, any of the projects in this report could be submitted for funding. He stated that there is a timeline of this month to have projects submitted, and NDDOT has indicated to the MPOs that they are submitting a TIGER Grant application for the Williston By-Pass, and that it is the State's number one priority, so, although they acknowledge that other projects can be submitted, it would most likely not be prioritized above this one.

Williams asked what the funding split is for TIGER Grants. Haugen responded that it is the typical 80/20 type split, although he thinks some rural areas may be given 100% funding.

Williams asked if there was sufficient information in this report to be able to submit projects for TIGER Grant funding. Haugen responded that there is sufficient information to do so, however there is a very tight deadline so if it is a desire to apply it should be done very soon.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE WASHINGTON STREET AND UNDERPASS CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF MNDOT DRAFT STATEWIDE MULTI-MODAL PLAN

Haugen reported that, as indicated via e-mails, Minnesota is updating their Multi-Modal Transportation Plan. He stated that an open house was held in Crookston at the end of January, and Mr. McKinnon is present today to speak on this process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

McKinnon explained that this update is something that the Legislature requires they do. He added that it was last done in 2009.

McKinnon stated that this is the Broad-Range Twenty-Year Plan that will provide guidance and direction on transportation. He said that they really want to make it a streamlined plan that is easy for the public to use and understand.

McKinnon referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and explained that the objectives are:

- 1) To make transportation system decisions through processes that are open and supported by data and analysis; provide for and support coordination, collaboration, and innovation; ensure efficient and effective use of public resources;
- 2) Integrate land uses and transportation systems and enhance communities in ways that respect and complement cultural, social, fiscal, and natural contexts;
- 3) Identify global, national, statewide, regional and local transportation connections essential for Minnesotans' prosperity and quality of life; invest to maintain and improve those connections; support new connections when practical;
- 4) Strategically maintain and operate transportation assets; rely on system data, partners,' needs, and public expectation to inform decisions; put technology and innovation to work to improve efficiency and performance; recognize that the system should change over time;
- 5) Safeguard travelers, transportation facilities, and services; apply proven strategies to reduce fatalities and serious injuries for all travel modes; reduce system vulnerability; ensure system redundancy to meet essential travel needs during emergencies.

McKinnon pointed out that there was also some information about Stakeholder forums that were held. He stated that a lot of transportation stakeholders and other governments participated, and more of these forums will be held in March. He added that they also held some open houses, and two staff members from this MPO did attend, which was good.

McKinnon commented that if you would like to make comments on this update you need to go to www.minnesotagoplan.org. He stated you can comment on what you think about those five objective areas, maybe make some suggestions on some action plan on how, perhaps they can implement those specific things they can do in areas of communication or making connections. He said that they want to have a specific action plan, something that can be done with in the next four years, as well as on-going, and they don't want a document that is hard to get anything out of, they really want it to be simple to understand and implement. He stated that this should be completed in May, after which they will then get into the next round of doing more specific plans.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

Haugen reported that the last couple sheets of the document are the actual comment forms that you can write out your comments on and mail to the address provided, or you can e-mail them to Kirby Becker at the e-mail address provided.

McKinnon referred to the information on the packet, and commented that the text provided is Chapter 4 of the document, which they have been told is the main part of the plan, and includes the action plans.

Haugen referred to slide that explains how this plan fits into the 50-year plan, as well as how the other family of plans all fit together with the Minnesota Go Plan.

Haugen reported that last month the MPO released an RFP for it's Long Range Transportation Plan Update. He stated that we will work with both MNDOT and NDDOT, who is also updating their Statewide Transportation Plan, to ensure that our three documents are not conflicting with each other.

Information only.

MATTER OF RFP FOR AERIAL PHOTO UPDATE

Haugen reported that Ms. Kouba drafted an RFP for the Aerial Photo update, and will give a brief overview of that document.

Kouba stated that it's basically the same RFP as 2009. She said that they reduced it to just look at six-inch resolution, so it will be more comparable to what we had in 2006, but other than that it is basically what we've done pretty much every three years.

Haugen said that the timeline is April 6th for submittals, and pointed out which departments have been identified to assist on the selection committee. He added that the budget is \$37,000, and they hope to have the fly over take place prior to the trees leafing out.

Haugen referred to a photo illustrating the area to be flown and went over it briefly.

Williams asked how this fits in with the other pavement pictures, and aerial photographs being done in the area. Haugen responded that he doesn't know, and asked what other photos are being taken. Williams asked if there weren't going to be some pavement management photos taken this year. Haugen responded that no pavement management photos are planned for this year. He added that they have not received any requests to do any, and the Long Range Transportation Plan Update being done this year would most likely preclude any additional work being done in any event.

Brooks stated that he knows there has been some interest in pictometry, and was wondering if that is something that might be looked at in the next couple of weeks, or is has it gone away. Kouba responded that they did look into it, but it is price exclusive, and the MPO doesn't have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

the kind of budget necessary to do it. Brooks asked if there was any way it could be included as an option, then we could see what the cost might actually be. Kouba responded that the RFP would have to include their oblique angle otherwise they won't even look at the RFP. Brooks said that he knows there are some departments that would be interested in this, and maybe it could be done with funding assistance from them, but in any event it would be nice to coordinate it at the same time the aerial photo flight is being done.

Haugen asked if the entire area would need to be included in the pictometry, or would we just need to focus on the urban area. Brooks responded that he would think doing just the urban area would be sufficient.

Ellis asked if it could be added as an alternative in the RFP so you can see what the difference in cost would be. Haugen responded that what we should do as a Technical Advisory Committee is to have staff look into this, and work with the local agencies to see what interest there is, then at the Executive Policy Board meeting we could have it drafted in as a non-MPO funded option, and if there isn't then we wouldn't have to include in the RFP. He stated that the Executive Policy Board meeting is scheduled for February 23rd, so that would give us a couple of weeks to look into this issue.

Williams commented that she supports putting it into the RFP as an alternative to see how much it would cost. Brooks agreed, adding that it could then be dropped if nobody is going to put forth anything, or the MPO can't support it.

Romness asked if any topography has been done in the past. Haugen responded that the Corps of Engineers did it back in 1997.

Discussion ensued.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE STAFF WORK WITH THE MPO'S PARTNER AGENCIES TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS ANY INTEREST IN ADDING OBLIQUE IMAGERY AS AN ALTERNATIVE/OPTION TO THE BASE BID OF THE RFP, WITH THE BASE BID BEING COVERED BY THE MPO, AND ONCE A DECISION IS REACHED, TO APPROVE THE RFP WITH OR WITHOUT THIS ALTERNATIVE/OPTION INCLUDED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. FTA Discretionary Grants

Haugen reported that FTA just released several of their discretionary grants; State of Good Repair, Livability, and Clean Fuels. He stated that the State of Good Repair and Clean Fuels are pretty much mode specific, while Livability is more open to other modes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11th, 2012**

Haugen commented that in the past, for the most part, there have been state-wide applications submitted for these funds. He said that he thinks the transit area of the DOT is going to arrange a conference call to discuss whether or not there is any interest in submitting a state-wide application, or if agencies want to go on their own. Bergman commented that the last discussion held on this indicated that they wanted us to go out on our own.

Williams asked if the TIGER Grant was awarded annually. Haugen responded that it has been awarded every year since the current administration has been in place.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 8TH,
2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:15 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 14th, 2012, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (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; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Troy Schroeder, NWRDC; and Molly Soeby, Park District.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 8TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROKS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 8TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2012**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that there are three projects that we are addressing with this agenda item. He stated that the first project is a NDDOT project at the Gateway Drive and Columbia Road intersection. He explained that through the project development process a decision was made to not do intersection improvements utilizing federal funds, therefore the scope of work is being reduced to more of a preventative maintenance project, and the cost is being reduced to just \$500,000, with \$400,000 of that being federal funds. He added that the project is utilizing regional funds, and there is a different project that could utilize the funds, but we are not addressing that at this time.

Haugen stated that the second project involves East Grand Forks' City Subtarget funds for Fiscal Year 2014. He reminded the committee members that we did a study for East Grand Forks to identify whether or not, or when the intersection at U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W. should be made a full intersection. He stated that a decision has since been made to delay that project, and since it had been the project they had identified for their 2014 Subtarget funds, this decision made those funds available for a different project. He said that the project the City is requesting the funds be used for is the reconstruction of 17th Street N.E. between Central Avenue and 5th Avenue N.E. He added that the Subtarget funds are capped at \$787,000, so with the estimated cost of this project being \$1,000,000, with \$737,388 in federal funds, there would be no change in the amount of federal monies being programmed, just the project itself.

Haugen said that the last project is more of an administrative amendment, or modification. He explained that East Grand Forks did receive some Safe Routes To School funds to construct a sidewalk on the other side of Bygland Road, and as part of Minnesota's Infrastructure Safe Routes To School Program, \$5,000 has to be set aside to be used as non-infrastructure activities. He reported that in our T.I.P. document we had this as one inclusive project, but MNDOT is requesting that we separate out that \$5,000, and assign a new T.I.P. project for those funds. He stated that in order to do that we are modifying our 2012 T.I.P. to show that \$5,000 project for non-infrastructure related to the infrastructure grant along Bygland Road.

Haugen stated that staff is recommended that these amendments are consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan. He added that a public hearing has been scheduled to occur next week at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting. He explained that the reason for that is because the East Grand Forks project had a slim chance of being funded in 2012, but that has since gone away, but we had been trying to wait as long as possible before publishing which year it would be done, so in turn that created the need to move the public hearing to the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting rather than holding it at today's meeting.

Lang referred to Project #5, and asked if the sentence shown in red was meant to be deleted. Haugen responded that it is. He added that it does have a strike-through line, but it doesn't show up well on the copies.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2012**

Lang referred to Project #6, and commented that based on the executive decisions of the PCI, the City recommended Alternative C, which is a no-build on this project, in which case there will be zero dollars spent in the Year 2012. He asked if there was a need to wait for additional information before removing the project from the list. Romness responded that they are working with the DOT to try to move a project from 2013 to 2012 to use up the funding from this project, and NDDOT recommended not taking this project off at this time, but rather to leave it as a placeholder. Hanson concurred, and added that they did recommend keeping the current project on the list in order to maintain the funding in the event a replacement project is approved, otherwise the monies would be allocated elsewhere.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P .

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPLICATIONS FOR FTA/JARC/NEW FREEDOM PROGRAMS

Kouba reported that they received a total of four applications, one for JARC and three for New Freedom funds, all from the Cities Area Transit.

Kouba stated that the JARC application is for funds to be able to continue Route 12/13; and the New Freedom applications are to keep funding the Mobility Manager position, to add a notification module to the RouteMatch software, and to purchase a replacement paratransit vehicle.

Haugen pointed out that copies of the applications themselves are included in the packets.

Ellis asked if the notification module was the one that is used for clients to call ahead for pickup. Bergman responded that there are actually two parts to this, and the wording is confusing. He explained that the notification module will work with the Emergency Operations Center so that in the event there is a storm, or issues whereby a vehicle can't make it to a stop, it will send out notification to the individuals waiting for the vehicle letting them know if and when the vehicle will be there. He added that the other part to this is a web-portal with which individuals can schedule their own trips on line.

MOVED BY ROMNESS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE APPLICATIONS FOR FTA/JARC/NEW FREEDOM PROGRAMS, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2012**

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT
PLAN**

Kouba reported that all the public participation process steps have been accomplished for this item, and staff is now looking for Preliminary Approval of the Draft Transit Development Plan.

Kouba referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and briefly went over the recommendations and funding options.

Presentation ensued.

Brooks asked what they would have like to have seen differently at the Garden View area. Kouba responded that they would have liked to have had a wider street. She said that they could probably get the transit vehicles through the curve, but the road is just too narrow as they need at least 12-foot wide lanes. Brooks stated that the roadway is 37-feet wide, with parking allowed on only one side. Kouba responded that they would need a 38-foot wide roadway. Romness commented that what they need to do is put a shelter out at the end of the roadway. Haugen stated that 11th Avenue would be the better location for a shelter than 42nd Street. Kouba added that if it were placed on 42nd they would need to put in a bus pull-out.

***MOVED BY ROMNESS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
GRANT APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN.***

Haugen asked where they are with the approval process on this plan. Kouba responded that they will present this to both City Councils for preliminary approval next week; and then in April they will present the Draft Final Report to both Planning Commissions and City Councils, and to the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Executive Policy Board for approval.

Haugen reported that the full draft report is available on the MPO's website, and they would appreciate any comments or recommendations anyone might have be submitted to staff as soon as possible.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR THE LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE – STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT**

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that the Selection Committee for the RFP met on Monday, March 12th, to interview the five firms that submitted proposals. He stated that they recommended SRF as their number one choice, URS as their second choice, and KLJ as their third choice. He added that they are currently in negotiations with SRF at this time, as their proposal came in slightly higher than the amount budgeted for the study. He stated that they hope to be able to negotiate a contract with SRF by next weeks MPO

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2012**

Executive Policy Board meeting so that it can be authorized for signatures, and so that they can start the study in earnest. He added that the first project that the public will see us do will be a vehicle intercept survey at the three bridge locations like we did about ten years ago. He stated that we will also begin doing turning movement counts at all signalized traffic intersections in the area beginning March 27th.

Haugen commented that it is hoped that this study will be completed by this time next year.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROGRESS ON STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Hanson reported that the NDDOT is taking on the TransAction III Statewide Transportation Plan effort. She stated that they are starting with rounds of invitation only stakeholder meetings that begin next week. She explained that they will hold one meeting in each City to garner information from the stakeholders in order to eventually generate the framework of what a State Transportation Plan should look like, as well as to determine what is important to people.

Hanson said that from there they will process the information from the stakeholder meetings and will then go out and gather similar information from the public. She stated that the public meetings will most likely take place in June. She added that the NDDOT will also be putting on presentations around the State, as requested from various interest groups, and their director will be meeting with the DOT Director's Committee to update on the process, and then ultimately there will be two final plans available sometime in October.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that MNDOT is updating their Statewide Plan as well. He stated that both Nancy and Teri attended the Bemidji meeting on March 1st, and provided input. He added that on March 22nd there is an opportunity for anyone not able to attend any of the meetings on the list to participate via the internet.

Ellis commented that it was an interesting meeting. She stated that they did the usual strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, etc. at the meeting, but Bemidji has a strong bike group consisting of a lot of people that actually commute by biking daily, and they were very motivated to look at more of the on-road facilities, with their focus being more on the fact that the trails are nice for recreational users, but they need to focus more on those that want to use the facilities on the road.

Ellis reported that she asked a question about authorization, and what MNDOT's take would be should transportation enhancements be eliminated, or if they are the ones that have to decide what they are going to dedicate for funding, and they are still coming up with some kind of policy or principle guidelines.

Haugen stated that he would encourage anyone who can to visit the website on March 22nd to see what this is all about. He pointed out that the website is included in the staff report.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2012**

Haugen commented that the last thing he is reporting on is MNDOT's Multi-modal Plan. He stated that the Multi-modal Plan is a sort of cousin to what Stacey identified as TransAction III, more of a multi-modal policy document. He added that they have had MNDOT staff present some of the objectives and policies that were drafted.

Haugen reported that MNDOT went around the state with this and got public input, and included the packet was the report they fed back. He stated that in April they will submit another draft report, and go around the State again to get public input on that as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF FLOOD FORECAST/BRIDGE CLOSURE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

Haugen reported that every year at this time we have our annual discussion about potential bridge closures during a flood event. He stated that the purpose of this discussion is for the respective agencies to begin preparation, if necessary, to implement the Plan. He pointed out that he included a chart indicating flood closure levels, for which updates will be made as needed. He said that in our metro area if we get to some of these heights we might be looking at East Grand Forks closing River Road/4th Avenue N.W. access point. He stated that we also need to make the contact sheet is up-to-date, as well.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Draft PPP Report

Haugen reported that back in January we drafted our Public Participation Plan family of documents; the Environmental Justice Document, the Limited English Proficiency Document, and the Title VI Document, as well as the overall Public Participation Plan itself, and put it out for a 45-day comment period, which has expired. He said that we only received one little bit of input, from MNDOT, and he wanted to remind everyone to please review it and get any comments to him within the next ten days.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 14TH, 2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the April 11th, 2012, 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: Joe McKinnon, MNDOT/Bemidji; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Jack Olson, NDDOT/Planning Asset Management Division; Kirby Becker, MNDOT-Statewide Multimodal Planning via teleconference; and Bobby Retzlaff, MNDOT-Statewide Multimodal Planning via teleconference.

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.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 14TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 14TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON STATEWIDE PLANNING EFFORTS

A. NDDOT TransAction III & Pembina Point Of Entry

Haugen reported that Jack Olson, NDDOT/Planning Asset Management Division is here today to discuss North Dakota Transaction III and the Pembina Point Of Entry Study.

1. TransAction III

Olson stated that NDDOT is in the process of updating their Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan. He said that they hope to have it completed by this fall.

Olson distributed copies of the TransAction III Topic Summary document. He explained that their plan is going to be a strategic policy plan, and will not be project specific. He stated that they hope to be able to talk to people in order to be able to develop shared convictions and goals for their transportation system.

Olson commented that he was able to attend a MNDOT meeting earlier this year, at which they discussed some things that NDDOT had been considering doing with its plan as well. He stated that when going through any kind of planning process it is good to go back and look at where you came from, and where you are at currently in order to get that historical perspective to avoid some of the problems that occurred in the past. He pointed out that, as everyone is probably aware, North Dakota is going through some phenomenal changes.

Olson stated that the theme for their planning process is: “Where did we come from, where are we at, and where are we going to be in 2035”. He said that the plan itself will be strategic and will identify strategic programs, strategic initiatives, and projects that they need to look at.

Lang reported present.

Olson reported that they held a series of meetings around the state recently, at which there were a couple hundred people in attendance. He stated that this input process will help them determine what issues need addressing.

Olson referred to the TransAction III document, and went over it briefly. He stated that they hope to have the plan completed in September or October of this year.

2. Pembina/Emerson Port Of Entry

Olson commented that transportation, whether it be personal ability or freight ability, does not stop at the border of North Dakota. He stated that over the years they participated in studies with Minnesota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and the two Provinces to the north of us, and looked at trade and transportation needs in the area, and one of things that came up over and over was the problems we experience at any of our land ports of entry, or our border crossings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

Olson reported that the Pembina/Emerson port of entry is the 5th largest port of entry between the United States and Canada in terms of trade value, and it is the largest port west of the Great Lakes, so it is a very significant land port of entry. He added that approximately \$18 Billion dollars of trade crossed through that port this last year.

Olson stated that about 12 years ago they started doing a study to determine what they needed to do, long term, considering Emerson and Pembina as a single entity, as a single port, in order to get people through there more efficiently. He said that that study was released in July of 2001, and then we experienced 9/11, and unfortunately the paranoia surrounding that stalled everything out, and then about three years ago our friends from Manitoba asked if we would be interested in rekindling that effort, and we agreed it would be a good idea, so we have been working with them since to put together another study to look at what has changed in the world since 2001, and where we need to be in the future, such as what improvements will need to be done to make it more efficient and secure.

Olson commented that they have joined with Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT), and each put up 25% of the study, with Transport Canada came up with the remaining 50% of the \$200,000 it will cost to complete the study. He stated that they hope to hire a firm out of Pennsylvania that has worked on many such crossing issues in the past, and put together a long term study that tells us what we need to do to become more efficient and safer.

Olson reported that one other significant thing that will come out of the study is that they will be creating a Cross Border Planning Team. He explained that this will allow entities from the provincial and state level, local level, and from the federal agencies that perform and operate the port, to be able to have an on-going dialog of things that may be coming up that could affect each other. He stated that this would mean that if we make an improvement to the port one year, and the Canadians don't do anything for three years out, that those types of activities are coordinated such that three years later when one of does something it will dovetail into something that was already done and we'll have better use of our funds.

Olson commented that we have also invited our friends from MNDOT to be involved in this, as I-29 is a port that also serves Minnesota traffic as well.

Information only.

B. MNDOT Multi-Modal Plan

Kirby Becker, MNDOT-Statewide Multimodal Planning, gave a brief power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file, and available upon request).

Becker reported that about a year and a half ago they started a process called "MinnesotaGO" to work on a long range fifteen-year vision for transportation for the State of Minnesota. He said that it was a vision that was developed with a very far reaching steering committee outside the agency to make sure that we created a vision for transportation for the entire state.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

Presentation ensued.

Becker commented that they really want this to be a statewide plan that is for everybody, so, as mentioned earlier, they want to make sure that our stakeholders are comfortable with what the language is saying so that anybody can pick up this document and use it as a tool moving forth with their planning process, whether it be the MPO and their Long Range Plan process, or cities and counties when they go about their local plans.

Becker explained that their plan is being developed by working with a Project Management Team consisting of representatives from Federal Highway Administration, MPOs, RDCs, the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities, the MPO from the Twin Cities, and all of the Multimodal offices within the department.

Becker reported that last December they went out to all of their key stakeholders; which currently consists of a data base of about 1500 individuals, however this number continues to grow; and got input from as to what the key things or ideas are needed to achieve the vision, and also asked for some feedback on the draft objectives we have. He said that they then took that information and developed some draft strategies, and refined the objectives they have based on that feedback.

Becker commented that from the middle of January to the middle of February they held ten public open houses around the state at which they shared the information received, and asked the public what is important to them, and they did receive a lot of good feedback.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON MPO TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that SRF was the consulting firm selected to assist us with our Long Range Transportation Plan Update. He referred to the packets, and pointed out that he included a summary of SRF's Scope Of Work for your review, adding that they will be formally hired and put under contract at a meeting tomorrow morning.

Haugen stated that, as you just heard, part of what we need to do as an MPO is to work with both Minnesota and North Dakota so that we are relating to both for our metropolitan area, and even though North Dakota is our lead state, we can't ignore the divisions and objectives, etc., that MNDOT has laid out.

Haugen commented that the timeline is to simply start in April and finish twelve months later, and assuming that Congress does not throw us a real wild card in the process, we should be able to accomplish that.

Haugen pointed out that the schedule includes some meeting dates. He explained that one thing we have been doing since last month is negotiating with SRF to have one more round of meetings at the initiation of the process in order for us to gather people's views and issues at the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

start of the process rather than later in the game, so he would expect that you will be asked next month to begin identifying some of the issues that are relating transportation issues in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and also begin looking at the goals and objectives and performance measures we want to establish for the next Transportation Plan.

Haugen stated that rather than provide a detailed Scope of Work, he provided a summary of methodology for each of the important steps we will take during the update process instead. He explained that the RFP identified that we wanted an existing conditions report, issues report, range of alternative report, financial plan report, and final draft plan. He said that in each one of these we identify the activities and study deliverables, as well as the timeline that we hope to have each identified.

Haugen commented that one thing they had to negotiate into the Scope of Work was, initially SRF was going to just review our signal timing plan, and provide us a report as to whether or not they were operating well, but they weren't going to get into any re-timing plans, so we had to re-negotiate the Scope of Work so they will actually be going to assist us in re-timing our signal coordination plans as necessary. He explained that in order to get this task included we had to assume most of the GIS duties. He said that in working with Teri, we are fairly comfortable doing this.

Haugen stated that he included in the staff report that one of the first activities needing to be done will be our vehicle intercept survey, which will be done in the next couple of weeks. He then explained what this will entail, and how it will be accomplished.

Haugen reported that we will also be working with ATAC on an update to our Travel Demand Model to reflect 2010 conditions. He stated that Teri, along with our MPO interns, are working on updating the network, and then also the census data to reflect 2010 status, taking our current 2005 data and updating it with our 2010 data.

Haugen commented that Fargo/Moorhead is completing an Origin Destination (OD) study, so our trip generation is going to reflect more up-to-date, and more Red River Valley metro area information, so our trip generation will be updated based on a combination of what our OD is saying, what the Fargo/Moorhead OD is saying, and what the general national trends are reflecting.

Bergman asked if the bridge intercept will be a one day thing or will it run for a week. Haugen responded that it is a one day study, and will encompass only the three main peak periods of the day, although the work stations will remain in place all day.

Williams requested that, because she was not here when the previous update was done, it would be helpful if an informational meeting could be scheduled to ensure everyone knows what basic data/information will be used for this update. Haugen responded that he would bring that to the May meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINNESOTA FY2013-2016 T.I.P. PROJECTS

Haugen referred to the project tables and reported that there were only a few changes, some of which we have already processed as a Technical Advisory Committee. He pointed out that the only real significant changes was the switching of East Grand Forks' 2014 project from doing a full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W. to doing a reconstruction of 17th Avenue between Highway 220 and 5th Avenue N.E.. He added that in 2015 East Grand Forks was awarded Transportation Enhancement monies for a sidewalk along 5th Avenue N.E., from U.S. 2 to 20th Street to complete a gap in the system; and in 2016 there are a couple of MNDOT projects, with the largest being the Kennedy Bridge project, at a cost of \$10,000,000; and some pavement resurfacing on Gateway Drive.

Haugen commented that the transit dollars are reflecting the financial plan from our soon to be adopted Transit Development Plan, so those have been updated to reflect what we anticipate the costs will be for transit.

Haugen reported that all of the 2012 projects meant to be done are on board and in progress. He stated, however, that the first project on the list was a Transportation Enhancement project to build a multi-use trail from the underpass by the pool over to River Heights Park in East Grand Fork, was dropped and the monies were turned back to the ATP, otherwise all the other projects are on schedule.

Haugen commented that we did advertise today for a public hearing, and they also advertised that they would receive written comments prior to noon today, and none were received. He then opened the public hearing, there was no one present for discussion, closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT FY2013-2016 MINNESOTA SIDE TIP.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen asked for an update on North Dakota's T.I.P. schedule. Johnson responded that they had their internal management meeting, however nothing has been finalized at this time. He added that they are trying to work out their current situation with 2012 dollars, therefore nothing has been done beyond that point.

Haugen asked if there was any information on the request for additional federal funds for a couple of important projects for Grand Forks, projects that were previously programmed but had significant cost estimate changes, and most recently one that has additional lanes added to the project scope of work. Johnson responded that he believes they are waiting for something from the City. He stated that they got a three month extension on SAFETEA-LU, which gets them to June, but they haven't received the funds yet so they don't know how much they will have to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

work with. He added that there have been some rumors that they may not get any more funds for 2012, but nothing is for sure at this time.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FAMILY

Haugen reported that several months ago we were given the Draft Public Participation Plan Family of Documents; which consists of the Public Participation Plan itself, the Environmental Justice Manual, the Limited English Proficiency Plan, and the Title VI Plan for review and comments. He added that since then we opened the 45-day comment period that is required, and the only comments received were from MNDOT and NDDOT. He said that Brian McCoy has worked with both states, and has made the necessary revisions to those documents.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AND THE TITLE VI PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that included was a summary slide, and also the recommendation and implementation chapter from the plan.

Kouba stated that, basically they are looking more in the short-term for the improvement for on-time performances, and development, approval, integration and operational study which is something that is new to this a little bit. She said they were needing to study the routes in order to do a 30-minute headway or frequency for our service, but in addition it was requested by council that we do a study on fares as well, so an operational study would probably best fit for both circumstances.

Kouba said that other than that they are still looking in the short-term for funding to rehabilitate the bus facility and any vehicle replacements and continuation of regional coordination will happen throughout the whole term of this TDP. She added that they are hoping that in three to five years they will be implementing the 30-minute service, as well as continuing to fund alternate funding for any projects that we have listed in our illustrative project table.

Kouba commented that other than the above there have really been no real changes than the last time she presented this plan to this body.

Williams asked if there were any changes made to the routes. Kouba responded that there are suggested changes for on-time performance issues. Williams asked if any had actually been implemented. Kouba responded that they have not. Haugen added that this document needs to be approved before any changes can be made to the routes. He stated that once approval is given

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

there will be finalization of designated stop locations, so that will have to happen before some of the routes can be changed.

Bergman reported that he received several comments from riders when he drove bus this morning, filling in for a driver, and it appears they have been hearing about this, and must be looking at it because they are asking questions, such as how soon it will get started. He said that several of them stated they are tired of vehicles being late.

Bergman stated that one thing he noticed while driving bus this morning was that the signal coordination timing plan is not working on all of the corridors. He explained that he drove two routes this morning, University and Columbia Road, and he wasn't even a block from the light and it turned green and then red before he even got up to it. He said that he has heard this from others as well.

Haugen commented, again, that the only real new item was the Discounted Fare Structure that was requested by the Grand Forks City Council.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE FINAL TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Aerial Photo RFP Update

Kouba reported that they received five proposals this past Friday, and the selection committee met Monday afternoon and selected AeroMetric to do the update. She stated that they are drawing up the contract right now, at a cost below our budgeted amount.

Haugen asked if they were able to make a bid on the options we presented. Kouba responded that they were able to bid on the oblique angle option, however if we had gone with that option they probably wouldn't have wanted it. Brooks asked if any other departments were interested in putting up funding to have the oblique angle option done. Kouba responded that not enough of them she didn't think would be able to confirm. She added that this is something that would need to be looked into before budgeting season, for all departments, so we would have to plan farther in advance.

Brooks asked if they were three or six inch. Kouba responded that they went with six inch, but did have an option of doing a combination of three inch in the urban area and six inch outside the urban area, but they went with straight six inch for both areas.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012**

Haugen stated that they expect the MPO Executive Policy Board will approve awarding AeroMetric a contract at their meeting next Wednesday. He asked when the fly-by might occur. Kouba responded that it would take place within a couple of days after approval to award the contract.

2. Mid-Year Reviews

Lang asked if the Mid-Year Reviews would be taking place at our next Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Haugen responded they would be done prior to our TAC meeting; however they will be done a little differently this year. Johnson agreed, adding that the format would be a little different this year as Stephanie Hickman is planning on doing a risk assessment this time.

3. 2010 Census

Haugen stated that they have released the New Urbanized Area, so we may be reviewing changes to our Urban Aid Boundary. He said that the census did identify some urbanized area outside our current boundaries, so there may be some minor expansion tweaks necessary, but not a lot.

4. TCSB Grant Update

Bergman asked if there had been any news on the TCSB grants yet. Haugen responded that he does not have any new information on the Federal Highway Discretionary Grants. He asked if transit had submitted for the State of Good Repair and Livability funds for the bus barn. Bergman responded that they had.

Haugen asked if they will also be doing the one-click/one-call request soon as well. Bergman responded they would.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 11TH,
2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:05 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the May 9th, 2012, 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: Bobbi Retzlaff (Proxy for Joe McKinnon), MNDOT-RDC, St. Paul; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Teri Kouba (Proxy for Nancy Ellis), East Grand Forks City Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Stacey Hanson (Proxy for Les Noehre), NDDOT-Local Government Division.

Guests present were: Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Katie Caskey, MNDOT-Office Of Statewide Multimodal Planning, St. Paul; and Stephanie Hickman, FHWA/ND Division, Bismarck.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ROMNESS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 11TH,
2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2012**

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON MNDOT CIMS

Haugen referred to the packets, and explained that this agenda item introduced the Technical Advisory Committee to the MNDOT Corridor Investment Management Strategy (CIMS). He stated that it was his hope that Joe McKinnon would be in attendance today to give a brief presentation, however he was unable to do so, therefore he would like to go over the CIMS in his absence.

Haugen explained that this is a new way of looking at corridors within MNDOT. He said that they are starting out this process on a lot of their real major roads, with US Highway 2 being one of them. He stated that US Highway 2 runs through our MPO area. He added that they are having a series of meetings with all of the corridor partners, with the one in our area being held tomorrow in Thief River Falls.

Haugen pointed out that he included a copy of a brochure that highlights what Minnesota is trying to achieve with the CIMS. He explained that they are trying to get away from “pie in the sky” corridor plans and wish lists. He said that they are trying to meet all the needs by focusing in on doing more with less funds, and trying to preserve the corridor by looking at a low cost/high reward type of projects.

Haugen stated that as they go through this process, by the end they hope to identify investment strategies along a corridor segment that will allow that more “realistic” plans as to how MNDOT will manage that corridor can be developed.

Haugen commented that as part of the CIMS agenda they do have a series of maps that identify, from their performance measures, what past investments have been made to that corridor, what current investments are programmed, and, again, based on their performance measures, what they identify future needs are along the corridor.

Haugen reported that there is still some ongoing discussion occurring amongst the MPOs and MNDOT as to how this CIMS will fit in with our Long Range Transportation Plan, so it is a work in progress. He reiterated that the first meeting is tomorrow in Thief River Falls, and he will be going so if anyone wishes to ride along, please let him know.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that this agenda item is an update on our Long Range Transportation Plan update process. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that in addition to the staff report, a copy of a public meeting notice was also included.

Haugen commented that there are actually two meetings scheduled for next Wednesday, the first is the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting that will take place at 12:00 noon. He explained that the board requested SRF be present at this meeting to allow them to discuss what they want

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2012**

studied. He added that in addition to that meeting, a public open house is also scheduled for that evening.

Haugen stated that, per the request from the Technical Advisory Committee, he will give a brief power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen reported that the plan will be going out to FY2040, and will be looking at what is out there today, what the current trends are, and what the future might bring.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen stated that in terms of population, as a result of the 2010 census, there are some maps and graphics that illustrate the changes that have occurred up to now. He referred to those documents, and went over them briefly. He pointed out that Grand Forks grew at a rate of 7% for the decade and East Grand Forks was at 14.7% for the decade. He stated that the national average growth rate was 9.7%, so both cities are growing at a fairly healthy clip.

Haugen referred to a table showing population projections, and pointed out that the current population forecast in our 2035 plan used a 1.2% annual rate, or roughly a 12% increase per decade. He stated that we have continued the 12% per decade increase out to 2040 for East Grand Forks but has lowered the growth of Grand Forks to 9% per decade out to 2040. This resulted in 10,000 less people forecasted to live in Grand Forks by 2040 than were forecasted for 2035.

Haugen pointed out that there are also maps and graphics depicting travel/traffic changes that have occurred in both cities as well. He went over that information briefly.

Haugen reported that the Land Use Plans for both communities have just been updated. He explained that the plans did not contain substantial changes from the previous land use plans, and gave a brief overview of the changes that did occur to each of the plans.

Haugen stated that everything is based on a tier growth philosophy, whereby they identify three different tiers, as well as what type of growth they would like to occur in each tier. He said that Tier 1 is closest to the community, and has a built up environment, and they would like all future growth to occur between this boundary and the current city limits. He pointed out that Tier 2's boundary is a little further out, and the philosophy is that they will allow growth out there but only at urban densities, with urban infrastructure. He stated that Tier 3 is to be preserved as agricultural land.

Haugen commented that the one change made was to I-29 and 47th Avenue. He explained that previously the Tier 1 boundary stayed on the east side of I-29, and then crossed over closer to 32nd Avenue; but it was adjusted to allow Tier 1 type development to occur on the western side of this area as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2012**

Haugen stated that another change was that they were using a 1.2% rate as their forecasted population growth out to 2035, but the results of the 2010 census dropped that to down to .9% per decade, so our 2040 population forecast will be significantly less than our current 2035 population forecast for Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that there weren't many changes to the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan from their 2035 plan.

Haugen pointed out that our Travel Demand Process is a five-step process:

1. We gather socio-economic data
2. We generate trips
3. We distribute trips
4. We make mode choices
5. We assign trips

He stated that in more common terms this means:

1. People
2. Make trips
3. Between places
4. By various modes
5. On various routes

Haugen went over the various methods used to gather the data required for traffic analysis, and ultimately to create a base model that reasonably represents observed data. He stated that from this information we can forecast future traffic, and garner the ability to determine what changes might be needed to our network to reflect future streets, and what changes might be needed to reflect future population and employment data. He said that once we have the base model then we start adding all the future information in and start doing all the "what ifs", and testing the different alternatives to see what they do to our network.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the 2035 Recommended Street and Highway Plan Project Listing, and commented that the end result of all we just discussed will be something similar to this for 2040. He then cited the example of the Washington/DeMers Intersection project, and briefly went over the alternatives and criteria used for that project, explaining how they reached the end result.

Haugen reported that the last couple of slides are just reminders that we have SRF under contract, including some of their study methodology and their timeline.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating our current TAZ structure, and went over it briefly. He stated that we have been working with ATAC, and there are a few areas where we are adding in, or splitting up some TAZs; such as by the Ralph Englestad arena where we have one TAZ

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2012**

covering both the sporting event facilities and the housing in that area, but we are now separating the housing out. He added that they are also fixing some geo-referencing on the East Grand Forks side, but there aren't too many other TAZ changes.

Haugen referred to a slide of the areas aerial photo and pointed out where some of the new improvements, or roadways are located, and reported that they are actually meeting with ATAC tomorrow to make further refinements to this.

Haugen then went over the updated schedule, stating that the final product is scheduled to be completed by April 2013, and that there are five public meetings scheduled to take place as well, with the first one taking place next week.

Williams commented that there was a map included that showed the change in ADT from 2000 to 2010, and asked if there was a map available that actually has the numbers on it. Haugen responded that he does have one and would be glad to get a copy of it out to everyone. Williams asked if copies of the one that shows census tracts, and the gains and losses in population, could also be made available as well. Haugen stated he would get them both out to everyone.

Williams reiterated that when we did the 32nd Avenue South study, we came up with new saturation rates, are they going to use that information. Haugen responded that they are. He added that ATAC is utilizing our signal coordination timing plans when they develop the network models, and will also use those rates as well as our new traffic count data that was just taken. Williams asked if they were going to run a model then on the weekend because you only have A.M, P.M. and Off-Peak down now, so are you going to do a weekend one too. Haugen responded that it will depend on how different they are.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Risk Assessment

Hickman reported that Federal Highway and Federal Transit, the two DOTs, and the MPO staff got together about a week and a half to two weeks ago, and conducted a Risk Assessment of the MPO Program and Activities. She said that she sent out a list of twenty activities that the MPO is involved with their planning program and everyone commented, or was able to provide comments on what they thought were the high risk areas, and the top three were chosen for setting performance measures, etc..

Hickman stated that they went through this and ranked them on the impact they would have if the performance measures weren't done, and on the likely hood of that impact happening, and the number one risk this MPO has is establishing and using performance measures to make sure that their plan is implemented and that they are getting the results they want.

Hickman said that they are now in the process of doing the final stages where they will come and work with the MPO staff to come up with some sort of action plan in order to address the highest risk area, or areas, as Earl determines are necessary.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2012**

Hickman commented that these results did not surprise anyone as to what they thought were high risk areas for the program, so she just wanted to inform this body that this was done, and that we are working on getting a final report for you.

Haugen reported that the other thing discussed this morning during Mid-Year Reviews, that he will revise for future discussion on the Long Range Transportation Plan is that we do have to make some changes to our urbanized area based on the 2010 census data. He said that changes will need to be made what is called the Federal Aid Adjusted Boundary.

Haugen added that Grand Forks County has also requested we consider adding in some additional area north of the airport, where there is a county road that intersects with Airport Road 5. He stated that part of that area is where the new city landfill is located, so they are asking us to consider adding that into our study area. He said that if we decide to do that we should do so soon so it can be included in our transportation planning process. He commented that they will start this discussion next month at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

2. 2010 Census

Haugen reported that as a result of the 2010 Census, on the Minnesota side there is a newly identified urbanized area focused around Mankato. He explained that Mankato has begun the process of creating an MPO, and the Minnesota MPO Directors and MNDOT are going to meet sometime this summer to consider the impact this will have on our planning funds. He commented that, fortunately for the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO we are such a small fish in that pond the impacts will be smaller than for those larger MPOs.

Haugen added that there are no new MPOs planned for North Dakota, however there is discussion on the City of Minot doing a special census, which they feel could get them above the 50,000 threshold, and if that were to occur we would have to revisit our North Dakota distribution of monies process.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY ROMNESS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 9TH, 2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:15 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 13th, 2012, 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: Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Ryan Brooks (Proxy For Brad Gengler), Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; John Green, HDR Engineering; and Patrick Dame, Airport Authority.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 9TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 9TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

MATTER OF MNDOT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AWARD

Ellis reported that the Minnesota Department of Transportation had some Safe Routes to School funding available for non-infrastructure programs. She explained that there were two different awards; one for the planning of a non-infrastructure program or activity in the schools, and then there was another that was for the implementation of a program you currently have.

Ellis said that Safe Kids coordinated with the East Grand Forks School District and applied for these monies, and received \$20,000 for non-infrastructure funds to implement the pedestrian/bike program they already have been using in the East Grand Forks School District.

Ellis congratulated both the School District and Safe Kids on this award. She commented that there were eight implementation grants given out across the State of Minnesota, and there were twelve grants to start new activities, so receiving this award was a great accomplishment.

Ellis reported that the funding will be given access to this year, therefore Safe Kids and the East Grand Forks School District have requested that we amend our current T.I.P. to include the \$20,000 so they can get the program up and running this fall. Haugen added that a public hearing on this amendment will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting on June 27th, as we were unable to make the ten day requirement for notification of the public hearing in time for this meeting.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDING THE CURRENT 2012-2015 T.I.P. TO INCLUDE THE MNDOT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT OF \$20,000.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF CHANGES TO URBANIZED BOUNDARY

Haugen reported that we need to change our urbanized boundaries as a result of the 2010 census. He explained that they defined a new geography for urbanized area, and we need to react to that change and make adjustments to our federal urban aid boundary.

Kouba commented that, as Mr. Haugen just stated, the 2010 census has put out what they are defining as the Urbanized Area, and they have put out definitions of them, which they tried to, the biggest change is that they are trying to represent the urban footprint of every area. She said that where they have come close, for the most part, there are still certain areas that need to be tweaked a little bit for the use in the federal highway administration boundary base, so what she has done is to provide maps in the packet.

Kouba stated that what she is done is to take our current boundary, shown in grey, which is what we are currently using as our federal urban aid boundary. We can see that there are several areas

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

that are not included in the grey area, but which the census says is urbanized area, so we need to make sure that the boundary the census as provided is included in everything.

Kouba said that, beyond this, what they tried to do is to try to make straight lines, smooth them out, but, as you can see there are some areas that are sticking out of the grey area, and some of them are harder to see, such as the area in East Grand Forks along Business 2, that stretches beyond the city limits east of 13th Street S.E.

Kouba stated that another change in East Grand Forks is mostly on the north end, where the boundary came up around the new housing development in that area, and with it being that close we made sure our city limits were included, and then also smoothed out most of the area in there.

Kouba pointed out that in Grand Forks the North Washington area started getting included, along the intersection of Mill Road and North Washington. She said that the boundary shown is where the Census shows their boundary. She commented that the difference is that the Census put it as the centerline, but in the last go-around with this area it was decided that it should be brought out to the property line, which is basically what she shows.

Kouba commented that on the west side they brought out the lines to completely include the city limit lines. She added that there are just some small adjustments along the far west side of the city to ensure we include up to the census boundary, which has to be included within everything.

Williams asked if the line was located along 55th on the west side. Haugen responded that the census uses the centerline of the railroad track. Kouba referred to a slide illustrating where the boundary line is located, and pointed out that it is located along the railroad tracks there. Williams asked what they used previously, the section line. Haugen responded that they previously used the property line. Brooks commented that the railroad lines are on the section lines. Haugen added that the railroad does not own the property on both sides of their tracks through this portion of Grand Forks County. He stated that this means that we will most likely end up with the quirkiness of having some farmer's sliver of land located inside the federal aid urban boundary, or the urbanized area boundary, but not all of that piece of property.

Haugen commented that in most cases when we had, like on other roadways ten years ago, where we had the centerline down the roadway we included all the right-of-way for that roadway instead of having a line down the centerline, that is what we are suggesting we do up on North Washington this time. He explained that along the railroad track, since not every place has adjoining railroad property on the other side of the centerline, we are just maintaining the census defined centerline on the west side.

Williams asked to see a slide of the North Washington area, and asked if it was the census boundary that we are following there. Haugen responded it was.

Romness questioned that the census takes it to the centerline. Haugen responded that they are not consistent with that policy either, but in the case of North Washington that is what they have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

done. Romness asked if this makes North Washington an urban area. Haugen responded that it takes North Washington, from 27th Avenue to its intersection with Mill Road, back into the federal aid boundary. He added that ten years ago we were able to delete it out of the federal urban aid boundary because of how the census defined an urbanized area, but now we have to bring it back in so with it will be all the required North Dakota Department of Transportation maintenance agreements, etc..

Williams asked what makes the east side different than the west side, specifically for urbanization, since both are light industrial areas. Haugen responded that the Census is using its census block boundaries to determine an urbanized area, that is all they are considering.

Haugen commented that the urban aid boundary has always been the change in maintenance responsibilities between the City and State. Williams asked, then, if the request is to take in the entire street. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that in order to be consistent we need to include all the right-of-way for the street rather than using the centerline.

Haugen stated that the only change to be made to the map included in the packet would be to the area along North Washington, to use the right-of-way instead of the centerlines, otherwise the rest is pretty much inclusive of what the census or the feds are requiring we included, and then smoothing out some of their ragged edges. He said that the needs to be done within the next couple of months, however we don't have to do it today if anyone has any concerns or changes they would like made first.

Haugen commented that, as a side-note, the urbanized population does not include all of the population inside the City of Grand Forks, so our population isn't one for one either.

Bergman asked if this would end up affecting the information in their NTD reports. Haugen responded it wouldn't, adding that they are not impacting the census urbanized area boundary, we are adjusting for federal highway purposes as FTA does not allow for adjustments, and their NTD report question is still, there is a webinar at the end of the month that will probably answer all those things.

Romness commented that he would like to discuss this with Les Noehre to see what impact using the centerline versus the right-of-way will have. Williams added that actually taking just the right-of-way on the west side, that is part of the parcel so we would actually be affecting that parcel, and it will make the city responsible for a street or county parcels, because those parcels are all out in the county, they are not in the city at all, on either side of the road, so now we have the city being responsible for that half-mile street but not collecting any tax dollars or anything else. Haugen agreed, adding that this is the same situation we had going on on U.S. 2. Williams stated that that is true, but it doesn't make it right.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL THE JULY 11TH TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

Haugen asked if there was anything the committee wanted staff to do with this, or is this something that you want to discuss and come back with. Romness responded that they would probably discuss this and come back with recommendations.

Williams asked, since we can take the entire right-of-way, the reverse is true that we can back it in and run the boundary up to the right-of-way, correct. Haugen responded that that isn't true. He explained that the census is including from the centerline to the east right-of-way property, so, again we have no choice but to include that. Williams asked if they can request to adjust the census line. Johnson reported that the local federal highway office recommended not leaving it at the centerline because it could turn into a planning issue later on.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN OPEN HOUSE AND
BRIDGE INTERCEPT SURVEY**

Haugen reported that there are three parts to this item. He said that the first is in regard to an open house that was held May 16th. He stated that there were about 25 people attend, and the first half hour involved having people look at display boards and ask questions and submit comments.

Haugen commented that the bulk of the meeting involved an interactive survey which posted questions on a screen to which those in attendance were able to, with the help of MNDOT equipment, respond to electronically. He said that after the questions were answered, the results of those answers were then show immediately.

Haugen stated that they had a predominant Grand Forks population versus East Grand Forks, they had people that weren't overly familiar with the Long Range Transportation Plan, so when asked certain questions people had some strong feelings towards them, while for some questions people had no basis to be able to answer at all. He added that some of the questions were phrased in such a way that they were hard for people to respond to using the choices made available.

Haugen continued going over some of the questions from the survey, as well as the responses given.

Haugen reported that one of the financing questions had to deal with a revenue source, and he thinks a maintenance/utility type of fee was the main response. He explained that they strongly agreed that there should be more revenue, and the preferred method to increase that revenue was utility fees for transportation at 32%, the second most favored method was either no opinion or negotiated developer impact fees at 21%, bonding at 11%, and property taxes or special assessments were the lowest.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

Haugen asked, for those of you who were in attendance, what was your reaction to this type of instrument in getting immediate feedback. Williams responded that she thought it was a very good format, she really, really liked the format. She added that once they got a couple of questions under their belts she thinks people responded very well. Citing an example, Williams said that her comment, the comment that they wrote in their memo on the open house, stated that the only thing she felt was wrong was that the questions were not prefaced with enough information. Haugen asked if she submitted a memo because they don't have it as part of the record. Williams responded that she did, adding that she would follow up as to where it is and get a copy to him.

Haugen stated that the second item is the draft results of the Vehicle Intercept Survey on the bridges. He explained that on May 3rd they stopped a percent of vehicles on all three of the river crossings, essentially from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m., 1:00 to 3:00 p.m., and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Haugen commented that they stopped over 2,000 vehicles between the three bridges. He said that the only two things of any significance that came from the survey were: 1) there wasn't much difference from ten years ago, a lot of the destination origins were still predominately the same; and 2) there has been an overall 6% increase in traffic on the bridges, with roughly a 6% increase in Minnesota license plates than ten years ago. He commented that they know the City of Grand Forks grew 7% and East Grand Forks 14%.

Lang asked if the 14.7% growth shown in the report was incorrect. Haugen responded it was correct, explaining that the 1.4% increase was the annual rate, and the 14.7% was for an entire decade.

Haugen reported that he did ask SRF to check one thing. He referred to a map illustrating the Kennedy Bridge east-bound origin destination pairs and pointed out that there isn't anything from the south end of I-29 connecting to cross at the Kennedy Bridge. He stated that ten years ago there was a pairing that should have shown up here. He added that they also have a pairing shown just east of the lagoon system, going to Crookston, and that doesn't seem to be a logical origin for a significant number of vehicles to be crossing. He reminded everyone, however, this is a draft and SRF is still working on addressing inconsistencies.

Lang asked if the survey was actually handed to participants or were the questions asked and recorded by staff. Haugen responded that the questions were asked and recorded by staff.

Discussion on how the survey was conducted ensued.

Haugen stated that the third item is the draft goals, objectives and standard performance measures. He explained that the goal statements are something you have seen twice already during the past two years; first with the T.I.P. Manual, where we identified our scoring criteria; and the second time was when we added them to our transit process; and now for a third time for our Street and Highway Element.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

Haugen commented that, included with the goals, essentially the goals are the SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors that we are to consider when we develop our Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that, with those factors we did infuse the livability principles that were signed on by the Federal DOT, HUD, and EPA. He added that those livability principles were also infused into each City's Land Use Plan Goals as well. Haugen stated that the objective statements that we adopted in the last two years, East Grand Forks two years ago and Grand Forks last year, so we are carrying through on those livability principles as well in the Land Use Plans.

Haugen reported that one thing we are achieving, which may be somewhat different from our current Street and Highway Transportation Plan, is that we are trying to use what is known as "SMART" Goals (S-specific, M-measurable, A-agreed to, R-realistic, and T-timebased). He explained that these are an effort to identify goals and objectives, and standard statements that allow us to easily identify the performance measurement we are trying to achieve with those statements. He added that this is being done at the encouragement of Federal Highway, specifically that we utilize their SMART training that they gave us two years ago for our next Long Range Transportation Plan update, which we are in the process of doing now.

Williams asked if there were things in here that cannot be changed. Haugen responded that the goals cannot be changed; the objectives, standards and performance measures are all drafts that we are presenting to you to identify what those things are, where they came from, and what we are trying to achieve, otherwise there isn't anything here that we are requesting approval for today.

Haugen stated that he has not been able to provide SRF any comment on this draft yet, prior to it being released to this body.

Haugen commented that we start with the SAFETEA-LU planning factors that congress tells us we should consider when we develop Long Range Transportation Plans. He added that we use those factors in our T.I.P. priority ranking system, and in our transit plan, and have included the livability principles that have been adopted by the DOT, and promoted through federal highway and FTA. He said that these will then be coordinated with the Land Use Plan updates that we've just completed as well. He added that we have performance measures that are typically time-based for either an annual collection or a three or five year collection period. He reported that the intent is to, every year, if we have annual ones we will produce a performance measurement report.

Haugen stated that they have a draft that everyone can review and comment on. He said that they would be more than willing to meet with everyone as a group, or individually to go over it in depth, or they can wait until the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting to do so. Haugen said, then, that this is where they are at with the Long Range Transportation Plan update. He added that there are some future things going on, including Nancy spearheading the connection with the freight industry, the local freight movement.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

Ellis reported that there was a Freight Study completed in 2009. She pointed out that at that time the MPO intern, who just happened to be Ali Rood, met with all the freight providers and some of the larger industries that use a lot of freight to gather input on what their daily process is, what their trucking needs are, etc., as well as what their issues and concerns are on the area's transportation system, and what types of things they would like to see put into the Long Range Transportation Plan, in terms of the freight. She stated that they are going to hold a meeting on June 27th, at 9:30 a.m., to invite all those same players to make sure their daily activities are the same as they were before, and provide them with what projects we have completed since 2009, and find out if they have any new issues.

Haugen commented that the biggest activity SRF is currently working on is an update to our signalized intersections. He stated that we provided them with updated data, and they are reviewing the timing plans and identifying whether or not the plans need any changes to the signal coordination plan for Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that SRF is scheduled to be back in mid-July to hold some public meetings to present the existing conditions report, which should include an analysis from their findings from the turning movement counts given them.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MNDOT Bridge Post

McKinnon reported that the MNDOT Bridge Office, on June 11th, posted a solicitation for proposals for the Kennedy Bridge Study. He added that the final date for submission is July 11th.

McKinnon commented that this will be the study that will investigate the feasibility of rehabilitating the Kennedy Bridge structure, and then looking at replacement options should it be determined that rehabbing it is not feasible. He stated that it is anticipated this will be a nine to twelve month study to complete. He added that an advisory committee will be set up, and one of the big things they will have to look at is, what is called "Pier 6" which is the one that is severely moving, so recommendations are necessary. He stated that the Bridge Office in St. Paul is the project manager for this, although the District will be involved.

Haugen asked if anyone had an update on the Memorandum of Understanding for the Sorlie Bridge. McKinnon responded that he asked J.T. Anderson, MNDOT Engineer, about this but they wanted to get the Kennedy Bridge project completed before working on this one.

Johnson commented that they got an e-mail about a week ago stating that it was moving its way up the ladder.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2012**

2. Updated Timeline

Williams asked if a request could be made to SRF for an updated timeline for the Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that it is on the MPO website. Williams stated that she went to the website, but couldn't even find the stuff for the open house, so if they could just post it, or someone could send her a copy, she would appreciate it.

3. Status On Draft T.I.P/S.T.I.P.

Johnson responded that he believes the program has been approved, but he has not yet seen a copy of the document. He said that they are in the process of getting the letters, etc., finalized, so he will get it out as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 13TH, 2012,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:30 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 11th, 2012, 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: Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; and John Green, HDR Engineering.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 13TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks has requested we amend our 2012-2015 T.I.P. to move \$1.4 million from the FY2012 Gateway Drive/Columbia Road Intersection Improvement project, which, through the project development process has now been put off from having the full reconstruction done to the Columbia Road Phase 1 Reconstruction project, which is actually being done in 2013, but is short funding.

Haugen stated that we need to change the project scope to identify what is going on and why it is being changed, and to illustrate that the dollar amounts are essentially the same for this year.

Haugen commented that a public hearing has been advertised, however it will not be held until next Wednesday at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting. He added that, because of this, any action from this committee will have to be contingent on the MPO formally receiving a letter from the City of Grand Forks requesting this amendment. He stated that he has seen a draft of such letter, but have not formally received it at this time.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ROMNESS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDING THE CURRENT 2012-2015 T.I.P. TO REPROGRAM FY2012 FUNDS FROM THE COLUMBIA ROAD/GATEWAY DRIVE PROJECT TO THE COLUMBIA ROAD PHASE 1 RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT.

Williams referred to the City of Grand Forks' council staff report, and reported that the City Council asked for reallocation of funds and to retain the previous project allocation of \$2.45 million dollars. She asked if this all needs to be included in one amendment. Haugen responded that he visited with Mark Walker, Assistant City Engineer, and we need to have the amendment for 2012 be approved separately, which is what we are addressing with this agenda item. He added that when addressing FY2013 dollars, we will do so between the Draft and Final T.I.P. documents.

Haugen explained that the 2012 dollars are on a very tight timeline, and we need to have this amendment action sail through both the MPO, DOT, and Federal Highway without any hiccups, so that is why we are distinctly amending the annual element to address the 2012 dollars with this agenda item so that nothing slows down the process.

Williams agreed, adding, however, that her next question is whether or not the 2013-2016 T.I.P. be processed concurrently with this agenda item, or should it be processed during the next cycle, after the 2012-2015 gets through, so basically, should these two amendments be processed at the same time. Haugen responded that we have to address the amendment for the 2012 dollars today so that they don't get lost, and later on we will be approving the Draft 2013-2016 T.I.P., at which time we will discuss the 2013 funding. Williams stated that she just doesn't want to have to go

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

back and change something we have adopted to make sure we don't miss anything, which is why she is bringing this up now.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE OF THE 2013-2016
T.I.P.**

Haugen said that he hopes everyone received the e-mail he sent Monday with the updated version of the Draft North Dakota side T.I.P. He pointed out that there was one major correction that needed to be done, which Mr. Noehre pointed out, that involves a project for 2013 on the Regional System that was programmed but was missed when the draft was written.

Haugen stated that he has a brief presentation today that will walk us through this draft. He commented that there were some substantial changes to it from our current draft T.I.P., and also from our December approved list of candidate projects.

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

Haugen pointed out that last year we were informed we should use a 0% growth and revenue rate, but the Draft T.I.P. document changed that as we are now averaging a 3.6% revenue growth per year. He said that the first couple of years are actually more than 3.6 but the last year is less, so the average is 3.6.

Haugen reported that when they were told 0%, our previous T.I.P. assumed a 3% growth, so when we started in December we thought we were going to have \$800,000 less in our program than we currently had, but with the release of a 3.6% annual rate we have essentially recaptured that \$800,000 of revenue, however we still have the obligation limit. In prior T.I.P.s our revenue, on the North Dakota side, was not set to the obligation limit, which is typically 90% of what is available, so last year, in December, we had to account for the imposition of obligation, which still means our program is \$1.2 million dollars more than our previous T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that the 4% expenses rate remains the same.

Haugen reported that on the regional side, back in December there was one new project, which is the same project that Mr. Noehre pointed out was not included in the Draft T.I.P., but we did know about it in December so it will be included in the updated T.I.P. on our website. He commented that this project is programmed to occur in 2013.

Haugen stated that the only other changes are the repainting of the University Avenue Overpass in 2015; and in 2016, as most of you are aware, there is a difference between what is being programmed for the Kennedy Bridge project. He said that we can probably approve the Draft T.I.P. with the different amounts, but when we get to the final there must be a reconciliation of these cost estimates, so between now and the final we need to come to an agreement on the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

amount to be programmed for this project. He explained that the Minnesota Draft T.I.P. showed a \$10,000,000 total project cost, \$5,000,000 each side; and the North Dakota Draft T.I.P. is showing a \$32,000,000 total project cost, \$16,000,000 each side.

Noehre commented that there is also a signage project as well. Haugen stated that because some of the project might be located in the MPO study area, we have been asked to program it, however it was left off the presentation list as well.

Haugen added that there are a couple of other projects that aren't showing up in any of these presentation listings, simply because it was easier not to include them at this time. He said that one is a safety project for the pedestrian countdowns on Columbia Road and Washington, a \$30,000 project for 2013; and a couple of illustrative projects that don't show up either.

Haugen referred to the Urban Roads project table, and explained that this is what was submitted in December. He pointed out that they highlighted that there were significant differences between what was already programmed for projects and what the requests were for additional funding.

Haugen briefly went over the Urban Roads project list.

Williams stated that her question on the Columbia Road Phase 1 project is: Because the money was moved from 2012 to 2013 the reduction is actually going to show up in the 2012 budget instead of moving it, 2012 from Gateway and Columbia to Columbia and DeMers, and then having that amount being the same in that year and then that way the total dollar amount, the bottom line didn't change, and then when we got to this one then it would because what's happened now is, what we have seen is, we're seeing a reduction in the year 2012 in dollar amount. Haugen said, not in federal dollar amount because you are getting the \$1.4 million. Williams stated that you are moved it to 2013. Haugen responded that the \$1.4 million in 2012 says in 2012. Williams asked where it went. Haugen responded that it is going to Columbia Phase 1. Williams said that that is what she is asking, so it went to Columbia and DeMers. Haugen agreed that it went to the previous agenda item, to Columbia Phase 1. Williams said that that was what her question was earlier, that it actually moved to that agenda item. Haugen explained that that agenda item amended our annual element of our T.I.P., which, once it goes through the process, the State will adopt by reference, the feds will concur with State action, so the 2012 project will now be \$1.4 million and change, in federal dollars going to Phase 1 of Columbia Road/DeMers Avenue, so the \$1.4 million in 2012, in our previous agenda item, was captured and maintained in the urban area for Grand Forks to use on Phase 1.

Haugen commented that the other half of Phase 1, which is the funding in 2013 to make the request from December of \$3.48 whole, will show the \$2.07 million in federal dollars Phase 1 Columbia Road in 2013.

Romness stated that what he is concerned with is, that that reduction, based on our current estimates will increase the City's share by approximately \$220,000. Haugen agreed, explaining

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

that his advice to Mr. Walker was to ask the MPO to still work with the City and the State between the Draft T.I.P. and the Final T.I.P. to try to address that issue of what happened to the \$400,000 in 2013. He asked if Mr. Johnson had any clarification as to why the \$400,000 was dropped from the project in 2013. Johnson responded that, when the City made their request to have the \$1.4 million moved from the Gateway and Columbia project to the Phase 1 Columbia Road project, they then received a letter from the City stating that based on the \$1.4 million and what their updated estimates were for the project, they needed additional federal funds in 2013 to make up for their total, so they matched the dollar amount the City requested in February. He added that that did show a difference in the total dollar amounts, but in that letter from the City, they did not specify the additional identification of the other monies. He stated that they were told to program a certain dollar amount, by the City's request, and that is what they accommodated, so the change in the dollar amount was not identified for a different project. Haugen asked, then, if in the Draft T.I.P. for this project, unless we want to drop projects that have not been requested or modified, the funding of projects that haven't been requested, our fiscal constraint issue only allows us to program the \$2.07 million in 2013, the remaining portion of Phase 1 to be funded. So that is where we are at with the Draft T.I.P., and between now and the Final T.I.P. we can continue to work with NDDOT to try to find \$400,000 to program into Phase 1 in 2013.

Haugen reported that there are a couple of other projects in 2013 that are now being delayed to 2014. He stated that those projects are the roundabout at 24th and 34th intersection; the two intersection improvements at Washington and 40th and at 42nd and 11th Avenue South. He said that the other thing to note is that in the Draft T.I.P. we are fully programming the funding requests the City made back in December for all their projects.

Romness asked, when the City made its request to move the \$1.4 million to the Columbia Phase 1 project, they didn't know at that point that their other two projects scheduled then would be moved, but if they had known that could they have asked for those monies to be split between the two projects that moved out of 2013, rather than lose it into thin air. Johnson responded that if they would have known that they definitely could have made that request at the time of the change, and they would have done what they could to have accommodate it, but there wouldn't have been any guarantees. Haugen clarified by explaining that basically this means that they found another project that needed \$400,000, plus some of your previously programmed 2013 dollars, to make another project able to be done in 2013, and then to meet your full funding request they delayed the two projects to the next year, but had we known they were wanting to delay projects we could have tried to capture some of the dollars in the projects.

Haugen commented that Columbia Road Phase 2 was programmed in 2014, but, again it was underfunded \$1 million because of a soil condition, and another \$1 million because of a capacity expansion decision, so in order to meet the City's request for more monies the State is deferring it to 2016.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

Haugen stated that in 2015 there were no projects programmed on the Urban local side of north Dakota, and in 2016, because of the delay of Phase 2, in order to make it fully funded the City's request of Columbia Road south of 32nd Avenue was not programmed at this time.

Haugen reported that the Transportation Enhancement project for the South 20th Reconstruction, between 40th and 47th, was funded, the DeMers project was not, however he wants to continue to remind you that the State does have a DeMers Avenue project that could combined, or coordinated with anything to help get bike/peds underneath the interstate more safely on DeMers Avenue.

Haugen stated that the Safe Routes To School request was not funded, although he thinks the City is doing some of the radio controlled beacons themselves. Williams responded that they are doing the three beacons shown.

Noehre asked for clarification on the area Mr. Haugen was referring to on the State's DeMers project. He stated that he just wanted to bring this up so that you know that they couldn't do all of it, it isn't all State highway. Haugen agreed, but added that almost half of it is State highway, and if they could work with the City to fund half, the City might fund the other half.

Haugen reported that beyond 2016, some 2017 projects are still being identified as projects that are seeking funds, but is outside of the T.I.P. program years.

Haugen commented that something that shows up in the North Dakota S.T.I.P., District 6, Grand Forks is the Illustrative Project of the Sorlie Bridge being replaced in 2016, whereas before we were looking at it being done in 2018.

Haugen asked Mike Johnson to explain the difference between a pending project and an illustrative project. Johnson reported that essentially a pending project has a funding source identified for it, and if they receive all of their obligation authority from Congress, they would then be programmed the year they are identified, but if they don't receive it then they are pushed to the following fiscal year, and would be the first project looked at when funds are available. He stated that an illustrative project does not have any funding source programmed to it, so it would be a project that should any additional funding become available would then be programmed.

Noehre commented that the Sorlie Bridge project has not been moved to 2016.

Haugen referred to a summary list of projects for consideration and went over it briefly.

Haugen reported that on the transit side they just received an award for their One Click One Call Center in the amount of \$1.7, initially for Grand Forks, and then there will also be statewide North Dakota funds awarded. He added that he also submitted a request for increasing the frequency of the night service route and to add a new route to service the Industrial Park and Ray Richards areas.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

Haugen stated that they have been working with UND, NDDOT, and the City on getting a Campus Road Bridge over the English Coulee replaced. He said that they have been informed that the federal dollars are available, so the City and UND need to work out a couple of items, then we will have to amend the T.I.P. to bring that project in.

Noehre commented that there is also a potential for, or a desire for some improvements to the Campus Road, but they are looking at is bridge replacement funds for a bridge, so anything done to the roadway is not included in the funding made available for the bridge.

Haugen stated that this is where they are at with the Draft North Dakota Side T.I.P. for 2013-2016. He added that in the draft document on the website, please note that the South Washington 2013 project is not there, but will now be programmed in. He added that, as Mr. Noehre pointed out, this was all done prior to MAP-21 being passed, and the City will be submitting a letter asking the MPO to continue to work on recapturing the \$400,000 for Phase 1 Columbia Road 2013 and reconcile the Kennedy Bridge project cost estimate.

Haugen said that staff is seeking action from the Technical Advisory Committee. He added that a public hearing has been schedule to take place at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2013-2016 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. SUBJECT TO POSSIBLE CHANGES FROM THE PASSAGE OF MAP-21; FOR THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, THE MPO, AND THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA TO TRY TO WORK OUT A WAY TO RECAPTURE THE \$400,000; AND FOR THE TWO STATES AND THE MPO TO TRY TO RECONCILE THE KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECT COST ESTIMATE.

Williams asked is there any reason why we can't do this at next month's meeting because they haven't had time to look at the city dollars, so right now they are approving something that has changed federal monies, but then the City dollars are still at the same amount. Haugen responded that there are a couple of answers to that question; first we don't have to adopt a new document, we have a current document for two years, secondly we have a draft published so that we can identify what the known issues are so that between the Draft and the Final we can have a reconciliation or an agreement on what the known issues are.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen pointed out that the Draft T.I.P. also has an Appendix A which tries to capture the current status of projects for Fiscal Year 2012. He said that he would be sending out an e-mail to everyone soon asking that you update the obligations for the 2011 projects, as well as the status of the 2012 projects so that in our Final T.I.P. we can include the appendix that includes those updates. He explained that the 2011 is our Annual Listing of Obligations that we are required to do.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

MATTER OF HIGHLIGHTS OF MAP-21

Haugen reported that he included some summaries or highlights of the MAP-21 document. He referred to that information and gave a brief overview.

Haugen stated that MAP-21 doesn't really start until the new federal fiscal year. He said that it officially extends SAFETEA-LU another three months first, and then in October it will kick in in-force.

Haugen said that the MPO specific portions show that they left the threshold as is at 50,000, and they left a lot of things unchanged. He stated that one thing he would like to touch on is that they are now requiring us to have performance measures included in our planning documents, as well as submit annual reports on how we measure against what we said we wanted to have as our performance, so we will have performance outcome reports required.

Haugen commented that the performance measurement is something that the feds and States have been hammering on us to do for a couple of years, so we have already started that process.

Haugen stated that another big thing about the program, as discussed on the cover page, is that it "kicks the can down the road another couple of years". He explained that the Highway Trust Fund had to get infusions of close to \$20 billion dollars from the general fund in order to even make this go out to the end of 2014. He said that in 2014, if everything else stays as MAP-21 identifies, there will only be \$4 billion dollars left in the Highway Trust Fund and \$1 billion dollars in the Transit Trust Fund, and that isn't even one year of appropriation, so basically it got us funded to the end of 2014, but there is still a huge revenue issue on how to fund transportation projects.

Haugen reported that they consolidated a lot of the silos into a more simplified programming tool, which is what was alluded to in regard to the fact that the Draft T.I.P. and S.T.I.P.s don't address the impact MAP-21 has on them. He explained that an example is the off system bridge on Campus Road, which is only a 2012 funding silo, and in 2013 there is no longer an off system bridge program as a separate silo, and it has been split and rolled into some of the other programs.

Haugen stated that the other real big change that was discussed a lot was what happened to the enhancements, safe routes to school, and recreational trails programs. He said that the end of this report kind of gets into a nice separation of what was and what is. He added that it also gives an analysis of what was in SAFETEA-LU and what is in MAP-21, what the differences are between the two. He stated that one of the bigger things is that, again, there is no longer a separate safe routes to school silo, or a recreational trails silo, or even a transportation enhancement silo, these are all now combined into a Transportation Alternatives Program. He explained that the Transportation Alternatives Program is further split, really 50/50 and combines all the eligible items of those previous programs, adds a few more eligibility items, deletes enhancement activities like museums and some other things that weren't funded regularly

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

anyway. He stated that it splits that level 50/50, 50% of what the State gets has to be allocated down to the local level, and the other 50% the State may or may not reserve for transportation alternative activities.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side the State was already taking enhancement dollars and sub-programming to the urban and county side, and he anticipates this program being similar. He added that it is a little different on the Minnesota side as each ATP kind of got to decide their enhancement sub-category and programming amounts so we will have to see how that shakes out on the Minnesota side.

Haugen stated that with the Transportation Alternatives Program there will still be an opportunity for local entities to get bike/ped, safe routes to school, recreational trails funded, and the dollar amount might be very similar to what is currently eligible for North Dakota and Minnesota localities in our area already, but the big difference is the State may not have to put those funds into transportation alternative activities.

Williams asked if HSIP was specifically mentioned in MAP-21. Haugen responded that HSIP is still a specific program.

McKinnon commented that the NHS system will now be called NHPP, and will expand to include all the principle arterials in Minnesota, but the money will be more restrictive and will have to stay within and can't be flexed it back to STP or such. He stated that this means there will be more money on the principle arterial routes and less to the minor arterials.

Haugen asked if anyone knew whether or not CMAQ has lost any of its flexibility. McKinnon responded that he hasn't heard anything on that as they don't really get them both in Bemidji too much with congestion and air quality. Haugen explained that because in Minnesota you do have some air quality area maintenance, you do have to maintain your separate CMAQ program, while North Dakota was able to flex it completely out. He said that he doesn't know if MAP-21 maintains that flexibility or not.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Haugen stated that staff is requesting we hold a special Technical Advisory Committee meeting on the Street and Highway Plan on July 26th, which is a Thursday, in the afternoon from 1:30 to 3:00 P.M.

Haugen said that they will also be holding their second open house that evening to try to finalize the issues they will address in the plan document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2012**

Haugen reported that at the Technical Advisory Committee they will try to spend some time going over the goals, objectives, and performance measures. He added that they will also be going over existing conditions report that shows the level of service, crash data, timing plans, etc.

Information only.

2. Urbanized Maps

Haugen commented that last month we discussed urbanized maps, and have not heard of any more requests for information, so they are assuming everything is good to go for August. He added, however, that if anyone needs any further clarification, please contact him as soon as possible.

3. NDDOT Open House On Long Range Transportation Plan

Haugen reported that NDDOT is holding an open house on their Long Range Transportation Plan next Wednesday at the Howard Johnson from 7:00 to 9:00 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 11TH, 2012,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:36 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 26th, 2012, 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: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Katie Caskey, MNDOT-Office Of Statewide Multimodal Planning-St. Paul; and Teri Kouba (Proxy For Dale Bergman), Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Guests present were: Jon Markusen, KLJ; Mike Bittner, KLJ; Lance Bernard, SRF; Brian Shorten, SRF; and Cecilia Crenshaw, Federal Transit Administration-St. Paul (via conference call).

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE JULY 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

**MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – STREET/HIGHWAY
ELEMENT UPDATE**

Haugen reported that Brian Shorten and Lance Bernard from SRF are present today to give a brief overview on the Long Range Transportation Plan update. He pointed out that there were several documents concerning this agenda item included in today's agenda packet. He added that tonight at 5:30 p.m., in the Training Conference Room in East Grand Forks City Hall, we will be holding our 2nd open house.

Shorten commented that SRF has teamed with CPS to perform an update to the Long Range Transportation Plan. He referred to a slide, and went over the agenda they will be following for today's meeting:

- 1) Project Update
- 2) Review Goals/Objectives/Standards and Performance Measures
- 3) Existing Conditions
- 4) Public Open House

Shorten then briefly went over the project schedule (which is available on the MPO Website). He pointed out that over the last three months they have completed the first three tasks in the scope of work, including the Origin/Destination Study, the results of which you were given at your last meeting, and which will be very helpful to your traffic model.

Shorten commented that Lance has been working with the MPO staff in defining the goals and objectives and standards for this plan based on the last plan. He added that there is a new enhancement that the MPO desired be included in this plan; which wasn't in the last plan, but which is strongly encouraged in MAP-21, and that is performance measures, so they have a significant amount of information on this to share today.

Shorten reported that they are currently working on the evaluation of the signal timing plans with Jane Williams. He stated that they will be doing some field work on this item in August and September, once school is back in session.

Shorten said that they also have some information concerning the existing level of service analysis, which that they will be going over later today. He added that they also have information on crash analysis as well.

Shorten stated that Lance has developed some information concerning the carbon footprinting analysis from 2006 to 2012, specifically in terms of what has been happening with greenhouse gases.

Shorten commented that they have been working with Nancy Ellis and representatives from the freight and shipping entities in the area on the freight report to come up with some new information concerning their needs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

Shorten reported that they have been giving Earl monthly updates on the progress of the update, and did hold an open house in May at which they gathered some public information, the results of which are available on the website for review, especially the results of the electronic facilitation function they used at the meeting. He added that they held two meetings with stakeholders on the University Avenue issue, and are making some progress on potential solutions for that issue as well.

Shorten commented that they have an updated list of issues and opportunities they would like to discuss today. He added that they are on schedule, and have been working diligently with MPO staff to stay on schedule. He stated that over the next few months they will be refining the goals and objectives, finalizing the existing conditions report, and finalizing the issues identification report. He said that the future activities they will be looking at include developing a range of alternatives, identifying future projects, and doing a financial analysis.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STANDARDS & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Bernard reported that the first thing he wanted to focus on are the goals and objectives report that everyone should have received earlier. He stated that they started with a foundation of past goals and objectives from the last plan, and refined them for this update. He said that one of the things they wanted to focus on was to look at the performance measures, specifically applying the SMART (specific, measurable, agreed, realistic, time-bound) principles throughout all the goals, objectives and standards and performance measures, so they really made sure they emphasized how the SMART principles were being applied to each, providing dialogue and discussion in the report concerning how they took those principles and used them throughout the document.

Bernard commented that another thing they wanted to do was to align this plan's goals with the State Plan as well, so in the report they provided some matrixes that show where those goals align with the North Dakota Plan and the State of Minnesota's Multi-modal Plan, just to give a sense of where things align to make sure that both plans are meshing with one another, so they are seeking this body's feedback today.

Caskey stated that in looking through the goals, objectives, and standards and performance measures chapter, one thing that MNDOT would like to see is, on the back where you have the matrix, how this plan connects with the MNDOT Multi-Modal Transportation Plan's Guiding Principles. She explained that those principles are from their Vision, and they would really like them to use the objectives from the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan that is almost finalized as they tried to get the vision up to the next level, so it will be a better reference point. She stated that they can use the Guiding Principles as well, but the one thing they would really like to see them use is the plan objectives.

Shorten asked, just generally, from either DOT's point of view, do you see that what has been developed here is fairly in line with your plans, is there anything you feel they should be aware of that hasn't been accommodated. Johnson responded that on the North Dakota side he isn't as familiar with the goals as they are laid out right now, as he attended some meetings early on but

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

hasn't had the opportunity to do so lately, but this is something he will look into. Bernard commented that they are using the goals from the TransAction 3 Plan for this, so if things change or are updated in that plan, which is still a draft, they can take those changes into consideration as well. Caskey responded that they have some staff looking through this, then they will put together some comments that they will submit as soon as they can.

Williams stated that she has some general comments, as well as some very specific comments that, in general she thinks the goals and everything, the City support all the effort being made, but there are a lot of objectives, or standards that are written as though the City is a regulatory agency, and they have no way of regulating to the point of reducing trips and making people car-pool, they don't have the authority to do that, that is a state level function. She said that the only authority that they really have is over their employees, and saying how many people come into the parking lot, and that is very very limited, as they don't even have control over people parking on the street. She added that they do have authority over their fleet vehicle, and as part of the Mayor's Green Initiative, that may be something that should be looked at. She said that the City's other green initiative is working on different things within our own building, but those are the only things, as a City, that they have any control over, they can't regulate any of the other things, although they can certainly encourage employees to do flex hours and that sort of thing, but they can't make them. She commented that there are some other things mentioned in the report about developing, monitoring, and doing all these different things, which would be really great, but she doesn't know who would do them, because, with the staffing levels that they have right now, she doesn't believe the City has the staff persons to do it, and she doesn't know whether Mr. Haugen has staffing time available to develop a lot of these programs either, so she thinks that when you get to the realistic standpoint, these would be great, but she doesn't know how we can implement them, so that would be something that would really need to be looked at in terms of how we can do them.

Williams commented that throughout the document there were different reduction measures, and one that jumped out is the one that says that by 2040 we were going to reduce the number of pedestrian and bicyclist and motor vehicle fatalities, when compared to 2010; but what will our population be in 2040, how can she actually reduce those numbers. She stated that they may want to look at it statistically, and reduce the percentage, but she can't aim for an actual reduction number, and that is throughout the document, that their looking at trying to reduce or compare actual numbers when what they may actually want to do is look at percentages, or something else, because she thinks we would be boxing ourselves into a corner.

Haugen reported that, when we talk about performance measures, he thinks that is one of the real tasks we have is, when going through the SMART exercise, we make sure that when we do get to something that is measureable, that it is also time-bound, that we have an agreement that that is a measurement we want to achieve, and that it is realistic, and as to who will be doing the developing and monitoring, it seems fairly clear that MAP-21 is going to require performance measures, and it is also clear that the MPO will be reporting on how it's products are progressing towards those measures identified, so the onus will be on the MPO's work program to develop

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

those things and to actually monitor them. He said that, unless someone knows better, he thinks the MPO will be doing annual reports on its performance measures in the near future.

Williams requested that a matrix be set up for each of these goals; as far as what programs would be associated with each one of the goals, what will need to be developed or maintained, so we can take a comprehensive look to see exactly what the work program states for each one of these. Haugen asked what kind of program she is talking about, funding programs. Williams responded that that is exactly right, what type of programs are going to be associated with each one of these goals, what is going to have to be developed that we don't already have, what all are we approving that we are going to have to develop or do. She said that she would like to see what we are approving, as far as what is involved with approving this. Haugen commented that, as he reviewed this, all of the things that they were measuring is data that is already collected, and you mentioned the bike/ped fatality, that is already being measured, it just isn't being held in one MPO performance measure report. He said that a lot of these things are already being reported, or measured, they just aren't, perhaps, at an MPO specific level, or their not in one report but are in a mixture of many documents produced by different agencies within a state.

Bernard stated that they wanted to develop performance measures that were realistic, that there is data being collected now, and so if there are things in the report that don't seem realistic, that data is not being collected or information that is very challenging to gather, that is kind of the information or feedback they would like to hear so they can figure out if there is a better way to craft a performance measure, or if it is something that needs some tweaking. Shorten added that there could also be a need for some cleaning and/or consolidation as well.

Shorten commented that what is being done here is something that no other MPO has done, so in terms of accountability to actual numbers, they may have overshoot that a bit, and maybe just sending it in the right direction or decreasing, or decreasing by a percentage, but this is the direction that MAP-21 is pushing, so, even though they don't know MAP-21 and all the details of its rules, based on their experience working on performance measures, especially for the State of Minnesota, they tried to get to that next level. He stated that the goals and objectives from your 2008 plan were about half a page, and you see the length of these goals and objectives, and so they are trying to help transition into what they think will be the requirements the MPOs will have to meet in the next few years. He added that, usually in this type of process they will provide you a little leeway as it will take some time to learn everything, but this is the direction of the future.

Johnson said that he would like to add to what Mr. Haugen originally said; the implementation of these performance measures are going to have a trickling effect, from the local level all the way up to the MPO, in that there will be additional reporting and monitoring requirements at every level, so even though some of the tasks will be done by the MPO, the Cities are part of this and will need to take on some of that responsibility as well. Williams agreed, stating that that is her point. She said that if the City is going to be taking on additional responsibilities, they need to let their elected officials and everyone else know that there is additional work being generated by

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

this change at the federal level so it doesn't come as a surprise that staff time is being taken from something else to do it.

Bernard stated that they certainly welcome comments, so if anyone wants to send them copies of notes or edits to the report, please do so so that revisions can be made if necessary. Haugen added that they would like and comments or changes submitted within two weeks from today.

Bernard referred to a slide presentation of the Draft Goals, Objectives, Standards and Performance Measures Report, and went over it briefly.

1. Goal 1: Economic Vitality

Haugen commented that the goal statements are the factors that are in MAP-21 that we need to consider when we do long range transportation planning, so we are just reiterating what the federal perspective is of what we need to look at. He said that we modified them slightly, as you recall, the last couple of years to include some of the livability principles that the DOT is encouraging us to do to not only meet our transportation needs but to create a livable community at the same time, so these goal statements are the planning factors in MAP-21, plus the livability principles.

Williams asked if they would be including any definitions, because there is an issue with wording that she sees appearing throughout the entire document; such as "develop and maintain" – what does maintain mean, is it something that every citizen is supposed to call in and we have to answer. She stated that she is doing this because she has been through this kind of thing before in another area of the country, where people point to a statement and say "it says right here you have to do this...", and that clearly wasn't the intent. She asked what "ensure" means, are we ensuring something or are we encouraging, because ensure means you are absolutely going to do it, so.

Bernard responded that when he looks at goals and objectives and standards, in some respect they are supposed to be a little high level to give you direction so when transportation decisions do come up you can go to the goals and objectives and get the direction and guidance you need to make those decisions, so developing, maintaining and ensuring, he doesn't think we want to be completely specific and try to hold you to something, but rather to give you more of a vision and direction.

Noehre stated that he would have to agree with Ms. Williams that some of the language does, in his view, get very down into the needs. He pointed out that they use the word "install", not "consider" or "evaluate" it says "do it".

Bernard responded that they can certainly work on making the language a little less onerous, and put more words in there that encourage rather than state that something be done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

Haugen commented that they are trying to straddle the fence in being “SMART” and not being so prescriptive that there isn’t any flexibility. He stated that, again, we are straddling the fence, and the more we give to one side versus the other, the weaker our performance measurements become. Noehre pointed out that the one standard that really stands out for him is the one in Objective IV, Goal 2: “Integrate monitoring systems into key and/or new transportation facilities, such as bridges that monitor fatigue, tampering, or failure”. He agreed that we need to look at those things, and consider them, but we also have to evaluate the technology and its costs versus benefit, and this just says integrate, it’s going to be done, not evaluate and do if warranted. Williams stated that there is also the issue of liability that is incurred if you don’t do it, whereas if you can come up with an evaluation process that says that we did evaluate it, but we determined we didn’t want to do it. Noehre said that he isn’t trying to get away from any of the SMART characteristics, just trying to say that we need to be smart about sweating the SMART characteristics. Williams added that they need to give them the opportunity to do their value engineering.

Shorten responded that maybe these need to be a little softer, in the sense that they need to grow over time, and allow for the multiple steps needed to be able to make a commitment. Haugen commented that the State of Minnesota might be the one place where they have established measurements already, so our language can’t be altered too much from their language.

Shorten commented that since Minnesota is kind of a leader in this, when the MNDOT people give us their written comments maybe you could give us some suggestions on how far we go with some of the opening verbs in some of these standards, that would be helpful. Caskey responded that when they send this around to some of their departments, they will certainly try to get some feedback on this.

2. Goal 2: Security

Williams said that she isn’t sure this is the proper place to discuss this, but she would like the Technical Advisory Committee to consider that someplace in here we consider developing a traffic incident plan. She explained that it is actually a cost recovery program, a supplement to FEMA, and if we have it in place we can recover some of our transportation costs, those that FEMA doesn’t cover. Haugen stated that he thought the Bridge Closure Plan filled that requirement. Williams responded that she doesn’t think it does, adding that it needs to have more information than the Bridge Closure Plan does, it needs to have actual transportation information in it.

3. Goal 3: Accessibility & Mobility

Williams asked what “dark fiber” is. Bernard responded that he isn’t sure. Shorten said that he thinks it means that you put in the fiber when doing any work, but it is “dark” in the sense that it isn’t active.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

Williams commented that another issue is “LOS C”. She stated that MNDOT allows for a LOS D, while North Dakota wants a LOS C or better, so is this something that we still want to build to, to a LOS C, can we do an analysis that says that this is how expensive it is to build to a LOS C, and this is how expensive it is to get to a LOS D.

Discussion on LOS ensued.

Noehre referred to the measurable criteria, specifically the reduction in AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic), and commented that the objectives talk about vehicle miles traveled, so should this be vehicle miles traveled instead. Williams asked if this was for each person because the population is growing. Noehre said that this is why he was asking if it should be VMT versus AADT because you might be able to reduce the VMT, but when your population is increasing it might be difficult to reduce the AADT. Williams added that the LOS question/discussion will affect this as well.

Shorten responded that this is a very good question, as that isn't a little thing here, because your metropolitan level, when you decide whatever it is going be, when you start looking at projects in the future, there will be a whole lot of cross-referencing that can be related to that, so when your programming your T.I.P. will it be C or D, this could be a significant change in in the way the metropolitan area looks, or it could be a reaction to the funding situation, so it is really worth some consideration.

4. Goal 4: Environmental/Energy/QOL

Williams commented that they are reducing their emissions by 50% below the 2007 emissions, but once again they are not considering what the population is, so we may want to look into that performance measure. Bernard agreed, adding that they were just trying to put a target in there.

Williams referred to the performance measure that states: “Improve the percent of projects completed without environmental violations”, and stated that she didn't know that they were doing any that were in violation. She asked if it should state: “Continue to complete projects...”.

Noehre commented that the measure above is also confusing: “Decrease the percent of impervious pavement on residential and non-residential sites near agricultural and natural resource lands”. Bernard responded that they were trying to pair each performance measure to address each of the objectives and standards, so this one was just trying to invent more of a landuse/city regulation type of issue that started to address impervious pavement. Shorten stated that they maybe should have focused more on natural resources than agricultural.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

Williams referred to the performance measure that states: “Reduce the percent of populations exposed to at-risk levels of air pollution by 10 percent every five-years”, and asked who is at risk now. She said that some of these measures need a definition, such as where is the risk now, and where are we going with this. She stated that if you are going to put something in there, we are not a non-attainment area so if we are going to do something maybe we say; continue to be a non-attainment area, continue to do these things, monitor or something. She said that they are in compliance, as far as she knows.

Ellis referred to the monitoring activities section, where they are talking about a survey of the regions’ largest employers, and stated that she wouldn’t do that annually if the freight study is updated every five years, as it would make more sense to do this activity in conjunction with the freight study update. She added that instead of saying implement use encourage or provide opportunities for increased car-pooling, etc.

Romness commented that one of the things Jane brought up, and he keeps looking at this and trying to figure out how to do it, and that is the “Reduce the percent of populations exposed to at-risk levels of air pollution by 10 percent every five-years”. He stated that if our percent is zero, does that mean we bring people in who are at risk for weekends so we have a percentage, because if you don’t have it, why do you need this measure at all. Bernard agreed that this is something they need to know. Shorten added that air pollution is one thing, but then you have green-house gas, so you may be fine with one but not the other, so maybe you want to continue to reduce green-house gas, so maybe that is the way we need to go so we keep the theme.

Noehre asked, if he sends the rest of his comments on this, will they receive a response to those comments prior to the final so they know that they were reviewed and addressed. Haugen responded that it is a federal requirement that all comments received are reviewed and addressed.

5. Goal 5: Integration & Connectivity

Williams commented that she doesn’t know how they are going to be able to do anything about the second standard: “Refrain from extending facilities which would promote development that is not currently contiguous to developed areas”, because if a developer owns a piece of property, and it is within the City, and there is nothing else developed around there and he wants to pay to have everything extended out to that piece of property, we can’t stop them. She said that they can encourage them not to do it, but we can’t make them stop if they want to pay for it all.

Gengler stated that this actually conflicts with what is being referred to as the “Bakken Initiative”, with developing some of our vacant industrial type of land in the western part of town, in fact they have one on the next Planning Commission Agenda, so at face value that would conflict with that principal.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

Shorten asked, however, if it is the City's general policy to avoid leap-frogging. Gengler responded it was.

Gengler reported that some of the areas they are thinking of would be, for example, near the City's Baling Facility, the old landfill area, and other such areas. He stated that on one hand we annexed all of the City owned land, over five square miles, so some of this area is technically contiguous and adjacent to the City, but not the City as you would typically think of it.

Noehre commented that, as a citizen he likes the standard that states: "Investigate impact fees and other methods of assessing developers for the costs of extending municipal services to new developments". He stated that, sure, we can put out some pavement out there, but what about fire, garbage, sewer, water, etc., because if it is leap-frogged, the rest of us citizens have to pay for it because there isn't anyone to assess.

Gengler stated that special assessments have been a huge issue lately, kind of intermixed between the City and AE2S. He explained that they have been working on a ten-year infrastructure master plan that is hitting every single element, such as the cost of roads, storm ponds, etc., and is pretty extensive and will be coming out soon. He added that some of these statements kind of fit into the model of what they are trying to do with that plan.

Shorten commented that the impact fee is controversial in Minnesota. He gave an example of a case where his firm was involved with Country Joe versus Egan, which was one of the early impact fee issues that was thrown out by the court because they were taking those fees and putting them into libraries, parks, and such instead of putting it back into transportation projects as it was meant to be. He added that they also worked with a couple of cities, who are trying to keep a low profile, that were challenged by developers and stood, but it would certainly be best if there was something in the legislation that clearly discusses impact fees, however in lieu of the two cities not doing, and with the continuing costs that local government has to serve, sooner than later, they have developed some ordinances, and it is basically following a process where you can document the cost of per housing unit added, or per acre added, so you have a legitimate method, that is rational and fair and equitable, and based on that you have a policy. He stated that the policy can then be used if your going to leap-frog.

Gengler reported that the City of Grand Forks currently has an 8% Park and Open space dedication, so when a new residential development comes in the developer either pays cash or physically dedicates 8% of the land, and with the ten year plan that they are working on they are going to morph that 8% and introduce the idea of requiring land dedication for storm ponding, because that has been a huge burden on everyone.

Shorten stated that some of that, especially if you have policies developed, this is the time to try to get those things in so when a development does swing into gear again, now it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

isn't new, and its policy. He said that they've learned that if developers know the rules, even if it costs them, if they know the rules in advance, it is just another add on that they put on the value of the land when they sell it, so it isn't an insurmountable thing right now.

Kouba reported that Engineering and Planning have managed to develop some way of gaining some of these things in their policies, but transit is kind of being left out. She said that it does not have policy as to when it expands out, it does not have policy as to how it is going to get out into the industrial parks. She stated that they have tried to do so, but have failed. She commented that they are now getting into more apartments being built, and it is an afterthought as to how they are going to get service into them, and that is an issue that needs to be expanded out. Shorten said that he doesn't know if the Transit Development Plan will address this or not, but that is another feature, another service that people sooner or later want, and its costly to provide it much later once the road system is in, and then the bus can't handle the turns. Kouba added that it will come up when 42nd starts developing more. She said that right now the bus goes into the Alerus Center, but down the road you now have Black Gold Headquarter, and there will certainly be more businesses going in along there, and the bus can't continually keep going into these separate streets to have bus pullouts along the way, and they have to be planned out.

Williams referred to Objective II, the standard that states: "Include the jurisdiction and the axle load limits of the roadway in this system mapping", and asked if they could add height restrictions as well. She also asked about the monitoring activities, and asked who was going to calculate the costs.

Noehre stated that he had highlighted a standard concerning the building of a traffic operation center, but he can't find it. Ellis responded that it is under Goal 2, Objective IV. Bernard responded that they were trying to address getting a central hub. Noehre asked who was going to pay for that. Haugen responded that it probably doesn't fit ITS Strategic Plan, in the past that is how has paid for it. Noehre stated that that is a big undertaking. Williams commented that they have all of their traffic signals already. She stated that this isn't regional, from the standpoint that we don't have one out there at the, there are a couple of stragglers. She said that the one at the airport they don't have, nor do they have the five in East Grand Forks either. Noehre stated that it doesn't sound like that fits your situation because regional and metropolitan lines, on the North Dakota side, what you need is being fed in. Williams added that they already have an emergency management center. Noehre said that he isn't suggesting that it be scratched completely, just suggesting, again, the verbage be changed.

Williams asked if there was a standard in here that talked about the yellow light, and that the City has an ordinance about not being in the intersection when the yellow light comes on. Bernard responded that he thinks that came out of the freight study. Williams stated that the statement isn't correct. Bernard said that those were comments they heard through their freight meeting. Haugen commented that it isn't part of the goals and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

objectives document. Bernard stated that he would make a note to revisit that in the freight chapter.

6. Goal 6: Efficient System Management

Ellis referred to Page 21, monitoring activities, and asked if the statement: “Calculate and compare the cities, counties and/or state DOT’s Capital Improvement Plans’ estimated costs to the actual bid process...”, was referring to costs in the MPO area, those that use federal dollars or federal funds because that would be a lot to look at the State’s CIP and compare them with their bid process, so maybe be more specific to the MPO. She stated that in our TIP it is fairly easy because we know what the estimate is for projects that use federal dollars, and then we know what the bid amounts end up being, or the obligated amounts so we can compare those, but just City local projects that they special assess might be a problem. Williams added that they re-estimate their projects every single year, so they go through that process all the time anyway so you could just say “continue to...”, and not tie them to how to do it.

Haugen commented that the real intent, and they had a cost estimate webinar a while ago, but when they enter something into the TIP they believe they enter in a pretty good cost estimate, because we need to be fiscally constrained.

7. Goal 7: System Preservation

Williams stated that she has a question on the actual wording of the goal itself: “Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system by first targeting...”, could first targeting be changed to first considering because sometimes they have a project that just, we have to do something rather than doing a maintenance project, there has to be something done, or whatever, and we just may not be able to target preservation first all the time. Bernard responded that the goal statements they used are the ones that have been used in other parts of the Long Range Transportation Plan, so he guesses it is really a question for the MPO. Williams asked if this is exactly how it worded with the State. Bernard responded it is in the transit plan and other components, so they haven’t changed any of the language for the goal statements that were provided, so, again, it is a question for the MPO as to whether or not changes should be made to the goal statements or if they are adopted goals that they need to stick with. Haugen stated that they are already adopted, but nothing is unchangeable.

Discussion on appropriate wording ensued.

Williams commented that there is another standard that says: “Maintain pavement, signal systems, signage, striping and other features of the transportation system to a level that permits safe traffic operations.” She asked what is safe, adding that safe is a good liability word, so we need to change that to something like “good level of service” or something.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

8. Goal 8: Safety

No comments.

Bernard stated that they really do appreciate all the comments and feedback, and he knows this was a lot to get through, but it is all really helpful for them to be able to refine these even further to make sure they meet your needs. He said that, as mentioned previously, they would appreciate it if everyone could get their written comments to them in the next two weeks so they can work on them and get a redlined report, showing all the requested changes, out to everyone as soon as possible.

Williams asked if there was still a Safe Routes To School Program. Haugen responded that there is a Safe Routes To School eligibility under the transportation alternative program, so it is not a stand-alone separate program, but it is still an eligible activity.

Williams commented that wherever you make reference to the reduction of crashes, could you please put “correctable” crashes in there. She stated that their last two fatalities were caused by someone fleeing police, and you can’t correct those.

FREIGHT

Bernard reported that they worked with staff in the last couple of months to meet with the freight community, and held some focus group meetings and interviews to gather their list of issues to try to start identifying some freight projects for us to consider for our range of alternatives, to include in the Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that they were able to touch base with some of the bigger industries; American Crystal, LM Windpower, S&S Transport, Simplot, Post Office, Carriers, etc.. Ellis stated that the one she is still trying to connect with is the State Mill.

Bernard commented that they are still trying to gather input from the freight community to really emphasize, and provide a stronger freight component to the update. He said they are really trying to address some existing conditions and identify projects that they see a need for on the system.

Bernard stated that part of their conversation with the group was to talk about what was in the past plan, and what has been completed, and he thinks that throughout their conversations they determined a lot of projects that are in the current plan, that address freight issues, are still pretty relevant for this update as well.

Bernard reported that two projects they identified, that could be potential projects for them to look at are specifically dealing with a southern truck reliever route. He explained that a lot of the freight community recognized that a lot of their needs are more to the south right now, so they looked at what type connectivity issues are there, and what type of opportunities there are to address some of those needs to the south.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

Bernard commented that one specific project that came out of their discussion as well was with Simplot. He said that they looked at some of the issues that they have with trucks coming and going from their site, specifically along the frontage road and trying to access Gateway Drive, and they are wondering about the possibility of providing some better connectivity to the north of their property to bring them into their site. Williams stated that Simplot is actually doing a lot of work right now, but it is the tank farm that is causing the most problem, it is there trucks that line up in front of Simplot. Ellis agreed, adding that this is why Simplot would like an access to the north of their property as their freight entrance, where their trucks come in is located on the north end of the building, not off the frontage road, so if they could have a connection from 42nd, on the north end, that would be beneficial.

Romness reported that there is a fairly significant number of trucks that are short circuiting the north side by taking 27th Avenue North, across to 42nd, and down to Gateway. He stated that 27th Avenue is only partially in the city, and isn't even really a gravel road, it is more of a dirt road, and it is a mess. He said that they are trying to work on this, but part of it is a Township road, so it is difficult to get anything done. Haugen commented that it is a federal aid eligible road. Romness responded that it is, but then again a large portion of the property on either side is farmland.

Noehre commented that, regarding the construction of a South Bypass Truck Reliever Route, he thinks in the current transportation plan there are only two elements identified a river crossing and Merrifield Road, and it doesn't really address a South Bypass Truck Reliever, it might have it identified, but it doesn't identify all of the infrastructure needs that would need to be created and the cost estimates associated with that to actually bring it to fruition. Shorten stated, then, that if this project moves forward, as far as an alternative to look at, it isn't just about what was in the old plan, but it should also include what is needed to bring it up to a truck route. Noehre agreed, adding that it should include things like in-slope, drainage, access management, etc.. Bernard asked if this is a project that this body feels is needed, will it add value to the system. Noehre responded that it would certainly add value to the system, but there is also the cost of all those goals we just discussed, a whole bunch of them that talked about not doing it.

Shorten reported that through this process they are looking to see if there are new issues, new projects, that will all be put on this big menu, and then later in the process they will have to be financially constrained, and will need to be whittled down. He stated that they might start with a list of 25 from the old plan that still to be done, and through this process we might end up with 40, but then after going through the fiscal constraining evaluation we get back down to 30, so they are just trying to determine if these projects are feasible and rational.

Romness commented that what this comes down to is that these are projects that we might not do in the next twenty years, but we should begin preserving the right-of-way in the event they are done in the future.

Discussion on the benefits of right-of-way preservation ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

CARBON FOOTPRINTING

Bernard commented that they are trying to emphasize a stronger sustainability component to the update, and provide some discussion in the document about what can be done, and also emphasize all the work that has been done and is still being done by the City and UND to address some of these issues as well. He stated that they did an analysis that looks at passenger vehicles, and trucks, from a VMT standpoint to try to start setting some benchmarks.

Bernard stated that they looked at a five-year period of VMT, and did their analysis to show if there was a reduction or not within carbon emissions. He said that this is something they are planning on integrating into the plan as well to help them develop some performance measures to continue to stick with the SMART Principles.

LOS-CRASH DATA

Bernard reported that they have been working on updating the signal timing plans, and were able to use the data they received from that to look at the level of service at the intersections and came up with a list of the intersections that are at a level of service D during the p.m. peak hours. He said that this is based on the 2012 count data they received, and so they are now working with staff to kind of compare those levels of service with past levels of service from the old plan to see where any changes may have occurred, and also to compare whether or not traffic data, turning movement counts have changed or if even the software used back then had an influence on these changes that have occurred in the last five years, but as of now these are the intersections that they have identified:

17th Avenue South and Columbia Road
32nd Avenue South and Columbia Road
17th Avenue South and Washington Street
DeMers Avenue and Washington Street
32nd Avenue South and Washington Street
U.S. Highway 2 and Central Avenue

Williams asked what is causing the LOS D to be registered at these intersections, is it because of the number of approaches, and is one of those approaches at a LOS F that is dragging the rest of them down, and if we were to put in a right turn lane would that bring the LOS up. Bernard commented that even some of the signal timing work they will be doing in September might fix some of these issues. Haugen commented that for the first time we aren't showing a LOS below D.

Bernard pointed out that they also did a crash analysis using current crash data they received from both Minnesota and North Dakota DOTs. He stated that everyone should have received the spreadsheet that identified where some of the higher crash rates are located:

20th Street South and 32nd Avenue South

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, July 26th, 2012**

31st Street South and 32nd Avenue South
34th Street South and 32nd Avenue South
5th Street N.W. and DeMers Avenue

Williams commented that they can make all the 32nd Avenue intersection issues go away by putting in protected only left turns. She said, however, that they would have to retime all the signals and change out all the signal heads, but that would make all those go away.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Open House On Long Range Transportation Plan

Haugen reported that there will be an open house for the Long Range Transportation Plan Update this evening at the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room beginning at 5:30 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 26TH, 2012,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:45 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 8th, 2012, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 2:35 p.m.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that, because a quorum is not yet present, he would like to suspend the agenda to discuss MAP-21, under Other Business at this time.

a. MAP-21 Briefing

Haugen reported that a representative from MNDOT gave a briefing on MAP-21 last Thursday; and earlier today, at noon, over at Mr. Noehre's facility several staff watched a webinar on MAP-21, and with a few exceptions, MNDOT probably just took the webinar presentation and condensed it for their presentation, so there wasn't a lot of difference between the two presentations. He said that Federal Highway does now have, on their MAP-21 website, the presentation they are doing this week.

Haugen commented that, as we all know, there is a new 27-month bill that is actually a three month extension of SAFETEA-LU and 24-months of MAP-21. He added that October 1st is the implementation of MAP-21, but he feels there will still be a lot of loose ends needing to be addressed concerning how the implementation will occur.

Haugen stated that there is a lot of consolidation taking place, which we will get into a little later in today's discussion.

Haugen referred to a table, prepared by MNDOT, and explained that Bryan McCoy, Intern, prepared a similar table for North Dakota as well, which he will go over next. He pointed out that this gives us an idea of what is happening at a State level in terms of how the programs were funded in 2012, and how they may be funded in 2013 and 2014. He stated that you can see that the first two programs are no longer separate programs, but are rolled into a new national highway performance program, which is the old national highway system with added mileage from the interstate system and all the principle arterials. He commented that this means that all of the principle arterials in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks will now be part of this HNPP program, where before we really only had U.S. 2 as part of the NHS system. He added, however, that this will have an impact on funding programs as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

Haugen pointed out that in Minnesota there was roughly \$270,000,000 of interstate and NHS system funding, and under MAP-21 that program sees an infusion of an additional \$100,000,000 more in funding, and that is where the bulk of the money is being located in MAP-21. Haugen reported that the STP program is fairly similar to how it is right now, but it will no longer have set-asides such as the enhancement program. He added that you will also see that it is getting less in appropriations than in the past. He commented that some of the mileage that was in the STP is now in the NHPP program.

Haugen reported that Recreational Trails and Border Infrastructure are now eliminated as separate programs. He stated that the Recreational Trails maintains its eligibility for transportation alternative funding, and Border Infrastructure was a separate program that focused on areas within 100 miles of an international border, but it is now being rolled into the STP program.

Haugen stated that the Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program has been split into two; on-system bridges and off-system bridges, but you will now notice that the on-system bridges portion is now part of the National Highway Performance Program and the off-system bridges are now a part of the STP Program.

Haugen commented that CMAQ remains the same on the North Dakota side. He stated that since we don't have any non-attainment or maintenance areas it can be flexed 100% and will remain so. He said that on the Minnesota side there are some maintenance areas, so CMAQ needs to be earmarked or distributed to those areas.

Haugen reported that Transportation Alternatives is a new program that takes the old Safe Routes To School, Transportation Enhancement, and Recreational Trails Programs and puts them into the Transportation Alternative program. Haugen pointed out that 10% of surface transportation, which used to be its own enhancement program, would be \$18,000,000, the total in Minnesota for the new Transportation Alternative Program is \$16,000,000, so there are more programs competing for less money.

Williams asked if there was a requirement to spend the money within that category. Haugen responded that at least 50% of it has to be spent. Williams asked if the remaining 50% can be redistributed. Haugen responded that 50% is split between local and state, and the local share has to be spent.

Haugen stated that there is still a metro planning program that did not change much, and there is also the Highway Safety Improvement Program as well. He commented that within the Highway Safety Improvement Program the railroad crossing is still a sub-section, but is no longer a stand-alone project.

Haugen referred to the table created by Bryan McCoy, Intern, for the North Dakota side, and went over it briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

Haugen reported that this is the same basic table as the one done for Minnesota. He pointed out that the State received \$240,000,000 in 2012.

Haugen commented that you will see that the NHP Program is at \$142,000,000, where the old Interstate/National Highway System combined was closer to \$130,000,000, so there is a little bit of an increase. He stated that Transportation Alternatives is at \$4,230,000, but 10% of the old Surface Transportation Program would be at \$4,800,000, so it is less, but then under Transportation Alternatives there are more programs. He added that this gives us an idea of the impact and the changes to funding these programs.

Haugen commented that the other part of the NHPP is that it also includes the Defense Department's Network, or the Strategic Highway Network, and it does include for the allocation of intermodal connectors, so there aren't any in the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks area. He explained that an interconnection could be something like a railroad passenger stations and/or airport terminals.

Haugen said that the STP is pretty much the same, although there is a slight difference in how it is sub-allocated within the state, the formula has changed a little, but not significantly. He added that the HSIP changes include that there is now a mandatory update of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan that needs to be maintained when in the past they just needed to produce it once.

Haugen reported that most of the enhancement activities are carried over, with a few exceptions, such as transportation museums, etc..

Haugen commented that the Recreational Trails Program does have a provision in it that the State can opt out of the program. He stated that Federal Highway has already informed the states of this provision, and they need to inform federal highways in September whether they are going to opt out or not.

Haugen stated that a lot of the summaries for MAP-21 indicate that 50% is sub-allocated to MPOs to do the selection and prioritization. He explained that this is really only relevant to MPOS with populations of 200,000 or more. He added, however, that there isn't anything preventing States with MPOs with less than 200,000 doing this as well, but the actual MAP-21 states 200,000 or more.

Haugen said that some of the big things with Environmental Streamlining are: 1) projects with limited federal funding are automatically categorically excluded; and 2) projects that are located with the operation right-of-way. He pointed out that they use the term "operation" so we asked the Minnesota Federal Division what the difference is between operational right-of-way and right-of-way, but he didn't have a good definition.

Haugen suggested that maybe with the program agreement for the environmental checklist there might be a few projects currently going through PCRs that just need to go through the checklist process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

Williams commented that she would think that “operation right-of-way” would be anything that is not creating additional lanes or anything, because some areas there is huge massive right-of-way that you could do all kinds of projects to widen and everything, but if your just doing something within your existing operational corridor. Haugen stated that Federal Transit Administration doesn’t use the word operational, they just say that if it is in the existing right-of-way it is categorically excluded.

Haugen pointed out that the top bullet under Environmental Streamlining is of some interest. He explained that in the past they haven’t really been able to do advance right-of-way purchasing, prior to the NEPA process, although there are a few exceptions to that rule. He stated that MAP-21 allows that to happen without seeking exceptions to the rule, you just can’t predetermine the outcome of the NEPA analysis, so that is still important to note, but you don’t have to wait for the NEPA process to conclude if you want to do some advance purchase of right-of-way. Williams asked if this includes projects that are already in the system. She explained that they have a project that they already started the PCR on, do they have to finish that or what. Haugen responded that that is a good question. He said that, typically when you start something you follow the rules you started under.

Haugen commented that under the second bullet under Environmental Streamlining, they are trying to do the linkage of planning products. He said that this has always been allowed, but they are just trying to strengthen that linkage between planning and project development.

Haugen stated that in terms of performance based planning, the State has to develop a process, develop performance targets, report on progress, and the MPO has to do the same. He said that there is a sort of “domino effect” in the law, whereby the feds need to create some targets, the states need to create some targets, the transit operators need to create some targets, and then the MPOs will create targets.

Haugen referred to slides discussion Transit Provisions, and stated that the two big ones are that they used to have a separate JARC program and a separate New Freedom program, which Grand Forks has utilized to fund some significant operational improvements and capital needs, but those programs are eliminated and rolled into two other programs. He said that the JARC monies have been rolled into the regular operating formula and the New Freedom monies have been rolled into the Elderly and Disabled Program. He added that in the past the Elderly and Disabled Program is a program that North Dakota hasn’t allowed be used in urban areas, so that is where a lot of the increase in federal funding for transit came from.

Haugen pointed out that the rest of the presentation is more details on the transit provisions, but he already highlighted the major changes.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

RESUME AGENDA

Bail reported present, making a quorum.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Roxanne Achman (Proxy For Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; and Teri Kouba (Proxy For Dale Bergman), Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; 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 JULY 11TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Haugen stated that he would like to delay approval of the July 11th, 2012, minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee until the September meeting as there was insufficient time for staff to review the typed minutes.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE ADJUSTED FEDERAL URBAN AID BOUNDARY

Haugen reported that back in June, Teri walked us through some of these changes, after which this body agreed they would go back and look them over more closely. He stated that he thinks everyone discovered that there is little impact, and the changes won't really happen until a project is done in the newly added area.

Noehre asked if the one on North Washington includes North Washington, he would assume so. Haugen responded that the maps included in the packet have not been updated so we will move over to the westerly right-of-way lines, that is the only change on the maps from what previously was done. Kouba added that she thought she made those changes, but she guesses they didn't get in. She stated that everything includes the complete right-of-way, and all sections. She said that the North Washington one, of course, was the most notable that needed to move over for complete right-of-way coverage. Noehre asked if it was a half mile section being added. Kouba responded it was. Kouba pointed out that it is actually located along Columbia Road. Williams agreed, adding that there is also a piece on Columbia as well. Haugen commented that, before

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

this was all in, and then we dipped along the east right-of-way line and followed up the section line, and now we are following the right-of-way line to Mill Road.

Kouba stated that, other than the above change, no other changes have been made to any of the maps. She added that she has not received any communication as to any other changes needing to be included. Haugen reported that most of the changes were required be done because of how the Census Bureau determined the geography of the urbanized area.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NEW ADJUSTED FEDERAL AID BOUNDARY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDING THE FY2012 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this amendment addresses some transit monies that have been awarded to the Cities Area Transit. He explained that back in April we stated that these projects are consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and recommended they be funded, and we were recently informed that we were awarded those funds, so we need to amend the T.I.P. to show those federal transit dollars coming in to our MPO area.

Haugen commented that, as you noticed, when he talked about the change of MAP-21, you can see here that there is close to \$200,000 that Grand Forks is receiving in this T.I.P. amendment from those programs that are now eliminated or consolidated into other programs, so, for Cities Area Transit, it is a bit of a financial wonderment as to what is going to happen with the new programs, and how they are going to fund some of the things that were previously eligible and funded.

Williams asked how many dollars the other transit systems in the State getting from these funds, are they applying and receiving any. Haugen responded that they are receiving funds. Williams asked if they are receiving a like amount. Kouba responded that she would say that Fargo is receiving equal or more than what Grand Forks is getting, but she doesn't think Bismarck has requested as much. Haugen added that, basically, what is being requested has been funded, and we still have three applications still pending determination of funding as well, although we have heard favorable comments as to those applications receiving funding.

Haugen commented that the public hearing will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting on August 22nd, so any action taken today would be contingent on the outcome of that meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P. AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED, PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Haugen reported that a special Technical Advisory Committee meeting was held on June 26th, at which time there were a lot of verbal changes discussed, and a two week review period provided for people to submit additional comments if needed, and that two week period ends at the end of this week, so this is just a reminder that if you have any additional changes, please do so by then so we can prepare an updated document that we can digest at our September meeting.

Williams asked that Mr. Haugen remind the consultant to send out the Long Range Transportation Plan table/chart. Haugen stated that he has it, and asked what it is she is looking for. Williams responded that she would like to have a copy. Noehre added that at the last meeting the consultants, and yourself, said that you would send out the Issues Map. Haugen responded that he thought he did that, that it was part of the open house information and power point from the Technical Advisory Committee meeting he sent out, but he will do it again. Noehre stated that if it is in that information then he has it.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Aerial Photo Update

Bail asked when the Aerial Photography would be available. Kouba responded that she just talked to them recently and they will be sending out some samples for her to look over and verify it is correct, so they will be looking at the end of September or first part of October for a final product.

Information only.

2. E-Mail Requesting Work Activities For Next Two-Year Work Program

Haugen stated that he sent everyone an e-mail requesting work activities for the next two-year work program. He said that Jane asked when we would like to have these requests. He explained that by the end of September they should have gone through your local governing bodies for approval for us to process them in October. He added that for anything we identify

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2012**

for FY 2014, we will reassess about this time in 2013 to ensure they are still valid, and make adjustment as necessary.

Haugen reported that we are looking at about the same budget of \$500,000 as we have had previously.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 8TH, 2012,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:10 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Nancy Ellis, called the September 12th, 2012, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Stacy Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; and Teri Kouba (Proxy For Dale Bergman), Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Staff present were: Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 8TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 8TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY BRIDGE STUDY

Ellis reminded the committee that the Kennedy Bridge Project is currently programmed in the T.I.P. to occur in 2016 at a cost of \$25,000,000. She said that they are looking at doing either a major rehab or replacing it. She added that the study will provide the information necessary to determine which alternative will work best.

Ellis reported that MNDOT has hired the consulting firm of CH2M Hill to perform the study. She added that the MPO did request that the DOT consider that the Executive Policy Board and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012**

Technical Advisory Committee be their stakeholder committee, along with other entities they would like to include, because we already have the two sides of the river meeting on a regular basis each month. Because we already have the cooperation and coordination through our boards, we are hoping that they will consider it.

Information only.

MATTER OF FINAL DRAFT OF THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. – MINNESOTA SIDE

Ellis reminded the committee that they approved the Draft T.I.P. for the Minnesota side in April, and that a public meeting was held as well.

Ellis reported that they had MNDOT compare it to their S.T.I.P.; and a few amendments were made, including the \$20,000 non-infrastructure program for the school district in East Grand Forks, so they are ready for final approval.

Ellis commented that the public hearing will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday, so she would just like to go over the project lists briefly.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KOUBA, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2013-2016 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P, PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Noehre asked to go back to the issue of the Kennedy Bridge Study, and commented that it was his understanding that MPO Board had asked to be part of the SAC (Study Advisory Committee), which Mr. Haugen requested, however, he knows that an answer was provided to that request so he is wondering if there is another request similar to that one. Ellis responded that she has not received any word from Mr. Haugen that the request was answered. Noehre stated, again, that it was. Romness asked if the answer was affirmative or negative. Noehre responded that the answer was negative.

Williams asked who it was being suggested be on the Study Advisory Committee. Ellis responded that they do have the Stakeholders listed in the document. She pointed out that it includes someone from the City of East Grand Forks, the City of Grand Forks, Polk County, Grand Forks County, the MPO, Federal Highway, Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps, etc. Noehre stated that that was why he was asking because he doesn't think the original request was for the MPO Board to be the Stakeholder, but rather for the Study Advisory Committee. Ellis commented that there is the Study Advisory Committee you mentioned, and then it also talks about Stakeholder Coordination, so she isn't sure if they are only forming the one committee, or what. Noehre stated that he would think the Stakeholder Coordination would be a different

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012**

issue. Ellis said that they will have to let Mr. Haugen continue to work through this to determine who will be on the Stakeholder Committee, etc.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. – NORTH DAKOTA SIDE

Ellis reported that this body did approve a Draft T.I.P. in July of this year, however with the passage of MAP-21, North Dakota is not quite sure what funds they have secured, how they are going to divide those funds, what projects they are going to fund that were in the Draft S.T.I.P., so at this point in time we are just not in a position to adopt the FY2013-2016 T.I.P./S.T.I.P.

Hanson commented that they were able to address the issue of the Columbia Road project for 2013. She stated that, in-fact the City of Grand Forks should have received their approval and maintenance agreement for the project, which reflects the total cost of the project. She said that they approved \$2.45 million from FY2013 and \$1.408 million from FY2012, for a total of \$3.858 million, which is the federal amount.

Ellis asked if there would be a meeting scheduled with the MPO and the Planning Division of the DOT to figure out how and when this T.I.P. document will be able to be finalized. Hanson responded that she is currently waiting for additional information from their management division. She stated that she knows that they are looking at a number of options with regard to MAP-21 and its different programs, to determine how those programs can be used to fund the various projects. She said that once those issues are resolved they should be able to move forward and have discussions on a T.I.P./S.T.I.P., and what kind of timeframe we need to get those documents out and to nail down the projects we want to get done.

Ellis commented that it was mentioned at a previous meeting that it isn't a requirement that a T.I.P. be approved right away as we do still have the current FY2012-2015 T.I.P. in place so we do still have an approved T.I.P. Hanson agreed that we aren't required to do one, but North Dakota typically likes to issue one every year, and last she heard they are still planning on moving forward with one, it just wouldn't issued and approved before the October 1 start of the Federal Fiscal Year, so until we do adopt a new T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. we would continue to move forward under the old T.I.P., and would just be operating into FY2013, and we can do amendments as necessary until the new documents are adopted.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROJECT SOLICITATION FOR FY2014-2017 T.I.P.

Ellis reported that, again, with the passage of MAP-21, we are unsure of our funding amounts, therefore will not be soliciting projects at this time. Hanson agreed, adding that the new Transportation Alternatives Program encompasses recreational trails, the old transportation enhancement program, and the safe routes to school program, so they are currently trying to figure out how much money there will be for each of these programs before they can go out with solicitation, in addition to determining how their urban and county program needs to work. She

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012**

said that they are trying to figure out how much money they will be receiving out of MAP-21, and then are there any program changes that require they revise their solicitation, so they want to have all of that information before they do project solicitation. Ellis stated, then, that once this information is available we will be sending out the solicitation of projects letters.

Williams asked if this means they will have a different timeline then we normally would, because we would usually receive it now, and in order for us to get the T.I.P. to NDDOT by December the City would need to get everything to the City Council by October. Hanson responded that what they are looking at right now is if they can get everything figured out, they can perhaps solicit in October, and then have submittals come in in January, so they would be about a month behind their typical schedule. She said that this is their goal at this time, but she doesn't know if it will be accomplished.

Ellis commented that on the Minnesota side MNDOT will be holding an all-day Webinar on MAP-21 implications and how they are going to divide the funding, and how it will work through their ATP District. So we will have more information on how their programs are split out and how the funding will be available. She added that they received an e-mail from their district planner, Joe McKinnon, through the ATP, and the MPO will be soliciting projects for county and state projects in the MPO area only. She explained that they are going to take a year off for the transportation alternatives because they aren't sure yet how they are going to do the application, or what they are going to use for funding, and they do have Transportation Enhancement projects already in the T.I.P. through FY2015, so they won't be soliciting any T.E projects this year at all. She added that since they aren't sure yet what will be done for transit, they won't be soliciting for transit projects either.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MNDOT MAP-21 Webinar

Ellis reported, again that next Monday, in East Grand Forks City Hall from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. they will be participating in a MAP-21 Webinar with MNDOT to go over the funding sources, and how they will be split up.

2. Sorlie Bridge RFP

Ellis reported that the RFP has been sent out for the Sorlie Bridge project. She stated that they are now looking for consultants to do the environmental study portion of the project.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012**

2. Update On Long Range Transportation Plan Update

Romness asked what is happening with the Long Range Transportation Plan, are we on schedule or off schedule with the update. Ellis responded that they are currently going through the signal timing plans, they are working on some TAZ and modeling, and then will be doing the selection of projects and alternatives.

Noehre asked about the status of the goals, objectives, standards and performance measures, whether there is a new draft available. Ellis responded that now that we have MAP-21, and we know what type of performance measures we are going to have to look at doing, they scaled down the number of performance measures in the draft, so they have one or two per goal now, which allows us to meet those performance measures and match them up with MAP-21. They are going through those right now and she isn't sure when they will be released.

Ellis stated that she can ask Mr. Haugen to send out an e-mail letting everyone know for sure where we are at in the process, and where we are headed. Romness responded that that would be good as they want to know where they are at each. He added that they would like to see bi-weekly updates from the consultant as to where they are at with the project timeline, similar to how they are done with a PCR, however at least a monthly update would be acceptable, but every two weeks would be better.

Romness commented that he would like to make it a requirement that consultants provide such updates. Ellis said that she has no problem with that, but she also knows that anytime you ask a consultant to do something extra, they want to amend the contract for more money, however, again, if they are hired to do a job, and they have a timeline, and they list their tasks and when they will be done, they should be able to produce a memo indicating where they are at in the process. Romness agreed, adding that he doesn't see this as an additional task; it is just giving us information on where they are at. Ellis stated that she will relay this request to Mr. Haugen.

Hanson stated that she agrees that this could be a little more labor intensive, and may cost a little more, but she also feels that it works well when they use it on their PCR's and designs, and it is a real good way of knowing where the consultant is at, and allowing you to know if the project is on track and that it is going in the direction you want it to.

Noehre commented that he didn't know they were re-writing the goals, standards and performance measures to match MAP-21. Ellis responded that they aren't re-writing the goals or objectives, but they are working on matching up the performance measures with what MAP-21 has. She added that some of it is based on this body's recommendations at the last meeting that, while you have all of the performances measures, you need to know how you are going to address it. If it is in the plan you have to be able to provide the information for it, and we want to make sure it is something that we are capable of producing. We don't want to put too many performance measures in the document that we can't delineate or validate. Therefore, we wanted to make sure that they didn't have five or six per objective, just a couple per goal so that they can accomplish them and prepare an annual report that does provide that information.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012**

Williams stated that they saw one rewrite, but it wasn't in the format requested. She said that the request was that it be done in a strike/underline format in order to be able to see where the changes occurred, and that wasn't the case, so they don't know what changes were made. Ellis responded that she doesn't know that the changes have been released yet. She stated that she has been working with Mr. Haugen on the goals, objectives and performance measures with the consultant, so she doesn't know if it just came to her and they are still cleaning it up before they present it to the committee.

Williams said that she would, again like to request that they come in a strike/underline format so they aren't guessing what changes were made. Ellis responded that she would pass that on to the consultant.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KOUBA, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 12TH,
2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:05 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 10th, 2012, 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 (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; and Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji.

Guest(s) present were: Josh Hinds, HDR Consulting Group; and Peggy O’Leary, Local Historic Preservation Commission.

Staff present were: Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, since there are some new people present today, would everyone please state their names and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 26TH AND THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2012,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE THE JULY 26TH AND THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2012 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE STUDIES

Haugen reminded the committee that at their last meeting it was just announced that North Dakota had released the request for a PCR on the Sorlie Bridge. He stated that most of the information on this agenda item is related to that.

Haugen reported that CH2M Hill was selected, however last he heard a contract had not yet been signed. McKinnon commented that J.T. Anderson, the MNDOT Project Manager, has said that there has not yet been a total commitment by all parties yet.

Haugen stated that he did talk to J.T. as well regarding the Steering Committee, and how it might be formed. McKinnon said that the first task, once the consultant is officially on board, will be to work out the make-up of the advisory committee.

Haugen asked if there were any updates on this from NDDOT. Johnson responded that they received seven proposals, and interviews are scheduled for October 22nd.

Haugen said that they chatted a little about why the project was dropped from an EIS down to a PCR, and he was wondering if there is any further information on that issue. Johnson responded that he can't seem to find an answer as to why this occurred.

Haugen asked what the timeline for hiring someone is. Johnson responded that, again, the interviews are scheduled for October 22nd; and typically they have a pretty quick turn-a-round in making a decision, so he would think that once a decision is made it should only take a few days to get a contract signed.

Haugen referred to a slide with the project schedule, and pointed out that for the Phase 1 document that is in the RFP is scheduled for September of 2014; and that they are trying to meet a November 2017 bid opening for a project. Johnson commented that he doesn't think that schedule has changed.

Williams asked what the estimated length of construction is on the Sorlie project. Johnson responded that he isn't sure, but it may depend on the design. Williams asked when the construction is on the Kennedy. McKinnon responded that it is currently scheduled for 2016.

Haugen commented that the Kennedy project is more of a planning study, whereas North Dakota is going straight into the project development process on the Sorlie project, so they are engaging the NEPA requirements right from the start.

O'Leary asked if she understands correctly that MnDOT is the lead agency on the Kennedy and NDDOT is the lead agency on the Sorlie Bridge projects. Haugen responded that that is correct. O'Leary commented that she went to the Minnesota State Historical Society State Conference a couple of weeks ago, and one of the SHIPO people from Minnesota that does studies on historic bridges did talk about the Sorlie Bridge; and he, along with a representative from MNDOT, both

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

stated that the Sorlie is absolutely on their save list, and that they weren't going to consider doing anything else. Ellis pointed out that the RFP does mention this as well. Haugen added that we have gone round and round with what is going on with these two bridges, so it is hoped that these studies will finally offer a solution as to what will actually be done on both of them.

Information only.

MATTER OF MAP-21 IMPLEMENTATION

a. Enhanced NHS Maps

Haugen reported October 1st has come and gone; SAFETEA-LU has come and gone, although there is still left over monies that can be awarded; and, in-fact, he received an e-mail stating that MNDOT will be soliciting Safe-Routes-To-School projects utilizing old SAFETEA-LU money, so think about both infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects.

Haugen said that one of the first things that went into play October 1st, that is of interest to us, is something called the Enhanced NHS System. He stated that the new MAP-21 bill put heavy emphasis on the NNHP System, which is essentially where the bulk of the federal dollars are located. He explained that the way the law was written, how it was interpreted, was that all principle arterials would be added to the system, however, upon further review it was determined that only those principle arterials that would be connected to the Enhanced NHS System would be added. He said that, for example, if you had a principle arterial designated that was not connected to any other principle arterial, that stand-alone principle arterial would not automatically become part of the Enhanced NHS System.

Haugen commented that the maps that were released by Federal Highway were done so with the hope that they were correct and accurate, but with an acknowledgement that there might be some errors in them. He referred to a slide of the map from the Federal Highway website, and pointed out that there are some gaps shown. He went over those gaps briefly, explaining that they can be easily corrected.

McKinnon stated that he attended a meeting last week, and their Central Office in St. Paul was taken aback at all the errors, which occurred state-wide.

Johnson commented that the maps for all the North Dakota cities were developed based on the current functional classification maps that are on the DOT website, and the maps that are shown by Federal Highway do match their functional classification maps. He said that he knows that the MPO was in the process of doing some updates to their functional classification maps, and he doesn't know if a letter of approval of those changes had been received yet. Haugen responded that it had, however, he would mention that they were making some other changes to minor arterials and collectors, but that those changes didn't impact any of the principle arterials. He stated that there should be a copy in NDDOT's files of the Functional Classification Map for Grand Forks that is signed by both the MPO and NDDOT.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

Brooks said that it was mentioned that they were just highlighting where they connect up to, so is that why we don't go on the west side of the interstate with those principles as well. Haugen responded that principle arterials are shown just to the end of the state highway in these two cases. He added that the different colors by US 2 have to do with the defense highway system, from interstate to the GFAFB are part of the defense system as well as the NHS system, so that is what is going on with the DeMers and 32nd Avenue, or ND207 and Business 81.

Williams stated that this is where her questions come in, because they had a question regarding how the area to the west integrates into anything in the rural area as they don't have maps that cover that. She asked if they are making sure that all the gaps are completed, or filled in, as she doesn't want to miss anything that County of Grand Forks might have out there as well. Haugen responded that in the MPO study area map there is a little insert that shows the rural classification as well as future classification, so US 2 and I-29 are the only ones that extend beyond our urban boundaries.

Haugen reported that the first step was just taking all of the existing functionally classified principle arterials and putting them into the Enhanced NHS System. He pointed out that 81 North, or North Washington, is not a principle arterial, it is a minor arterial. He stated that many years ago North 5th Street, the other part of Business 2, was a principle arterial but was reclassified to a minor arterial.

Haugen pointed out that the principle arterial ends at the west ramps of I-29, as that is where the State Highway designation ends. He added that on 32nd Avenue you will notice that when we get to the magical urban aid boundary, it drops down a class as well.

Haugen stated that the first step is to try to make sure that previously identified principle arterials, that should be part of the Enhanced NHS System, are in-fact put on the system. He said that the next step, where we will have to have role making and other things come into play, is; okay, now that we have the correct roadway identified we want to modify it; and modification usually means removal of some segments from the Enhanced NHS System.

Williams asked what the different is in funding between being on and not being on the system. Haugen responded that, essentially 2/3 of the highway dollars are on the Enhanced NHS System; 1/3 is in the "anywhere" pot and spread throughout all the sub-pots; so 2/3 is strictly on the Enhanced NHS System; and 1/3 is on the STP program and all the other sub-programs and transportation alternatives. Williams asked if the funding splits remained the same. Haugen responded that as far as he knows it remains and 80/20 split. Johnson added that the primary remains 80/20 and the secondary 80/10/10, however, he would add that because of the passing of the bill and timelines, they will be taking a closer look at how their NHS sits today, and develop some additional guidance to go along with federal highway guidance on principle, minor, collector, roadway classifications. Williams asked if this means that there may be some different criteria coming out for these different divisions of roads. Johnson responded that it is very possible that there could be, but they haven't started doing anything at this time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

Williams commented that one of the questions she has is; while reviewing this map, and looking at different things that were missing, one of the first requirements for a street to be in the system is that it has to be meet the requirements for a national defense system road, what is that. She stated that she went to the National Defense website and what they indicate is that Highway 2 and the interstate are basically the only roadways that meet this criteria. Johnson responded that basically only a US Highway, or Federal Highway, meet that designation, however with this new criteria they aren't sure how they will determine this. Haugen commented that there are some roadways that are designated as part of the Strategic Highway Defense Network that aren't principle arterials, so in order to ensure that the defense network was elevated up to this level, they said that everything that is on the Defense is going to be on the Enhanced NHS System.

Haugen stated that he thinks the first task we are trying to get accomplished is to make sure that all the roadways that meet the minimum are designated, and then as the rules and regulations come out as to how modifications should be explored, we will be working with both states through the MPO process to make those modifications in our urban area. He added that a lot of this will depend on what it means to be on the NHS System versus what it doesn't mean to be on the NHS System.

Haugen referred to a slide, and commented that MNDOT did an analysis of their S.T.I.P. based on SAFETEA-LU funding programs, and their S.T.I.P. based on MAP-21 funding programs. He pointed out that on the left are the MAP-21 funding programs, and that the NHPP is by far the significant funding program; and on the right is the S.T.I.P. based on how things we done during SAFETEA-LU, and one of the concerns MNDOT is expressing is that with the NHPP program they have identified that if you fall below targets it will impact funding, so they are contemplating programming more funds into projects that are on the Enhanced NHS System. He asked if NDDOT has had similar discussions. Johnson responded that he isn't aware of any such discussions.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON TRANSIT SERVICE
REDUCTION AND FARE POLICY**

Kouba reported that, basically, FTA comes in and does an audit every three years for transit, and this past June they did their most recent one. She stated that when looking over the MPO Public Participation Policy, which is used by Transit for any changes, they noticed there was no specific language regarding fare and services changes to Transit, so they requested that that be part of the written policy. She said that in order to change it they came up with an addendum, basically, to the current MPO Public Participation Policy so that Transit can continue being in compliance with FTA regulations.

Kouba stated that staff is asking that the addendum be adopted, approved and moved on to the MPO Executive Policy Board.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

Haugen asked if this has already been acted on by each City. Kouba responded that both cities have approved it. Rood added that it won't change what they are doing, it is just putting it in writing and formalizing it.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AN ADDENDUM TO ADD FARE AND MAJOR SERVICE CHANGE LANGUAGE TO THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITIES OF GRAND FORKS AND EAST GRAND FORKS AND THE MPO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

a. Traffic Signal Timing Plan Update

Haugen pointed out that in the staff report he identified five things: a) New traffic signal time plans; b) Proposed amendment to the scope of work; c) "Final" draft goals, objectives, standards and performance targets; d) "Final" issues map; and e) July 26th public meeting summary.

Haugen the signal timing plans will be implemented next week, so by the end of Saturday we will have tried and tested new plans in place so that our major corridors have updated coordination systems. He said that they are only focusing on the a.m. and p.m. peak times, and Saturday and Sunday afternoons, so they aren't getting into event timing or off-peak timing, or winter timing plans, just those three timing plans.

Haugen stated that one of the things that they discovered, as they were going through the plans, was that there were significant differences with the traffic counts that were done in 2012 than those done in 2009. He referred to a slide illustrating the counts from 2006, 2009 and 2012, and went over the differences briefly.

Haugen reported that the end result is that with the new timing plans, the side streets along our arterials should have a shorter wait time than they currently have as the amount of volume on the major streets is less, therefore we don't need as much green time on those major streets.

Lang asked why the counts were done at different times of year. Haugen responded that it was due to the availability of staff and flood issues, with flood issues being the major reason.

Brooks asked if there was any way there could just be some spot counts done at some of these locations. Williams responded that she is doing that. She said that she started doing it last week at Columbia and 11th, and plans on doing 13th and Washington and Columbia and Gateway as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

well. Brooks said that he wouldn't think there would be a lot of difference between spring and fall counts at these locations, but maybe he is wrong. Haugen commented that they had an intern a few years ago do a comparison of spring, summer and fall counts at many of these locations, and between spring and fall there wasn't much of a change, however, in the summer, as you got closer to the campus area there was a significant drop in traffic. He added that our current intern is taking counts from additional years at these locations and doing an analysis on those differences as well.

b. Proposed Scope Amendment

Haugen reported that there is a proposed amendment to the Long Range Transportation contract with SRF. He stated that this amendment is being proposed because of some potential significant land use changes in the southwest part of Grand Forks. He said that the current Land Use Plan doesn't anticipate the potential of an interchange in the vicinity of 47th Avenue South, as well as the potential commercial development that may be attracted by that interchange. He added that there has not been a formal submittal for this development so the City has not started the process of changing their Land Use Plan to include it, but there are expectations that there will be changes.

Haugen commented that we are in a timeline with our Street and Highway Plan where we need to do some traffic volume forecasting now instead of later based on what might be a future land use, so what this amendment is trying to do is to say that we have a current land use plan, we will do traffic forecasts based on what is in that plan, but then we will also do a second scenario with the potential development included to see how it changes traffic patterns, and if by January the City of Grand Forks formally changes their land use plan, then we already have a head start on those changes in our transportation plan, thus we won't have to play catch-up and redo our plan.

Haugen reported that another thing that is being introduced is to create an interim traffic forecast as well. He stated that currently our scope of work is to only do a 2040 forecast, this amendment would create a 2025 forecast as well to give us an idea of where we are at mid-point, and how much roadways can handle development forecasts up to 2025 versus what they can handle to 2040. He said that this may help up identify when capacity needs are really necessary, and if they are needed earlier in the planning process we hope that the 2025 forecasts will show us that, or vice-versa.

Haugen stated that the total cost of the scope on the SRF end is around \$13,000, and then ATAC will need to do a couple of model runs at a cost not to exceed \$5,000. He said that staff will be requesting approval of this amendment at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next week.

c. Issues Map

Haugen reminded the committee that back in July we talked about what the issues are, and a map was presented for feedback. He said that they received feedback from not only this committee,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

but from attendees at the July 26th public open house as well, and he would not like to go over the updated map at this time.

Haugen referred to the Issues Map and went over it briefly. He stated that one of the major changes is that they are identifying the full extent of the potential truck reliever route, or south by-pass; and they also addressed some of the changes that may be occurring in the southwest part of Grand Forks. He said that they also identified what is called the “Bakken Initiative” on the west side of Grand Forks where they are looking at creating some industrial/warehouse type developments that might service the Bakken area out west. Brooks added that there is also the Wal-Mart change there as well.

Williams referred to the map, and stated that she has a question on change number 2. She said that she was not involved in the original discussion on the north by-pass. Haugen responded that that is a Legacy project from 1965. He explained that up until 2000 it was an official project, and the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan showed a north by-pass identifying 27th Avenue North to 23rd Street N.W. in East Grand Forks as being the corridor for the north by-pass route. He said that this project was dropped in favor of the southern route, however there is still some interest in still trying to generate a northern route, so our current Long Range Transportation Plan asks that the need for a north by-pass be studied.

d. Draft Goals, Objectives, Standards & Performance Targets

Haugen reminded the committee that this item was discussed at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, with a lot of emphasis on the performance targets, and since then discussion was held with SRF to use a different method of approaching this.

Haugen said that they do know that MAP-21 is going to cause us to have to develop performance targets, and that in the timeline that MAP-21 lays out we first have to have US-DOT targets identified, then the States can react to those targets, and then the MPO will react to what those other parties have done.

Haugen stated that we have identified, although they aren't labeled as performance targets in our current Long Range Transportation Plan, there are several targets we are already following and maintaining, so we thought that in this draft of the document we would focus on a few of them rather than all of those in the earlier draft so we narrowed the scope considerably.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation and explained that it goes over the goals and targets we are going to try to identify, and discusses how we will monitor them.

Presentation ensued.

COMMENTS:

Williams referred to the first bullet under Environmental/Energy/QOL, and stated that we are not a regulatory commission, we are a regulatory agency so we have no way

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

controlling vehicles, we have no way of reducing emissions, we can time our signals to help encourage that, but we can't make people change their vehicles or drive less miles. She asked if this could be re-worded to encourage the public to reduce their emissions through whatever means they can, and maybe do educational programs or something like that, because we just can't do this as we are not a regulatory body. Haugen responded that the target isn't identifying how it is done, it is identifying what it is we are trying to achieve. He suggested we think about this the same way as our safety target toward zero death, we aren't ever going to achieve zero deaths in our transportation system, but toward zero death is the target that is out there so reducing our greenhouse gas emission is a target we need to try to strive for, but it is also a target we can measure ourselves against to determine how well we can accomplish it. Williams said that she agrees with exactly what your saying, that we are going to attempt to strive, but that isn't what that says. Ellis commented, however, that if we don't meet it, we say we didn't meet it. Williams argued that it says that by 2040 reduce. Ellis agreed, adding that we need to try to do that, but that will be a federal performance target that will be passed down to us.

Williams reiterated that we have to "try" to do it, exactly right, but that says that we are absolutely going to do it. Ellis responded that if we put "try" in there, that isn't a solid target. Haugen said, again, that we are going to reduce to zero deaths too, is what our safety target states. Brooks commented that the performance targets don't necessarily say that we have to do it. He asked what happens if we don't reach a target. Haugen responded that nothing happens. Williams stated that nothing happens right now, but they can always pass something that says that if you don't reach your performance targets, you get a 5% reduction in your funding. Brooks said that we would then change our performance targets. Williams said that it would be too late then, you can't go back and retrofit it. She stated that all she is saying is that all this needs to do is say that we will work towards doing this, or we will encourage, or we will..., we don't want to box ourselves in at the very beginning of having it absolute, we will make something happen, unless we have control over it. She commented that if we say we will buy hybrid bus, and we have someone here that says that we want one and we'll get the funding for it, then we'll make it happen, but if we can't make it happen then we shouldn't be saying things like that because there are environmental groups that will take you to court on it, saying that we promised.

Johnson commented that as far as the performance measures and targets are concerned, it doesn't actually have to be developed and finalized until Federal Highway has finalized theirs, and the DOT has finalized theirs, then the MPO can finalize theirs, so he thinks there is room for you to modify your targets as they become clearer.

Haugen stated that he just wanted to highlight how they approached what they understood to be the comments and suggestions received after reviewing the first draft. He said that they had a lot of performance measures in that first draft, and they tried to focus on things that have been traditionally done in the past, and that have already been identified as performance measures, although not labeled as such, but mostly to narrow them down to the most important ones.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

Haugen reported that as MAP-21 information was received they made some revisions to reflect the new information, including trying to identify how our goals are meeting the identified MAP-21 national goals.

Williams asked if there is a timeline on this. Haugen responded that there is because when they come up with a plan they want to try to use these targets as a measuring stick to what projects ultimately are being recommended in the plan. He said that they don't want to come up with projects and then evaluate them based on a different set of goals. Williams stated that she doesn't think the goals will change, nor does she think there will be any comments on them either.

Haugen reported that in the classic planning process one of the first things you do is identify what your objectives are your trying achieve, and the performance that are laid out, and then as you evaluate alternatives you refer back to what those goals and objectives were to accomplish so that when you come with a recommended plan you followed the process from cradle to grave as to goals and objectives, and the plan fits. He added that there is an opportunity at the end to re-evaluate to see if what you started out with is still appropriate, or if adjustments are needed.

Williams asked when they wanted comments submitted. Haugen responded that comments should be submitted a week from Friday.

Haugen commented that, assuming the MPO Executive Policy Board approves the amendment to the SRF contract, meetings will be scheduled with local staff to allocate out the growth areas, the type of growth in those areas, and identify what we think will be the street and highway network in place. He explained that in the past they have followed a kind of routine accommodation of growth so a lot of the collectors have been identified as future streets that will be in place just because development is expected to go there, so they will need collector streets at those locations, so that when we start identifying deficiencies in 2025, and in 2040, we will already be accounting for those streets that have to be in place for the growth to occur, so we will hopefully identify true deficiencies instead of phantom deficiencies, so we will be working with local staff to help us identify what those networks will be.

Williams said that Mr. Haugen had presented an item to the UND Traffic Safety Group, and she thought it was going to be presented at this meeting as well. Haugen responded that there were people missing from that committee, and they were given until yesterday to provide comment and feedback on the document, so he was unable to present it at this meeting. He added that he felt that before the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed that document they should get comments from the committee it is coming from first so they can be appropriated into a document.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2012**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. October 22nd MnSHIP Meeting

Haugen reported that he just wanted to highlight Minnesota's Statewide Highway Investment Plan process. He stated that a meeting on this will be held on October 22nd in Bemidji.

McKinnon commented that there will be the usual presentation by their central office planning staff, but they will also be breaking out into small groups to talk about different investment approach ideas. He explained that they will be talking mainly about three of them: 1) their current one, which is a balanced approach; 2) one that would swing more towards preservation; and 3) one that would swing more towards regional and community priorities. He stated that in December MNDOT top staff will choose an investment direction to go with in their 20-year plan, so this will be an interactive type of workshop.

Haugen pointed out that he did include a link to this interactive on-line tool, that sort of highlights those three approaches. He pulled up the website and navigated through it briefly.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 10TH, 2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:54 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 14th, 2012, 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 (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local Government Division; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; and Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Guest(s) present were: Jon Markusen, KLJ Consulting Group; and Peggy O'Leary, Local Historic Preservation Commission.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 10TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 10TH, 2012 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that in regard to the Kennedy Bridge, MNDOT was in the process of finalizing a contract with CH2M, but ran into an issue with the Memorandum of Understanding they have with North Dakota, specifically with some of the language in that document, but that has now been resolved so he believes that a contract with CH2M is now completed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

Haugen commented that there has also been some changes in management at MNDOT District 2, and J.T. Anderson will be moving away from being the Project Manager of the Kennedy Bridge Project to become the acting District Maintenance Engineer. He stated that a new project manager has not yet been named at this time.

Haugen stated that in regard to the Sorlie Bridge, NDDOT has begun negotiations with KLJ, who was their top pick after interviewing three firms last week. Noehre commented that KLJ was selected, and they are now in the process of reviewing their scope and fee schedule, however no contract has been entered into at this time. He added that in the October 10th minutes it discussed doing an environmental document, a PCR, but that isn't exactly accurate as they are not actually sure yet what type of environmental process they will go through yet, but they do know that it won't be a PCR.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HUMAN SERVICES PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
COORDINATION PLAN**

Kouba stated that, basically, since they finished their Transit Development Plan, the TDP, they started in on their Human Services Coordination Plan. She said that MAP-21 kind of skewed things a bit, but MAP-21 is still calling for there to be a Human Service Coordination Plan, Transportation Coordination Plan, which is good since they pretty much finished it all up, and, basically they gathered input and not too many things have changed. She commented, however, that many of the human services were glad, especially their Mobility Manager, as this is a new position since the 2006 Plan, and that position has now been added.

Kouba reported that they have pretty much continued on with the coordination committees, adding that they want to hear more plans for every opportunity for transit for their clients, especially looking at car-pooling and van-pooling, and things of that nature. She said that ultimately there haven't been too many new inclusions into this update.

Kouba stated that the Coordination Committee has approved this, and there were no comments from the public when it was presented to them, so she is now looking for approval from this committee to move it on to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval as well.

Williams referred to the document and pointed out that in a couple of places it talks about a coordinated transportation plan, and she is wondering if it would be clearer if the term "coordinated transit transportation plan" was used instead because they refer to other things as transportation. Haugen responded that they should be using the term "coordinated public transportation plan" instead.

Haugen commented that this was also a requirement of SAFETEA-LU for two FTA programs, New Freedom and Job Access Reverse Commute. He said that the City of Grand Forks received multiple grants through those programs based on this coordination plan, and MAP-21 changed things by rolling the JARC program into the regular 5307 program, and that did not require a Human Service Public Transportation Coordination Plan in order for formally JARC eligible

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

projects to be done through the 5307 program. He added that the formerly separate New Freedom program was rolled into the 5310 program, which is for the elderly and disabled, and that still requires that a coordination plan be maintained and updated as necessary, so in order for our MPO area to be eligible for those funds we had to update our coordination plan.

Haugen reported that the only difference this time from the first time we did the plan was, since the first time the funds had to be competitive with Cities Area Transit, competing for the JARC and New Freedom funds, was that we went to both City Councils for their adoption. He said that they also worked with the Human Service Coordination Agencies and Cities Area Transit and are now seeking approval from both the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board of the update.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

Williams asked if this would create any new programs, or is it something that will just be incorporated into what we already have. Haugen responded that they are not aware of any possible new programs. He added that they are also unsure yet as to how the formerly “New Freedom” program will be implemented. He said that prior to this the 5310 program was exclusive of being used in non-urbanized areas, but MAP-21 sets aside a portion of 5310 funding for use in urbanized areas, so they will have to figure out how this is all going to work. He added that New Freedom has been used to fund vehicle replacements, the Mobility Manager position, and other capital needs and services.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2013-2014 MPO UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that we are anticipating maintaining a funding level similar to what we have in the past. He explained that they worked with both states to revisit the distribution formula, and the outcome has sort of kept us status quo in terms of our funding amounts. He said that we had to update those formulas based on the 2010 census results, and with that we are able to fulfill our core requirements; the T.I.P., Land Use Plan, etc., and have roughly around \$200,000 each year to do special type studies. He stated that in 2013 they will wrap up their street and highway element and roll it into the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Haugen commented that with MAP-21 they have to revisit some of the elements of the Transit Development Plan that we just approved, and Ms. Rood will speak to that in a moment. He added that in 2014 they will be addressing their ITS plan and Regional Architecture Plan, as they both need to be updated, so that will be our Long Range Transportation Plan update. He added

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

that in 2014 plus, MAP-21 will, or may have some impacts that will require we amend those documents just as the TDP needed to be amended now.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he noted the other studies that we were asked to do, and are including in this draft. He explained that the first one, in 2013, is to try to utilize our resources to do a more frequent traffic count program. He stated that a lot of the things you will see in the work program are working with MAP-21, with a more performance based emphasis, so getting a better traffic counting program up and running, and utilizing video detection, as best we can, will allow us to have that data to establish our performance measures. He added that we also have our signal coordination plan on the North Dakota side, so in having more current counting information allows us to better manage the traffic signal coordination system.

Haugen commented that also in 2013, we will update our Pavement Management System. He stated that this will be the third update of that program. He added that it is a two part update, with the first involving the re-imaging of our right-of-way by taking photos of every twenty-five feet of the roadway surfaces and right-of-way. He stated that the second part involves taking that data and creating a pavement rating system, and putting our data fields for that.

Williams stated that their original request included that City staff be trained in access to the software and the data base. Haugen responded that they have access to the software now, and the training, as part of our annual contract with ICON, and some training hours have already been set aside.

Noehre commented that he was wondering about what they discussed about State Highways being included. Haugen responded that he included them for now because, if for no other reason, they will have right-of-way imaging that is current for the whole metro area, or federal urban aid area; and then they will establish a system and see how it is used from there on the state system. Noehre said that he has been thinking about it some more, and it would be nice if they were all rated the same way, but there are two different rating systems. Haugen commented that it is currently based on us doing all of the roadways in our urban aid boundary, with functional class roadways in both directions and local streets in one direction, just as we have in the past. Williams asked if this excludes the interstate. Haugen responded it does.

Brooks asked if the Earthmine stuff can be utilized, if the Earthmine pictures and the pavement management information can be used together. Haugen responded that he talked to Matt Yavarow about that, and he didn't think it could be utilized together.

Haugen reported that there is a very strong possibility of some changes in our staffing levels. He explained that currently roughly about 1/3 of a one position is contracted out for local land use planning on the Minnesota side; and East Grand Forks is now contemplating hiring their own planning staff, so should that occur there would be a release of hours committed to that activity that would be available for MPO activity. He said that one of the things that we have identified for those hours to be committed toward would be maintenance and upkeep of the pavement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

management system, which, in the past this has been a struggle accomplishing. He explained that what they did was to have the MPO go out and update the system and then turn it over to both cities to run with it and in the past there hasn't been a good updating of the system, so if this does occur, with performance based planning with the MPO leading, more reliance on that management system we will need to commit some staffing hours to make sure the system is maintained and can be utilized more than it has been in the past.

Haugen commented that the last item in 2013 is contingent on this project becoming a recommended project in our Long Range Transportation Plan, and that is the potential for a 47th Avenue Interchange with I-29. He stated that if it does become a recommended project, based on our fiscally constrained list of recommended projects, we would then take the next step and do the IJR. He added that this is a very similar process to what we did for Merrifield back about ten years ago when an interchange at Merrifield was a hot topic.

Haugen reported that in 2014, and he already talked about the ITS Regional Architecture project; but there are two other projects: A West Gateway Drive access for the new Wal-Mart just west of 55th Street, where the City is looking at some other potential development there as well; and the other is to look at our Traffic Incident Management Program.

Rood distributed copies of the City of Grand Forks Staff Reports that discuss transit activities, and went over the information briefly.

Rood reported that this information was presented to the Service/Safety Committee at their meeting last evening. She referred to the staff report discussing changes to the public transportation fare structure, and explained that they were asked by the City Council to look at their fare structure to see if they could streamline some of the discounts they give because they currently have several different discount amounts, and also to see where they might be able to generate more revenue on their contracts.

Rood explained that they proposed no changes to the cash fares, as they feel they are very solid, but are proposing an increase to the 10-ride fare for adults from \$10.00 to \$13.00; and are also proposing to increase the senior/disabled 10-ride fare from \$5.00 to \$5.25. She said that this would then create a 13% discount across the board.

Rood commented that they are also looking at increasing the monthly pass, which is currently at \$32.00 to \$35.00. She said that the Service Agent Committee expressed that they like what they see of the proposed fare structure, although there was a little bit of discussion on the contract rates. She stated that they are proposing they use \$0.75 as a rate for all their contracts. She explained that they currently have a contract with UND where they pay us \$0.75 per ride for all their students, and that seems to work well; but then some other agencies, such as Northland College and River Valley Community Action, they pay a set fee per month for an unlimited amount of rides, and we are now beginning to lose money as ridership increases, so we would like to set a fee of \$0.75 for all the contracts to keep them uniform.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

Rood stated that they will move ahead and work with the MPO on the Public Participation process and hopefully have an updated fare structure in place early in 2013.

Rood referred to the second staff report, explaining that it is really only an informational item on some of their 2013 action items, and went over it briefly (a copy of this document is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen commented that they will have to roll in some of the MAP-21 changes they have to do even though we just adopted a transit plan. Brooks asked if East Grand Forks approved those fare changes as well. Kouba responded that they are approving the preliminary proposal, and once it goes to the public and their input is given, then they will bring it back to the council for final approval.

Brooks asked how many adult ten-ride cards were sold. Rood responded that as far as she knows they don't track how many cards they sell, but they do track how many are used, and it looks like the ten ride cards aren't separated between adult, youth and senior/disabled, but it also looks like the monthly ride passes are heavily used, so those that do use them are getting a pretty good discount.

Haugen reported that he just highlighted the financial sheet for 2013 on the screen, and two things he wants to point out that weren't mentioned in the staff report, is that we are continuing to set aside \$25,000 for school safety studies; and then we are looking in 2014, previously Safe Routes To School was a separate funding program that was specifically K-8 grade, but it has now been absorbed into the transportation alternatives program, although some eligibility has remained, it may have broadened the scope of that to allow high schools to be looked at as well.

Haugen stated that they did receive some comments from Minnesota, St. Paul, and one of those comments is, we have a line item each year for A.T.A.C., and this year, in 2013, it has \$25,000 awarded it for a travel demand modeling forecast.

Williams referred to the tables, and asked where the information is that says how much the City is contributing because they say "city/local". Haugen responded that they are paying 50% of \$161,875.00. Williams asked him to go to the top of the slide, and pointed out that the middle column says "state/local". She then asked if there is any state money in that. Haugen responded that the State of Minnesota has some funding included.

Haugen stated that the other question St. Paul asked was specific to the pavement management. He said that they were wondering how much of the \$150,000 is set aside for a consultant, and the answer is \$120,000.

Haugen reported that the other thing they did, if you compare these work programs to previous programs, was to beef up our data collection as well as some of our other education equipment and our public participation as a result of MAP-21's emphasis on performance management and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

performance recording so our funds have been reallocated to ensure we are collecting the data and are able to report it.

Haugen commented that we are using; in 2013, as you can see we have an \$850,000 budget and in 2014 we have a \$600,000 budget, and the reason for that difference is due to the fact that we have some funds we are carrying over in 2013 from previous consolidated planning grants.

Williams stated that she has a couple of questions:

First, we have 300.53, that is the school safety study, and it mentions safe kids, local school districts, and the MPO, could we please have “and the Cities” put in there as well. Haugen responded that we can do that, but it does state in one place the word “city”, because that was a little editorial that MNDOT provided him. Williams stated that it shows it for the funding but it doesn’t show it in the actual description of the project.

Second, on the pavement management where it says “to include training new staff”, are they hiring someone or does it mean to train staff that previously hasn’t been trained. Haugen responded that it is probably both. Williams asked if they were planning on hiring somebody. Haugen responded that there is a potential new staff, and he isn’t sure who is all currently staffed that has been trained and who hasn’t, as there has been a lot of turnover since the last training so he isn’t sure who current staff are that have been trained in the system, so he wrote it generically to cover both scenarios. Williams asked when they would know if they were going to hire somebody new, or add to staff. Haugen responded that, as he spoke earlier about East Grand Forks potentially hiring a City Planner, that will be a time when he will know something. He explained that they were anticipating East Grand Forks would take action right away, but it now looks like it may not take place by the end of the year. Williams said, then, that the new hire would not actually be a new hire, but would really be a reassignment. Haugen responded that it could be a new hire. Williams stated that what she is trying to get around to is, you may have additional bodies or are you going to have the same positions and then you may have to hire someone, that is what she is trying to find out. Haugen responded that the way the work program is written up, as far as staff, is that it is the same number of staff as we currently have. Williams said that that was what she wanted to know. Brooks commented that he did mention that there would be hours because they won’t be doing EGF planning. Haugen agreed that he is anticipating there will be more hours available for MPO activities, however it is contingent on East Grand Forks hiring their own City Planner, but as he just stated they tabled that action at council last night, so we may have to adjust that item.

Third, is on GIS Development. She asked if this is something that the City has already done or are you going to need some of the City’s stuff and go from there, or exactly what is this? Haugen responded that they have their GIS system that we operate and maintain, and the City has its GIS system, however some of the materials are shared, while some aren’t. Williams said that her question is are you using whatever the City can provide

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

whenever they can provide it and then enhancing it. Haugen responded that that is correct, but that they are then providing to the cities their information as well so they don't have to duplicate it.

Haugen reported that whatever action is taken today, Stephanie Hickman from Federal Highway has informed him via e-mail that she isn't quite prepared to provide comments but will do so by the end of tomorrow, so whatever action is taken today should be contingent on those comments. Johnson stated that he hopes to get his comments to you soon as well.

Brooks commented that, in terms of Grand Forks we know that the School District is looking at a possible new school; so in the line item for school safety, is there a standing consultant, and is this something that when we get further along with a site plan we will need to review something, and should it be left open for this possibility rather than having to fix it later on. He basically requested that we include the new school in the A.T.A.C. school safety study before it is built.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2013-2014 MPO UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE CHANGES AS DISCUSSED, AS WELL AS ANY COMMENTS FROM FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND THE NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS

Haugen reported that University Avenue is part of our Long Range Transportation Plan, and they have asked the consultant to look specifically at some issues along University Avenue in conjunction with UND's Climate Action Plan. He stated that they are principally looking at the auto/ped/bike/transit conflicts that are occurring along University Avenue.

Haugen commented that they have been working through a committee that is the Grand Forks/UND Transportation Traffic Coordination Committee, which is made up of students, faculty, and staff out at the University; and City staff.

Haugen stated that they have come up with some recommendations that were listed in the technical memorandum before you. He pointed out that they grouped them as short-term and mid-term projects. He referred to the memorandum (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over the recommendations briefly.

Williams commented that she would like to note that this was not a unanimous decision from the UND Transportation Group to concur with all of these things. She stated that the City is still reviewing a lot of things, so at least four members wanted to do further studying before recommending any of these so that we would know that if you close something where would the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

traffic go and what would happen to it, so they will have some additional comments. She asked when comments were due on this. Haugen responded that they are holding a public open house on November 29th out at the Memorial Union on this, and comments will be due ten days after the open house.

Haugen continued going over the recommendations.

O'Leary asked if it would be possible to steal the width from the medians, reduce the size of the medians rather than widening the street in the mid-term. Haugen responded that it would be possible. Williams commented that it would be very difficult, though, because you have to have left turn lanes in there and as it is there are several places where there is a median in the left turn lane and it isn't shown on the diagram. She pointed out that there is a median, which is like three feet, and that leaves a seven foot length for the vehicles, and then an eleven for vehicles and then thirteen for shared bikes. She stated that she has been reading and checking with other cities and the recommendation is anywhere from fourteen to seventeen for a combined length. O'Leary stated, however, that if you're widening to increase the lanes then you have some options there too. Williams agreed, but added that there isn't any widening to the middle because the middle is already taken up at the intersections for turn lanes, and that is down to ten or eleven feet or less. She stated that this is why at least four members, not all from the City, several from UND also, wanted more information before any of this moves on, and she thinks that is where Mr. Haugen said that we can look at it in the Long Range Transportation Plan then as something, but as far as independently doing it, it would be very, very difficult. Haugen commented that they also stated that they did the detailed traffic options in 2002, and there is less traffic out there now than there was in 2002, and the 2002 report said that the traffic impacts were negligible, and didn't change operations to a point where it caused a degrade of any operations. Williams stated that 2002 did not include 42nd and several other streets, so she doesn't know if the 2002 model would be appropriate to University today in saying there is less traffic now.

MATTER OF A.T.A.C. SCHOOL STUDY DRAFT REPORT

Ellis reported that last year they began to study Schroeder and Valley in Grand Forks, and South Point in East Grand Forks. She stated that A.T.A.C. had an engineer leave and hired a new engineer so the study was postponed to this fall. She went over the study process; explaining that the main objective is to evaluate pedestrian safety, review roadway and parking characteristics, review traffic control and pavement markings, evaluate traffic circulation and then provide possible short and long-term improvements for each school.

Ellis commented that they are not ready at this time to provide a full draft report. She stated that A.T.A.C., because of the weather had to delay the site visits, so they do have somewhat generic recommendations for your review, but the full draft report will not be available until possibly next week. She said that they also plan on holding a meeting at the end of November with that school group to go over the recommendations and the draft report, after which a final report will be submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board in December or January.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

Ellis referred to a slide presentation, and pointed out that they list the recommendations by school. She said that there are a couple of recommendations that are recommended on all three; encouraging safe behavior, education for parents and kids, and targeting enforcement in and around the school districts. She pointed out that they also talk about some improvements just in and around the area such as damaged sidewalks, changing signs that don't meet the MUTCD's requirements, etc. She stated that these are things that we would address at all three schools.

Ellis then referred to maps illustrating each of the schools, and briefly went over the individual school recommendations included for each.

Williams said that the only thing she would like to add would be, both places they are looking at the hybrid beacon, there are already flashing beacons there, so as everybody is looking at this it wouldn't take a whole lot of money to change it over from a flashing beacon to a pedestrian hybrid beacon, so that isn't going to be a factor as far as money as it is only going to be about \$30,000 to \$40,000 to change. She commented that the hold-up is that the MUTCD still does not allow these at intersections, although that was the original intent, and the national committee for the review of traffic control devices wrote a letter immediately to the feds and the MUTCD came out and said that that was not what they wanted or intended so it will be changed in the future.

Ellis stated that she also thinks, and Mr. Haugen addressed this earlier, that with transportation alternatives now instead of specific transportation enhancement and safe routes to school, the safe routes to school program addressed walking and biking to school, but now that they are combined as a transportation alternative these studies will look all the different methods of getting to school, therefore addressing some of the high schools would be valuable.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Solicitation Reminder

Haugen reminded everyone of some solicitations that are currently going on on the Minnesota side, besides the next regular round of the T.I.P. cycle. He said that there are some for the State/County system and also for Safe Routes To School.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side there is a solicitation out for the Highway Safety Improvement Program, so if you have any projects that would qualify for this program, you should be working on them.

2. Freight Study Meeting Monday, November 19, 2012

Ellis reported that there was a freight study done in 2009/2010, and with the Long Range Transportation Plan they are going to be updating that study. She said that it addresses freight issues such as rail, truck, air, etc., specifically any issues that have arisen since the 2009/2010 study was done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2012**

Ellis stated that they are doing all this and adding it to the Long Range Transportation Plan. She added that they do have a Draft Freight Section that they are going to go over with updated maps, updated issues of different freighting operations whether it be the postal service, BNSF, LM Glassfiber, etc., so that if they have any issues or road projects they would like us to consider they will be included in the freight section.

Ellis commented that she is meeting with the freight group on Monday, November 19th at 1:00 p.m. to go over the entire freight report to ensure the issues and improvements they would like to see are in fact those that are included.

3. T.I.P. Process

Williams asked if the State of North Dakota has any idea of when the T.I.P. process will start. She commented that they haven't been solicited for this year, and she worries that it is just going to come down and they will be behind, so should they start working on it? Johnson responded that they are currently working on drafting NDDOT's solicitation letter; however, it will be very generic as the full impact of MAP-21 is still uncertain.

Williams asked if there was a due date for this. Johnson responded that it will be in the letter being sent out soon. Noehre commented that as far as the regional system they probably should start working on it. Williams agreed.

Haugen asked if Mr. Johnson knew of any T.I.P. amendments that are necessary for 2013 projects. Johnson responded he was aware of those Mr. Haugen was referring to and he also had another he needed to get to the MPO. Haugen stated that he has to do an amendment in December and would like to include all amendments if possible. Mr. Johnson agreed that that is the hoped for action.

Haugen reported that, for information only, when Minnesota adopted their final S.T.I.P., on the Kennedy Bridge, previously we had only been talking about the bridge bonding funds, but in their S.T.I.P. they threw in quite a bit of federal monies on that project as well, which is one of the amendments we will have to approve in December.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 14TH,
2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:54 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 12th, 2012, 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: Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local Government Grand Forks District; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local Government Grand Forks District; Roxanne Achman (Proxy For Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; and Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Guest(s) present were: Nick West, KLJ Consulting Group; and John Green, HDR Engineering Group.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 14TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROMNESS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 14TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen asked Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji, to give a brief update on the Kennedy Bridge project.

McKinnon reported that, as the staff report Mr. Haugen included in the packets indicates, CH2M Hill is the firm that MNDOT chose to do the planning study on the Kennedy Bridge, however as of Monday the contract with them has not been officially executed yet as there were some bureaucratic issues that needed to be taken care of first, so it should be executed within the next couple of weeks. He added that as part of the planning study they will be looking at alternatives for both rehabbing the bridge as well as for possible replacement.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it discusses a couple of changes that we are making to our T.I.P., which we will discuss in a later agenda item.

Haugen commented that in regard to the Sorlie Bridge project, he was wondering if NDDOT has executed a contract with KLJ yet. Johnson responded that he has not heard yet if a contract has been executed with KLJ, but he knows that the contract has been drafted.

Haugen pointed out that we currently have over \$3,000,000 programed in our T.I.P. to do an EIS study for the Sorlie Bridge, but it is his understanding that this has been re-scoped and scaled down, so he is wondering if there is a way to modify our T.I.P. to reflect what is going on with this project, what should the description say. Johnson responded that it would be best to generalize the description to say “environmental document”, but he isn’t sure what funding amount should be used. He stated that he would check into this further.

Haugen asked if there is anything we should be programming in 2014 toward any document like the Kennedy Bridge project. Johnson responded that he is not aware of anything in their T.I.P., but, again, he will check into this further.

MATTER OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that there are four projects that will be affected by the action we are asking this body to consider today. He stated that two are on the North Dakota side and two on the Minnesota side.

North Dakota:

1. Enhancement monies were awarded to do the reconstruction of the multi-purpose trail along South 20th Street in Grand Forks. The T.I.P. needs to be amended to include this project so that the federal funds can flow and federal action can take place.
2. North Dakota is asking the MPO to program roughly \$425,000 toward an environmental document for the Kennedy Bridge in 2014.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

Minnesota:

1. When the MNDOT Central Office finalized their S.T.I.P. they made some changes to our T.I.P. document and now we are coming back to reconcile those differences, which include moving a project that is currently programmed to occur in 2014 to 2013.
2. Minnesota decided they want to insert some federal funds into Minnesota's portion of the Kennedy Bridge Project cost in 2016.

Haugen commented that we did advertise for a public hearing on this agenda item. He opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present wished to speak on this item. There was no one present for discussion. He closed the public hearing.

Haugen added that they also advertised for written comments to be submitted before 12:00 noon today, no such comments were received.

MOVED BY ROMNESS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013-2014 UPWP

Haugen reminded the committee that last month they approved a 2013-2014 work program contingent on comments from our State and Federal Partners, and they have since received those comments.

Haugen reported that the approved 2013-2014 UPWP had included our doing an interchange justification report for 47th Avenue South, which, as was noted in that document, we had done a similar such report for Merrifield back in 2002 when we were updating our Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated, however that we have since been told that it is not a planning eligible activity, so we have listed a substitute project, a freight/rail access study.

Haugen commented that the real purpose behind this access study is to try to assist existing and future planning as to how that last mile or so of freight/rail can then become the first mile or so of truck freight, and vice-versa. He added that they will also be looking at our metro area to determine where we have properties that are adjacent to or nearby existing rail, at a planning level, what it would take to improve rail access to those properties, and also if that happens how it might impact our street and highway network.

Romness stated, then, that this is really a freight corridor study with rail added. Haugen responded that it is of equal importance, not with the rail added. He explained that it is a freight study that will look at rail, corridors, access to freight corridors, etc. Romness commented that it should have rail included anyway, right. Haugen responded it should. Romness asked if freight

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

corridors are funded 90% under MAP-21. Haugen responded that under MAP-21, if there is a state freight plan then you can have some local as well. He stated that, as he recalls, the funding ratios are based on what the state freight plan is. Romness said that he read about this and it is his belief that urban corridors are eligible as well.

Haugen reported that in addition they have been approached by the local economic development corporation to assist them in identifying some of the freight issues they have to deal with when working with their clients, either existing or those they are trying to entice into our metro area.

Haugen commented that the second change deals with pavement management. He explained that in 2003 we initiated a pavement management system for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and through that process we reached agreement to utilize the ICON software from Goodpoint Technologies. He stated that in 2008 we updated that data base with new images and pavement ratings.

Haugen said that they proposed last month to do similar work as that done in 2008, but have since been informed that not all of the roadways in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks are eligible for planning funds, only the federal aid eligible roadways are the roadways we can work with. He stated that they redrafted the text to state that the MPO will do the right-of-way imaging and the condition rating on the federal aid eligible network and the local agencies can decide if they want to piggy-back on our work effort at 100% their cost to have this updated in the ICON Management System. He commented that this means less cost for the MPO, so some of the monies earmarked for the pavement management system update is now being used to increase the consultant costs for the freight/rail access study.

Haugen reported that the third change, as we discussed, East Grand Forks, a month ago was still determining whether or not they were going to hire their own full-time planner, and they have since decided to do so and are currently advertising, so if you are interested applications are due Friday. He stated that this then means that we will have the ability to capture 100% of MPO staff being able to do MPO activities. He commented that we had identified in the work program that this will completely negate the need for us to do indirect cost rates any longer, although we still have not been able to work with North Dakota Federal Highway financial personnel to determine how we need to transition so we put language back into the work program language that states that during the month of January we will be meeting with FHWA personnel to get this ironed out.

Haugen thanked Mike Johnson, Stephanie Hickman, and others who have been reviewing the back and forth of getting this language agreeable.

Johnson commented that just a couple of minutes before this meeting began he received an e-mail from Stephanie regarding the language for the indirect costs you provided, and she is recommending that all the middle, existing text that discusses how the indirect rates are determined be removed, and just highlighting the bolded language that talks about how your going to transition out of it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2013-2014 MPO UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF ND HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REQUESTS

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks is submitting three projects, which they ranked in priority order, as shown in the staff report.

Haugen referred to the staff report and went over the projects as follows:

1. Replacement of countdown pedestrian heads.

Noehre asked if these are for the rest of the functionally classified roadways. Williams responded that the majority of them are for the state highways that are left, but they are all classified streets.

2. Addition of a right turn lane at 32nd Avenue South and South 34th Street for southbound traffic.
3. Three right turn lanes at 17th Avenue South and Columbia – for Eastbound, northbound and southbound traffic.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS' NDDOT HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SOLICITATION PROJECTS AS SUBMITTED, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS REQUESTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UNIVERSITY AVENUE RECOMMENDATIONS

Haugen reported that an open house was held on November 29th at the UND Memorial Union from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and again from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., with the bulk of the 30 to 40 people attending coming during the 10:00 to 3:00 timeframe.

Haugen distributed a handout with the comments received from the open house, and went over it briefly (a copy of the handout is included in the file and available upon request).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

Rood pointed out that it states that the shared bus and bike/ped will allow the shuttle express to be quicker, and asked how much quicker will it be. Haugen responded that there us up to four minutes delay right now with the conflict with peds crossing so the intent would be to stop pedestrians from getting into the roadway so the express bus would have priority, so it would seem it would make it four or more minutes quicker. Rood said that in the TDP they recommended moving two of their routes up to 6th Avenue rather than University to save three or four minutes, so this new lane will save four minutes and should be taken into consideration.

Williams commented that these are all recommendations, but they will be doing this as alternatives, and none of these have been approved. She said that several of them the consultants stated, and agreed, that prior to doing them there should be further studying done. She stated that another thing she would like to have, if your going to do further studying, the big tie-up on University is the students just stepping out wherever they want, and if that isn't controlled, we can add three more lanes to University and it isn't going to help because the bus is still going to get stuck in traffic. She added that that is where the whole problem is, the students crossing, if there was a signal, or some way of controlling the students from crossing we wouldn't need to restripe and rebuild University to accommodate this because if you go on University when there are no students crossing there is no problem with the buses, so this all needs to be looked at further before any decisions are made.

Bergman asked when they would be looking at implementing this. Haugen responded that the express route, the whole re-routing of the shuttle system is predicated on the northwest portion connecting student housing so they don't have to cross the railroad track to get on 42nd Street, so in order to implement the changes they have to make that connection up in that area of campus, connecting basically parking lots so they can avoid the railroad crossing. He stated that the public awareness portion they would like to get moving on as soon as possible, to get the public and the students aware of the rules of the road.

Discussion on proposed route changes ensued.

MATTER OF PROPOSED MNDOT CHANGES PER MAP-21

Haugen reported that the NW ATP is holding a meeting tomorrow in McIntosh. He said that it is their typical beginning of the T.I.P. cycle meeting, but with MAP-21, and the way it has changed the funding programs, Central office is sending up some people to walk the ATP through what those changes may or may not be. He asked Joe McKinnon to give a brief highlight as to what this may entail.

McKinnon stated that the Office of Capital Programs, which is the office that works with the distribution of funding to all the districts and ATPs, are attending all of the ATP meetings, and ours, as Mr. Haugen indicated, is tomorrow.

McKinnon commented that the available funding will be about the same as what was available under SAFETEA-LU, but the big change is that it sets up a difference between the National

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

Highway System and the Non-National Highway System. He explained that more money goes towards the National Highway Program and less towards the Surface Transportation Program; and in District 2 only about 1/3 of our miles, at the State Highway level, are included in the National Highway Program; and 2/3 are in the Surface Transportation Program.

McKinnon stated that they used to use the old expression that all money was green, that all federal money was green and could be used pretty much anywhere, now there have been some really big changes as to how it can be used in certain areas. He said that it appears Congress is aware that they have limited funding and they wanted to set up a national system, thus MAP-21.

McKinnon reported that this went into effect on October 1st of this year, so the Office of Capital Programs looked at all the years of the 2013-2016 S.T.I.P. to determine whether or not the projects can still be delivered. He said that they determined that with flexibility of funds, transferring of funds, and some money left from SAFETEA-LU, it appears that the years 2013-2016 will be kept intact, and no project will have to be delayed.

McKinnon commented that 2017 is the first year of the new S.T.I.P. process, and that is when these changes will really impact us. He stated that top MNDOT staff will look at what direction they need to take things, should they move towards the option of really emphasizing the national highway system as the federal bill is calling for, and that is the option that they will most likely head.

McKinnon stated that the one main concern they have is that they will be getting less funding for non-principle arterial roadways. He added that the amount of funding that went out to the local governments was previously based on a formula MNDOT had developed that looked at such factors as mileage, heavy commercial use, etc., with District 2 receiving about 5.8% of the available funding, but with the new bill the funding will now be distributed by population, so Northwestern Minnesota only has about 3% of the population state-wide, so already we will be seeing less funds, so the money East Grand Forks gets every four years for their federal share will be less, about a 30% to 40% cut.

McKinnon commented that one thing the ATP has not done is, for FY2016, no enhancement projects have been designated. He stated that they have a \$500,000 set-aside for this, so there will be a need for the ATP to hold a discussion on whether or not they should solicit projects for these funds.

Haugen reported that the Governor formed a task force to look at revenues, to increase revenues for transportation on the Minnesota side, and one of the basic recommendations is to increase the gas tax.

McKinnon announced that Governor Dayton appointed Charlie Zeller, who is the former CEO of Jefferson Bus Lines, as the new Transportation Director to replace Commissioner Sorel, who resigned in November to pursue other interests.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

MATTER OF ADJUSTED URBAN AID BOUNDARY

Haugen reminded the committee that back in August they took action to make changes to areas inside this adjusted federal aid urban boundary. He explained that with the new 2010 Census they were required to address the inclusion of those areas the census defined as urbanized that previously were not. He stated that there weren't too many areas for the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks area, and the final map was included in the packets.

Haugen commented that since this action was taken, the City received a letter asking them to take action on adjusting the Federal Urban Aid Boundary, and he is wondering what NDDOT is actually asking the MPO to do about this as well. Johnson responded that he just needs a letter and resolution from the City stating that they are okay with the boundary.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Haugen reported that, soon to be released, North Dakota will be announcing their transportation alternative programs for Federal Fiscal Year 2014. He added that they will also announce that there are some old SAFETEA-LU Safe Routes To School funds that they will solicit projects for as well.

Haugen commented that the total dollar amount available is still unknown for the TAP program, but they do have an \$80,000 minimum project cost. He stated that the total funding for Safe Routes To School is \$850,000, which are also under the old SAFETEA-LU rules as well, so it covers 100% of the construction costs. He added that North Dakota is not entertaining non-infrastructure project proposals at this time.

Haugen stated that the ATP will have to wrestle with how they want to deal with the out years of the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. for enhancements or alternative transportation.

Haugen reported that Minnesota is also has an open solicitation for Safe Routes To School, and it is also old SAFETEA-LU funds. He stated that they do have this broken down into three categories; infrastructure, non-infrastructure, and planning.

Haugen stated that the other solicitation to announce is that the North Dakota Transit is soliciting for old SAFETEA-LU/JARC/New Freedom funds. He said that the deadline for JARC and New Freedom submittal is January 4th. He added that the TAP and Safe Routes To School submittals need to be in by February 5th.

Bergman reported that the City of Grand Forks is applying for New Freedom funds to fund two new replacement Dial-A-Ride Mini Vans, and for JARC funds to fund the route covering the University Avenue/North 42nd area.

Haugen stated that there may be some other applicants applying for those funds in the MPO area. He said that they are aware of the solicitation and the deadline for submittal of projects. He commented that if we do get other applications there is a Coordination Committee that has been

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2012**

meeting ad-hoc, and they have been informed that if we do receive multiple applications they will have to convene and help us prioritize the projects.

Haugen commented that at this time the JARC and New Freedom programs do not have a minimum or maximum amount attached to them, although we have encouraged the State to consider a set minimum amount. He added that these solicitations are for 2014 to 2017 projects.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **MPO Way Finding Options For Cyclists Webinar**

Kouba reported that the MPO is putting on a Way Finding Options For Cyclists Webinar on December 19th from 2:00 to 3:15 p.m. in the East Grand Forks Training Conference Room. She explained that this webinar will give information on way finding for bike, approaches to planning, and implementation strategies to determine what is important and to prioritize.

2. **LRTP Update**

Romness asked the status of the Long Range Transportation Plan Update. Haugen responded that they are waiting for Grand Forks to determine its land use changes that it wants done to the southwestern and westerly parts of the city. He said that this week he thinks the city staff have been given direction as to how to proceed.

Romness stated that he knows that the Grand Forks staff would sure like to meet with the consultant prior to the public hearings to discuss the plan prior to discussing it with the public. He added that staff would like to take a look at where the consultant is at with the update, and to review what they have done, and he knows that especially Service Safety and the council are wanting to be informed. He said that he understands the budget and meetings, and all that, so if there is something...

Haugen reiterated that in order for them to continue they need to know what the land uses are going to be.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2012, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager