

2013 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 9, 2013

February 13, 2013

March 13, 2013

March 19, 2013

April 10, 2013

May 8, 2013

June 12, 2013

July 10, 2013

August 14, 2013

September 11, 2013

October 9, 2013

November 13, 2013

December 11, 2013

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 9th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Teri Kouba (Proxy for 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; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; and Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Guest(s) present were: Mike Bittner, KLJ; Jay Kleven, EAPC; Mark Lambrecht, AE2S; John Green, HDR; Vicki Ericson, GF School Board Member; and Dennis Denault, Citizen.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was not present. Haugen asked those in attendance whether they wished to adjourn or to continue and have discussion only on the agenda items. The members attending indicated they wanted to discuss the agenda items.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2012, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Because a quorum was not present, no action could be taken on the December 12th, 2012, Minutes at this time.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji, was unable to attend today's meeting, however he did send an e-mail in which he stated that the contract for the Kennedy Bridge Study has not yet been signed, although they hope to have it signed next week.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013**

Haugen commented that with all the MNDOT staffing changes, Roger Hille, who is their District Bridge Engineer, is now the project manager on the Kennedy Bridge Project. He added that Mr. Hille will also be the main MNDOT District person on the Sorlie Bridge Project as well.

Haugen reported that, included in the agenda packet was the Sorlie Bridge Phase 1 scope-of-work, which lists all the sub-contractors, as well as the main contractor, KLJ. He pointed out that Phase 1 basically will determine what type of environmental documentation is necessary for this project, and to allow the consultants to be able to prepare a detailed scope-of-work for the Phase 2 portion of the project, which will be the actual environmental documentation.

Information only.

MATTER OF CAMPUS ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Haugen reported that Mark Lambrecht, AE2S, was present today for a brief presentation on the Campus Road Bridge Replacement Project.

Lambrecht stated that in addition to himself, Jay Kleven, EAPC, is also present today, as EAPC is working in conjunction with his firm on this project. He added that this project is the subject of a T.I.P. amendment, and this body is being asked to advance it in order for the necessary funding to be made available.

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

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

Dennis Denault, Citizen, asked what caused the bridge to settle, and what is the structural fault of it. Lambrecht responded that what has happened is that there was some shifting in the foundation soils along the bank, and rather than a structural abutment, there is kind of a concrete basin along the soils, so when the soil shifted, combining with corrosion and the deterioration of those structural elements, the soil shifted and bent the structural element that was supported. Denault asked if there wasn't any way of beefing up the existing bridge, can't they put any pile drivings and new beams. Lambrecht responded that the bridge could be rehabilitated. He stated that there is always a rehabilitation as well as a reconstruction possibility. Denault asked what kind of structural support was used for the existing bridge. Lambrecht responded that the existing bridge has 18-inch deep steel I-Beams, and the research that was done said that there is a possibility of repairing the bridge, but the load grading used when the bridge was built does not compare to the current standards, and the desire of the University to have this route be able to support more traffic to their power plant, it was determined that it would make more sense to use this opportunity to upgrade the structural capacity to the current structure capacity. He added that the railing system does not meet the current standards, and the deck is delaminating to the point where it would need to be done. Denault commented that the steel is about 30-times tougher than the stuff you fabricate. Lambrecht said that he disagrees with that observation. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013**

added that this new bridge will be a 50-year structure that will take us from this point forward into the future.

Williams asked if the City of Grand Forks would be paying for any of this project. Lambrecht responded that the City is only assisting the University in this by being the local sponsor for the federal aid funding that could be available.

Lambrecht commented that there was a report done to evaluate the structural systems, and that is part of the Concept Report that was submitted to the NDDOT Bridge Division, so the Bridge Division will be scrutinizing the recommendations as well.

Haugen asked if Mr. Lambrecht knew whether or not there would be another opportunity for the public to comment on the PCR for this project, or was the meeting held at the University back in December the opportunity. Lambrecht responded that that was the primary opportunity for public input, but any comments anyone has should be submitted as the PCR has not been finalized yet, however it will be done within the next month.

Haugen stated that he wondering, because this is a hybrid shared-use between the City and the University of North Dakota, most projects go through the City Council a couple of times before construction begins, will we be seeing this project following that same schedule. Romness responded that once the City has the joint powers agreement in order they will back off and let the University handle it. Gengler said, then, that the City is just strictly a pass-through entity. Romness agreed, adding that it can't be authorized through the federal process unless either the City of County takes care of it, and the City volunteered to do it for the University. Lambrecht commented that Mark Walker did ask that it go through the process as if the City had advanced it, in other words that that it go through Service Safety for project concept approval.

Information only.

MATTER OF VETERAN TRANSPORTATION COMMUNITY LIVING INITIATIVE

Haugen reported that this item is also included in the T.I.P. amendment. He stated that Ali Rood will be giving a brief presentation on this, as well as some other technologies they are implementing at Cities Area Transit.

Rood gave a brief update on a project that has been ongoing for Public Transportation. She explained that they installing Auto Vehicle Location (AVL) Technology on all of their fixed route buses so that they can track vehicle mileage, hours, etc. She added that this will also be tied to automatic passenger counters on the bus so that they can track where people get on and off at various locations, which will be very helpful when planning designated stops and shelter locations.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013**

Rood stated that in order to meet ADA requirements, automatic stop announcements will now be made in the bus when approaching a stop. She said that the announcement will not only be audibly announced, but will also scroll across a message board at the front of the bus.

Rood commented that the AVL also allows them to push out schedule and estimated time of arrival information to our passengers through a free mobile app called: "RouteShout". She explained how this app will work. She added that if someone does not have the app, or a smart phone, the information can also be received via a text message or an e-mail. She stated that this summer when they do their designated stop changes they will be marking all of the stops with a unique ID, which is how a person can check on the route they need.

Rood reported that they hope to have all of this technology in place and functional within the next couple of months.

Bergman stated that in addition to what Ms. Rood stated, this will have the capabilities of allowing us to put a list together so that we can either text or e-mail riders that have registered for this information that a bus will not be arriving at a certain location due to an accident or some other unforeseen reason.

Bergman commented that the Veterans Grant is a grant that they worked with the Federal Transit Administration and the State of North Dakota for setting up a "One Call-One Click Center". He said that it is not free transportation, that is never what it was designed for. He explained that it was designed to put information together for all the different transportation agencies that would be coming into Grand Forks and leaving Grand Forks to other communities.

Bergman reported that this grant allows us to not only purchase coordination modules, which allow us to work with the other transit agencies within the northeast region, but also to give them the same capabilities that our buses and Dial-A-Ride vehicles have. He stated that this will help us better serve our rural clients.

Gengler asked who was actually providing these services, in and out of Grand Forks. Rood responded that she made a calendar of trips in and out of Grand Forks for the month of January. She distributed copies of the calendar, and went over it briefly (a copy of this document is included in the file and available upon request), explaining that this is all public transportation, wheelchair accessible vehicles, open to the public, and at a minimum cost.

Rood commented that they were awarded \$50,000 for a statewide marketing campaign to increase awareness of the public transportation options that are out there, so this grant will help us better serve clients regionally, and to work better with our partners around the region that are providing transportation in the rural areas.

Rood stated that the City Council recently officially approved the grant, they have signed the contract with RouteMatch, and they are now looking for approval from this body and the MPO Executive Policy Board to move forward with it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013**

Haugen asked if Northwest Minnesota decides to include East Grand Forks, what type of coordination would allow us to do and what would Minnesota need to come to the table with. Rood responded that they still need Minnesota to come to the table. She said that as part of the grant the technology and the coordination with North Dakota providers, but Minnesota also received funding through the same program, so they will have the ability to directly transfer calls from people who contact the disability or senior help lines, so there will be that communication back and forth, but at this point it is just information and referral with Northwest Minnesota providers, but eventually it would be nice to incorporate at least Tri-Valley transportation with the same system.

Williams stated that she knows that because we don't have a quorum today, but is there any way we can convey to the Executive Committee that the members that were here supported it, would that be appropriate. Haugen responded that because we don't have a quorum this body can't really forward anything, so this is all just for informational purposes for those that are here.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that they did publish a notice that there would be a public hearing at today's meeting to allow for public input on the proposed amendment to the T.I.P., to add in these two projects to our 2013 Fiscal Year. He referred to a slide, and pointed out that it illustrates the actual T.I.P. amendment language. He said, just to clarify why it still says 2012 on the North Dakota side, we have not adopted a 2013-2016 T.I.P. document for North Dakota, so we still have to use the current 2012-2015 T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that, again, the two projects that need to be amended into 2013 are the Campus Road Bridge Replacement project and the addition of the Veteran Transportation Community Living Initiative Grant.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion, and no written comments were received by 11:00 a.m. today. Haugen closed the public hearing.

Bergman commented that the Veteran Transportation Community Living Initiative Grant has been on the radar with FTA for quite a while because North Dakota is able to get their project up and running. He stated that they have been contacted by the State of Oklahoma as they have questions on how to get theirs up and running, so everyone will be watching how we run ours. Haugen reported that the total grant was for \$1.7 million dollars, and the Grand Forks specific component is \$230,000, so the bulk of the grant is to get these coordination modules up and running state-wide, and the \$230,000 will allow Cities Area Transit to get their equipment in place.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013**

Haugen reported that these are new funds coming in, they are not replacing or taking monies from any other projects, so fiscal constraint is not compromised in the T.I.P. by amending them in.

Information only.

MATTER OF JARC AND NEW FREEDOM APPLICATIONS

Haugen reported that the committee met yesterday and decided what we would be receiving, so he has asked Ms. Kouba to walk us through what we received.

Kouba explained that this is solicitation for the old transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU funds. She stated that we received a total of two JARC/New Freedom program funds applications, and one New Freedom program application fund. She said that our prioritization for New Freedom was pretty easy since it was only one, it is our top priority for New Freedom, but for JARC they called a meeting of their Human Service Coordination Committee and at the end of that meeting they pretty much decided that; backing up, the JARC projects were from Cities Area Transit for a University Route through campus, to Altru, to the new apartments along Garden View Drive, and to the proposed apartments by the Alerus Center; and from Red River Valley Community Action for funds to purchase bus passes, taxi vouchers and gas cards.

Kouba commented that at the end of the Human Service Coordination Committee meeting they decided to prioritize the Cities Area Transit project first, then the Red River Valley Community Action project second.

Haugen pointed out that the actual staff report talked about a third application, which was to add another bus onto the night route, but the City retracted that request, so it was just the two JARC applications discussed. Rood added that for both applications coming from the City they did go through Service Safety and City Council in advance and received their approval and support.

Haugen commented that they did spend some time talking about the \$2,000.00 amount, and whether that was enough money to engage the feds in on. He said that the Red River Valley Community Action group is part of a larger association of community action and they submitted a similar grant request to the urban properties down in the Fargo/Moorhead and Bismarck/Mandan areas. He stated that there is a meeting of transit operators on the 23rd of January in Bismarck, at which they will be discussing the possibility of bundling those three applications into one application so \$6,000.00 may be awarded, and then your bureaucratic cost to track \$6,000.00 is less than \$6,000.00, but for the three \$2,000.00 ones we probably spend \$2,000.00 bureaucratically just to track the federal requirements with the grant, so that is something that they are still discussing with other properties and the NDDOT.

Haugen reported that the reason for the \$2,000.00 dollar amount is simply because it is a 50/50 match, and all of the community action entities felt that the most they could come up with for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2013**

their local match was \$2,000.00. He said that if they had more local dollars, the request would have been larger.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Public Meetings

Kouba reported that they are holding two public meetings on the same subject on January 14th and 15th. She explained that the subject is Fare Structure Changes, mostly referring to the multi-task costs, balancing them out between the different types of ridership they have within the area.

Kouba stated that one will be held at the East Grand Forks City Hall on the 14th, and the other will be at the Grand Forks City Hall on the 15th, both at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

HAUGEN ADJOURNED THE MEETING.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 13th, 2013, 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 (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- Grand Forks District; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; and Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer.

Guest(s) present were: Peg O’Leary, Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission; Nick West, KLJ; and Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-Bismarck (via conference call).

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

INTRODUCTIONS

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

SUSPEND AGENDA

1. Federal Highway Initiatives

Stephanie Hickman, FHWA, stated that she would like to give a brief presentation on some things related to MAP-21 and Planning and Environmental Linkages (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Hickman reported that the information she is discussing today is out of MAP-21, and is something they are in the process of working toward. She explained that Congress directed the Secretary of Transportation to establish performance measures in several areas, including safety and traffic operations, and added that some of the performance management items did fall under Planning and Programming, and that is what she is going to go over today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Hickman commented this presentation is actually a new link they have on the Federal Highway public website, so you can go to it and find out more about performance based planning and programming. She explained that the overall performance management program does require Federal Highway to establish national performance measures within 18 months from the start of MAP-21, so eighteen months after October 1st, 2012. She added that all the States will then have one year in which to set theirs, which puts us two and a half years into MAP-21, and then the MPOs will have six months after that to establish theirs.

Boppre reported present.

Hickman reported that Federal Highway-North Dakota and FTA have requested a peer exchange on performance management for all three of the North Dakota MPOS. She stated that this was just submitted on Monday, so there isn't any word on whether or not it has been approved.

Hickman referred to the next slide on Planning and Environmental Linkages, and stated that this particular initiative allowed information developed in the planning stage to be used in the environmental stage. She said that this is a formal, agreed upon process that is used at the state level, and that uses criteria established by Federal Highway that says that if it is met it qualifies as a PEL process.

Hickman referred to the next slide, Every Day Counts, and reported that it is an initiative the Federal Highway Administration started in 2010, that focuses on streamlining project delivery and program approaches in innovative technology so that we can shorten project delivery overall.

Hickman reported that PEL is one of the initiatives of Phase I, which was during the 2010-2011 period, and they did sit down with the NDDOT and a representative for the MPOs, and collaborated on the Draft PEL Process, which, to her knowledge the State has not yet signed off on. Johnson stated that that is correct, adding that it has been put on the back burner until they are done dealing with some other issues they have going on right now.

Hickman commented that Phase II just kicked off in August, and it will go through the next two years. She referred to a slide, and pointed out that on the right side of the slide it lists the initiatives that are being brought out for Phase II. She stated that the last five initiatives: 1) High Friction Surfaces; 2) Intersection and Interchange Geometrics; 3) Geospatial Data Collaboration; 4) Implementing Quality Environmental Documentation; and 5) SHRP2 National Traffic Incident Management Responder Training were not rolled off this past fall along with the rest of the EDC2, but were rolled out this spring instead and they are called Twenty-first Century Technologies, and they will have more information on them in about April.

Hickman stated that the next slide is another new planning initiative called the "Public Involvement Reference" tool. She explained that it lets you see what the state agencies have in terms of public involvement opportunities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Hickman referred to the last slide and pointed out that it shows links to each of these pages and initiatives. She added that, as indicated, they were told that a guidebook will be out soon for Performance Based Planning and Programming.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2012, AND JANUARY 9TH, 2013,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Lang pointed out that his title is incorrect on both sets of minutes. He stated it should read: Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District.

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2012, AND JANUARY 19TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUBJECT TO THE CORRECTION DISCUSSED ABOVE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen referred to the Scope-Of-Work for the Kennedy Bridge Study, included in the packet, and pointed out that C2HM Hill is the consulting firm MNDOT hired to perform this study. He stated that they are still looking at various options, either to rehab it or to replace it. He added that they have identified a study area that is basically 1,000-feet on either side of the bridge.

Haugen commented that under replacement you should note that there are three alternatives listed that they have scoped out. He added that there has been discussion on doing a replacement project that would allow the existing bridge to remain in service throughout the replacement process, which would mean doing a new alignment for the bridge.

Haugen reported that KLJ has been hired to perform the Sorlie Bridge Study, and has already worked through Phase 1. Nick West, KLJ, added that they are currently in the process of working on the Scope-Of-Work for Phase 2 of this project, and hope to have it done soon.

Williams asked if they have gotten detailed enough to the point that they have determined that if the Kennedy Bridge is replaced and realigned, what the elevation will be, are they going to raise it. Haugen responded that he doesn't think they have gotten to that point yet. Noehre

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

commented that the first order of business will be to address Pier 6, to come up with a recommendation on how best to fix that issue.

Haugen reiterated that the schedules for these bridge projects are:

Kennedy in 2016
Sorlie in 2018

Information only.

MATTER OF ADVANCED TRAFFIC ANALYSIS CENTER (ATAC) SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY (VALLEY, SCHROEDER AND SOUT POINT SCHOOLS)

Ellis stated that she really doesn't have much to add to the discussion this body held at its December meeting, which is when we went over the draft improvements for each school. She said that they held a meeting two weeks ago with the schools and Safe Kids, and went over the respective recommendations for each school.

Ellis commented that one of the issues that came up for Schroeder was that Safe Kids has been working with the middle school to try to alleviate some of the traffic congestion in the two parking lots. She explained that one of the lots actually belongs to Kelly Elementary, but a lot of the parents will drive through that lot to pick up their kids at the middle school, however there is no left turn so they swing out which causes a problem with the parents that are entering into the middle school parking lot, so Safe Kids has requested they restripe or reconfigure the two lots so that they maintain more of a separation between them. She stated that ATAC was a little concerned that there was too much "engineering" involved with this, however they reminded them that in past ATAC studies they have been able to look at restriping or reconfiguring the parking lot without going into specific detail. She said that they did add some turn lanes coming out of the parking lot, one that would allow right turns only and one that would allow left turns only. She stated that they also suggested the idea of remote parking for the middle school, maybe having a different location for parents to sit and wait to keep them away from the entrances and congestion.

Ellis stated that another issue is buses that will pull into the middle school site, and when you add a bus into a drive through area, now you are causing additional congestion by having two or even three cars parking by each other and cars trying to go around buses, etc., so the other suggestion ATAC made since the last time we discussed recommendations was to keep the buses out of the parking lots, or at least have them wait until the majority of the dismissal had been completed.

Ellis reported that for Valley and South Point schools ATAC suggested adding some additional parking. She stated that South Point would do that just to the east, where some of the teachers and staff could park, thus leaving a drive-through and additional areas for parents to park when they pick-up and drop-off students.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Ellis stated that ATAC also suggested moving the bike-rack from the east side to the west side. She pointed out that when you enter South Point there is a Safe Routes to School sidewalk that comes in and a majority of the bicycle students are first crossing the traffic on 13th then they are crossing traffic going through the drive-through lane just to get to the bike racks, so we are asking them to weave through traffic to get to the bike rack, so we are suggesting they be moved closer to the school. She commented that Safe Kids has put funding in for the bike racks, so we are pushing the schools to put in the cement pad, then Safe Kids will put in more racks.

Ellis reported that it was suggested that additional parking be put in at Valley, off of their playing field area, as well as some sign corrections. She stated that they noticed there was striped parking right up against some of the entrance and exit doors, which they found strange, to have a door that would open right into a parking space, so it was suggested that they change some of that parking to make it more open and accessible to the students.

Ellis commented that the long-term suggestion for all schools is to consider the Hawk or the hybrid beacons in the future, to do studies to see if it would be something that would enhance the student's abilities to cross the street at 32nd Avenue South due to the amount of traffic on that roadway.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT FOR THE ATAC SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FOR VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL, SCHROEDER MIDDLE SCHOOL, AND SOUTH POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

FAREWELL TO NANCY ELLIS AND WELCOME TO AMBER BOLL

Haugen asked Nancy Ellis to give a brief overview of her new job duties as the City Planner for the City of East Grand Forks.

Ellis stated that she is now working full-time for the City of East Grand Forks as the City Planner, under a new department called "Community Development". She explained that it includes transit, building inspections and permits, planning, facilities maintenance, energy savings, and green step city. She said that she calls it the "junk drawer" as it seems like anything someone is doing they don't want to do she gets it. She added that she also does snow removal and mowing violations, changing of the liquid soap dispensers in the men's bathroom before the Governor comes, and fixing the men's urinal and tighten toilet seats, so she is a jack of all trades now. Hickman commented that they always say that if they don't know what else to do with something they give it to the planner. Lang asked if she would still be a member of the Technical Advisory Committee. Ellis responded that she would, so you will still see her once a month.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Haugen said that with Nancy's vacancy the MPO is receiving applications until February 22nd, so if anyone knows anyone that might be interested in the position, please tell them to look at our website for more information on the position, as well as for an application packet.

Haugen then introduced Amber Boll, the MPO's newest intern.

Boll stated that she is a senior at UND in the Geography Department, with an emphasis on Urban Planning. She said that she is in the process of hearing back from graduate schools for this fall, and will be with the MPO until the end of May.

MATTER OF NDDOT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SR2S) APPLICATIONS

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that it includes copies of the three applications the City of Grand Forks submitted to the MPO for consideration. He asked if either Ms. Williams or Mr. Romness would like to go over the projects briefly.

Williams stated that the first project, Permanent Solar Powered Speed Minder Radar Signs – citywide, is one they worked on with Safe Kids to identify the sites where these would go. She said that they checked with Mark Aubol, Street Superintendent, and he is able to take over the maintenance of them once they are in.

Williams reported that the second project is equipment to flash school beacons in emergencies – citywide. She explained that currently their beacons are all on timers, and those timers do not have enough slots to accommodate all the days kids are off, so they programmed the majority of them and then the rest of the time they just flash whether there is anyone there or not. She added that another problem they have with them is that in an emergency, if we let kids out early for any reason, or school starts late they can't flash the beacons to let motorists know.

Williams commented that the third project is a sidewalk infill project. She said that there are several portions of sidewalks that are on school property, or adjacent to it, and we are asking for funds to complete them. She stated that the other one is along 24th Avenue South where the proposed crosswalk would cross the English Coulee, there is a piece of sidewalk missing there that would connect all those patio homes.

Haugen reported that all three of these projects have been submitted through the City's process for approval, as well as to the MPO, and they have been reviewed by staff and it is felt that they are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and agree with the priority ranking given them, so we recommend approval.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2014 SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF NDDOT TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP)
APPLICATIONS**

Haugen reported that this is the MAP-21 program that is a consolidation of the former Safe Routes to School, Transportation Enhancements, and Recreational Trails programs. He pointed out that the last solicitation for Safe Routes to School was to deplete old SAFETEA-LU funds from the program, so that is why it was done as a separate solicitation this time in North Dakota.

Haugen commented that because North Dakota was doing a separate Safe Routes to School solicitation, they did not include Safe Routes as an eligible activity in the Transportation Alternatives Program solicitation this year. He added that Grand Forks has submitted three projects, and Mr. Romness will go over them briefly.

Romness reported that the number one project is the Historic Preservation of Granitoid Pavement in the Near South Side Historic District. He explained that the Granitoid Pavement there is over 100-years old now, and some of it is still able to be preserved, so they are looking at a program that will help extend the life of that pavement beyond the 100-years, but in doing that there is some granitoid that needs to be delisted, however the Historic Preservation groups do not want to delist anything until we have a program for preserving what is left, so we are working on getting that taken care of.

Romness stated that the second project is a shared use path along South 42nd Street. He explained that they received a petition with 130 signatures for a shared use path on 42nd and a connection to 32nd, so they are including that with an extended shared use path on the west side of 42nd Street between 17th Avenue South and 24th Avenue South. Williams added that this will eliminate the bike riders using our continuous left turn as a bike trail down the center of the street, which is what they are doing now.

Romness said that the third project is a shared use path extension along DeMers Avenue from South 42nd Street to South 48th Street. He explained that this has been a project for quite some time, however they have found that they need an easement or some right-of-way from the railroad, so it was dropped from number one to number three while they work on getting that right-of-way. He stated that this is an area that is used enough by pedestrians and bicyclists that there is a current trail in the dirt.

Haugen reported that these three projects were approved by the City Council for submittal to the MPO, and staff concurs that they are all consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and agree with the priority ranking, so we recommend approval.

***MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2014***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

***TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY DIGITAL PHOTOS

Haugen reported that this project is in the MPO's Annual Work Program and involves updating our pavement management system.

Kouba stated that, basically, since 2003 the MPO has been updating our digital imagery of our right-of-ways, and this is our third go-around for this. She said that they are just looking to a condition analysis through these photos.

Kouba commented that, as the RFP reads currently, it's definite that we have the classified roads, and we will be giving the opportunity for both the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks to come in on the project to do the local road if they so wish to. She added that she talked to East Grand Forks and they are behind doing the local roads, so that will be their option. She said that, mostly, with that option you're looking at mostly getting a cost benefit by reducing the cost for the consultant to come up here and do the actual work as opposed to coming up for the MPO and then coming up individually for the cities.

Kouba stated that other than that there's no real difference between what we have done in the past and with this current RFP, so we are looking for a recommendation to approve the RFP.

Noehre asked if they were only doing the imagery or are they doing the pavement condition assessment. Haugen responded that this RFP is only for the imagery, the pavement condition assessment will be a separate RFP.

Haugen explained that, as they discovered in their work program when drafting it last November/December, the MPO is only going to be paying for the federally eligible roadways, which are the functionally classified roadway, so we will do them as we always have, in both directions, and then as Teri described, we have approached both cities to see if they want to have the RFP include an option for them to tag along at 100% their cost to have their local streets done in one direction, and that is how the RFP is drafted.

Williams asked, to be consistent with MAP-21, could we say something other than "imagery" on the title of the RFP. She stated that it is really right-of-way asset management inventory that we are doing, so maybe it should indicate that in the title.

Johnson referred to the RFP document and pointed out that the scope of work states that the images will aid the cities in right-of-way related inventories, maintenance and budgeting, and to assist in the developing of pavement conditions ratings. He asked how this helps the MPO planning process. He said that there should be some language added that indicates how this ties

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

back to the MPO planning process. Haugen responded that staff would draft language to that effect and submit it for NDDOT's review, but would like to have the Technical Advisory Committee take action contingent upon approval of said language. Johnson agreed that that would be fine.

Ellis asked if staff had had a chance to talk to ICON yet about importing the pictures to the program. Kouba responded that it looks like you can, after doing some investigation you can bring in some pictures into the individual inventory as it is right now. Ellis stated that that was part of their question, that if they are getting this imagery it would be nice to be able to have the imagery with the segments in their ICON Pavement Management Software so that way when they click on a segment the imagery comes up with it, or is there, so they wanted to know if this was something they manually have to do, at an additional cost, or if there is a way that they can upload them, so that was their question for Teri, how that worked. Kouba responded that you can but it would have to be done manually, on your own.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY IMAGERY RFP SUBJECT TO NDDOT CONCURRENCE OF ADDITIONAL SCOPE-OF-WORK LANGUAGE AS REQUESTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR FREIGHT RAIL ACCESS STUDY

Haugen reported that this RFP is for our Freight Rail Access Study. He explained that this was a request that we received from the local Economic Development Corporation, plus in our Long Range Transportation Street and Highway meeting with the Stakeholders they were very interested in this topic as well, so in our 2013 work program we have initiated a study to identify how to get better access between freight and rail in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks

Haugen commented that the scope of work was drafted, and he knows that Mr. Johnson will have similar comments on it that he did on the previous RFP, to clarify how this ties back into the MPO planning process. He said that Mr. Johnson has submitted some draft language for us to consider to do that.

Haugen said that they are essentially trying to figure out how to address an interest on the economic development side of life to have industry come in to Grand Forks, with a lot of that interest stemming from work related to the Bakken oil reserves. He stated that one of the concerns or issues they are hearing is limited rail access for those industries, so we are trying to assist them by identifying the areas along the rails that are available, and what type of typical costs at a planning level there would be to improve rail access. He added that they are also asking the consultant to look at our street network as they try to identify places where increased rail activity might be, as well as freight activity that would impact our street and highway network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Haugen stated that one important component of this is to ensure that the quiet zones that we just established aren't affected, and/or negated in some areas if we allow increased freight/rail activities.

Haugen commented that he should highlight that he used the geography of the Federal Aid Adjusted Urban Boundary as he didn't want to include the entire MPO study area, but also didn't want to limit it to just inside the city limits of both cities, so he used the adjusted Federal Aid Urban Boundary for the geography of the study limits.

Romness asked if this study will also establish freight corridors. Haugen responded that this study does not have that in its scope of work. He said that they do have established truck routes. Hickman responded that, if she heard the question correctly, doing a freight study that identify appropriate corridors could potentially be eligible if you wanted to expand this RFP, although they would have to discuss it further with the NDDOT, but freight plans are eligible but you would have to discuss the details. Gengler asked if this aid area include that area east of the former landfill. Haugen responded that it does, it goes out to 69th.

Romness said that he thinks it would be advantageous to include the establishment of freight corridors. Haugen responded that his hesitation is that we do have a budget on this that did not include that option, and by adding it he isn't sure how that would increase the cost of the study, nor where those costs would be absorbed. Noehre asked if this it could be included as an optional item. Haugen responded it could, adding that it might then give us an idea of how to budget it for next year if needed. He asked Mr. Romness for clarification as to what it would mean to be designated a freight corridor versus what it is currently designated, a truck route. Romness responded that the he thinks the idea behind the corridor is the MAP-21 link, that it should be more of a system than a route.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE FREIGHT RAIL ACCESS STUDY SUBJECT TO NDDOT CONCURRENCE OF ADDITIONAL SCOPE-OF-WORK LANGUAGE, AS REQUESTED, AND THE INCLUSION OF AN OPTIONAL ITEM TO ESTABLISH FREIGHT CORRIDOR, IF POSSIBLE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

Haugen referred to the packet, pointing out that it includes some graphs that show growth areas, and that the staff report states that the City of Grand Forks has been addressing some potential changes to their land use plan to accommodate growth. He explained that one of the first things the staff report highlights is adopting a higher rate of growth for the planning horizon. He stated that the current rate is .9%, which is slightly higher than the last decade of growth which was at .7% per year, but the City is in the process of adopting a new rate of 1.2%.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he highlighted the fact that if we were sticking to the 9% per decade growth rate we would be dealing with a future population of roughly 68,000 people, but using the 1.2% rate we are now addressing 74,000 people.

Williams asked, if 1.2% is high, and 9% is mid, and 6% is low, is it supposed to be 12% for the high. Haugen responded it should.

Haugen commented that, as he wrote in the statement, our forecasted population in the 2035 plan was 74,300, and now our 2040 plan will be 74,200, so our plans will be essentially working off the same population forecasts now, where previously we would have been working off of 68,000, or less people.

Haugen reported that on the land use side, particularly in the southwest quarter of the City of Grand Forks, there is some switching of the forecasted land uses, with the general sense that it will be more commercial and less residential.

Haugen stated that for East Grand Forks there were no substantial changes to the growth, it was at 1.2% because the last decade saw them growing at that rate, so it was continued on.

Haugen reported that they then took those growth rates, and working with both cities identified where they thought we would be in 2025 and 2040. He explained that for this transportation plan they are doing and interim travel demand forecast to the year 2025.

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

Haugen stated that there are three additional slides, not included in the packet, that deal with financial information (copies of these slides are included in the file and available upon request).

Loss of Purchasing Power Graph from 2035

Haugen explained that as we go out further into the planning horizon we will be able to buy less and less project because the costs are escalating faster than the revenue stream coming in, and this graph indicates how we are shifting everything ten years, or adding ten years.

Financial Forecasts Revenue

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side they have agreed that a reasonable forecast of future revenue is a growth of 3% per year. He said that they are taking their historical expenditure of projects through the T.I.P. document. He added that now, because of SAFETEA-LU they have added the obligation listing as they are required to not only show what we programmed, but what we actually obligated for each T.I.P. year, so we are showing that we were programmed to have during the T.I.P. life, \$58,000,000 worth of projects, but on the North

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

Dakota side we are projecting that we will actually obligate \$54,000,000, so based on the average of those two amounts, starting in our base year of 2016 and projecting out 3% each year to 2040, we will have a range of \$226,000,000 to \$210,000,000 in revenue.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side they have advised us to use a 2% growth for revenue, so doing the same exercise they come up with either \$52,000,000 or \$40,000,000 of revenue available, which, if you add the two together brings us to \$278,000,000 to \$250,000,000 in revenue.

Haugen reported that if we had simply done our 2035 forecasted revenue out another five years, the 2040 revenue would have forecasted out to \$293,000,000, so with this planning effort we are forecasting less revenue than in our 2035 plan.

Financial Forecasts Project Cost

Haugen stated that for North Dakota we are using a 4% rate, and for Minnesota we are using a 5% rate. He explained that this table represents is, if they just took their recommended projects in our 2035 Plan (Table 16) and inflated them out to reflect these new costs, the total cost of the projects is \$364,000,000.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT NDDOT STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP)

Haugen pointed out that a copy of the full power point presentation on this item is included in the packet. He said that the one thing he wanted to highlight is, in the past North Dakota lumped all of their federal funds into one pot of monies from which the urban areas got a certain percentage of funding, which was then further divided 50/50 between the regional system and the local urban system, thus if Grand Forks were to get safety dollars for a project that amount awarded was deducted from their Urban Program, but now this Draft Strategic Highway Safety Plan states that it is going to end that process, so no longer will the Urban Roads Program have monies deducted for safety dollars awarded to a project.

Haugen said that one of the reasons for this change is because this is a data driven planning document, and as they went through the data they found that over 50% of the severe and fatal crashes in North Dakota are occurring at urban intersections.

Haugen commented the one thing that isn't really clear, and he will follow up on this, is that the Draft Plan says that the new process of not deducting funds from urban areas will begin in 2013, however, if you recall, last fall the solicitation for this program was done and there wasn't any mention of this new policy, so they are programming projects out that may or may not be based on this new policy, so he will have to follow up on this, unless Mr. Johnson knows what is going on with it. Johnson responded that he is not really positive, but he is aware that the funding no

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

longer comes out of our urban pots, they are going to be funded separately, but they will still be managing those projects.

Discussion ensued.

Haugen stated that because there will now be a separate pot, he wonders if there will be slightly more revenue for us to be able to do some of these safety projects, but that is still unknown at this time.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST
CENTUURY (MAP-21) IMPLEMENTATION**

Haugen said that, as you are aware, Minnesota has been working on their twenty-year highway investment plan. He stated that we have had some previous meetings here where we talked about a scenario plan that MnDOT was doing, with an Approach A, Approach B, and Approach C, and they are now trying to get stakeholder feedback as to whether or not MnDOT would change their investment policies, and if so which of these approaches would be the ones we would try to steer them towards.

Haugen reported that Approach B is their current investment policies; Approach A was more of an asset driven policy where the focus would be on the pavement performances, the bridge conditions, etc.; and Approach C was focusing more on mobility and mobility management by trying to address the Twin Cities and regional community improvement priorities.

Haugen commented that yesterday, MnDOT showed the results of that process, from a public input perspective, and they came up with a kind of hybrid policy somewhere between Approach A and Approach C.

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

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Special Meeting

Haugen stated that he would be calling for a special Technical Advisory Committee meeting sometime in late February to go over the 2025 and 2040 ? networks in order to start identifying alternative projects. He said that one thing he asks, and he will send an e-mail with the beginning of a list, is, if you recall, our mission in this Long Range Transportation Plan is to identify every project \$1,000,000 or more in cost, and we will be using 2012 as our starting

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2013**

point, so if it is less than \$1,000,000 in 2012 we won't identify them in the plan, but if they are \$1,000,000 or more we will. He added that our task is to not only identify those costs, but to also try to pigeon hole them as to when we think they will be programmed.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 13TH, 2013, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:12 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 13th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planning; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT- Grand Forks District; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Ali Rood, Grand Forks Area Cities Transit; Bobbi Retzlaff (proxy for Joe McKinnon), MNDOT-Central Office; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit

Guest(s) present were: Nick West, KLJ and Josh Hinds, HDR.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen introduced Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and Mikel Smith, MPO Intern, and asked that they say a little about themselves. He then asked that the Committee members to introduce themselves as well.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 13, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 13TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy

Haugen reported that he included in the packet information that was part of a kick-off meeting between the consultants and those people identified as potential study advisory committee members. He explained that this was an opportunity for the consultants to introduce themselves and to become a little more familiar with the local reaction to some of the information they had assembled, as well as with some of the historical properties in and around the bridge itself. He added that there was also considerable discussion regarding the slippage issues with one of the piers.

Haugen commented that one concern with the pier is just how much more adjusting can be done to it, and another is the fact that MnDOT staff feel it is starting to stretch their local capabilities of doing adjustments on that pier to ensure it remains in place. He stated that because of these concerns, the first component of the study is to take a look at this pier and determine what issues really are relevant and what remedies, if any, can be done.

Haugen stated that once that portion of the study is done they will then be able to begin the primary component of the study, and that is to determine whether or not the bridge can be rehabbed, or if it needs to be replaced.

Haugen said that this is a twelve-month study, and the study schedule was included in the packet. He pointed out that the first proposed public meeting will be held in late June. He added that prior to that their first tech memo will be completed and distributed by the end of this month, or early next month, and will address Pier 6.

Haugen commented that there was confusion between the Kennedy Bridge Study and the Sorlie Bridge Study because a lot of the environmental agencies that are being contacted aren't familiar with the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks, or even the North Dakota/Minnesota areas so when we are talking about two bridges that are fairly close in proximity, and they are being contacted about both of them, the potential for confusion becomes quite high.

Haugen stated that there is also some confusion about the fact that the Sorlie Bridge, which is being led by North Dakota, is going into an Environmental Impact Statement phase, and whether or not the NEPA process has started, or if this study is pre-NEPA. He said that some people feel that the NEPA process has started, while others are of the opinion that this is a pre-NEPA study that is looking at the basic alternatives to try to eliminate a lot of alternatives before entering the formal NEPA process.

Romness asked what the consequences are of entering the formal NEPA process. Haugen responded that it would probably entail spending more money to make sure that all agencies and all potential involvement takes place from the start. He added that by starting the NEPA process you would fully engage all of the participation requirements right from the start, so you aren't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

precluding points of view that might cause alternatives to be further considered if they are involved right from the start. Romness asked, however, if it isn't still considered part of the planning process, or has it then gone into programming at that point. Haugen responded that the project development phase is typically when we start the NEPA process, you move from programming to NEPA and project development. He explained that there is a Federal Highway's initiative of "every day counts", and one of its strategies is to do planning and environmental linkage, or PEL. He said that MAP-21 has initiated federal law that states that there should be more linking of the planning in environmental documents. He added that the planning laws have always required that we contact our environmental agencies for their input, but typically they are too busy and don't get really engaged in the planning process, so when we try to bring in all those planning findings into NEPA, and they haven't been engaged prior to that they tend to want to go back, challenge, and redo all the work, but if you invoke the PEL they have to participate, or, if they didn't participate in the planning, they have to accept that planning activity.

Haugen reported that ND FHWA and NDDOT, through the "every day counts" initiative, worked out a programmatic agreement that would identify how we can take our corridor studies and merge them with some project development so we have a combined planning PCR document, where planning carries the front end of it, and at some point there is a transition to the back end of project development. He stated that this was submitted to upper management, but he doesn't believe that they have formally signed off on the draft agreement.

Bergman asked if a consensus has been reached yet as to whether or not the NEPA process has begun yet. Haugen responded that a decision has not been reached. He added that the meeting was held a week ago, and he has not yet heard anything since between MnDOT, MN FHWA, and the consultant as to where they sit on it.

Haugen reported that one thing they have discussed is that with both the Kennedy and the Sorlie Bridges having their studies occurring at the same time, but with the Kennedy trying to have a project programmed in 2016, and the Sorlie in 2018, by possibly delaying work on the Sorlie a bit the confusion level between the two might be lessened quite a bit.

Sorlie

Haugen reported that it is his understanding that Phase 1 was to try to help all the parties involved determine what the proper project development document, or NEPA document is to pursue. He said that it has more or less been decided that it should be an EIS document, and KLJ is scoping that work and will present it to the DOT. He asked if KLJ was still scoping and negotiating, or if that has all been concluded. Josh Hinds, KLJ, responded that if their scope hasn't already been submitted, it will be in the next couple of days, and they should have a completed contract within the next month so they can proceed with the next phase of the study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

Haugen commented that when we get to approval of the T.I.P., which is the next agenda item, you will see that we have some 2013 costs identified with these studies included, plus in 2016 we have something identified for the Kennedy Bridge.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT FINAL NORTH DAKOTA 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that several months ago we adopted a Minnesota side T.I.P. in its final form; but on the North Dakota side a final T.I.P. was delayed until today.

Haugen stated that a public hearing notice was posted, so he would like to open the public hearing at this time. There was no one present for discussion. Haugen closed the public hearing. He commented that it was also advertised that the public could provide written comments until noon today, and none were received.

Haugen reiterated that, again, this T.I.P. is only addressing projects on the North Dakota side. He pointed out that with the inclusion of the Kennedy Bridge project we have roughly a \$67,000,000 four-year expenditure of transportation improvements, ranging from simple security for Cities Area Transit to \$25,000,000 for potential replacement of the Kennedy Bridge. He commented that the table also shows expenditure by year, from a low of \$6,000,000 to a high of \$36,000,000.

Haugen referred to the individual listing of projects, and explained that they worked with the transit operator, and the State DOT to try to infuse, as best they could, the MAP-21 changes as well.

Romness asked for a summarization of any changes that might be in this draft versus the first draft of the T.I.P. Haugen responded that they adopted a draft back in July, and at that time they were informed of the most significant changes and that was the delay of a lot of the Grand Forks Urban Roads projects a year or two, that is when Phase 2 of Columbia Road got pushed out to 2012. He said that these things have all been carried through to this draft, none have been moved back to earlier year. He added that there have been a couple of district projects that were added in from the earlier draft to this draft, most of which are district wide initiatives that, because they may involve some area within the MPO they are listed. Romness asked if Gateway Drive was added back in. Haugen responded that Gateway Drive, I-29 to 55th, is still included, and as far as he knows it was never changed. He said, however, that he knows that South Washington was moved to 2014. Romness commented that it is his understanding that the Gateway Drive project might be moved.

Haugen stated that there were some minor cost changes, but other than those few projects that we already amended in during the interim of 2012 to this final 2013 document, no major changes were made.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL 2013-2016 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. CONTINGENT ON STATE AND FEDERAL REVIEW AND COMMENTS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM

Haugen reported that currently we use count boards and employ temporary personnel to sit at intersections for twelve hours and manually compute what each individual vehicle is doing at that intersection, however, with the recent installation by the City of Grand Forks at some of their signal projects that were just completed, we have quite a bit of extensive video detection coverage now, so we are going to engage A.T.A.C. to assist us in trying to develop a program in which we can use the video detection capabilities to conduct those counts for us.

Haugen referred to the Scope-of-Work, included in the packet, and stated that it has identified this as Phase 1. He explained that this is essentially the beginning phase that allows A.T.A.C. to come in and do an inventory of all the equipment, and assess its abilities, and then to allow them to plan how to determine how we can engage them in the fashion we desire. He said that once this Phase 1 inventory is completed, then we will go to Phase 2 whereby we will do pilot implementations and try to work out the kinks, and compare the data with the manual counts we are doing to ensure we are getting reasonable results, so there will be a second Scope-of-Work for Phase 2 that you will be looking at.

Haugen commented that this is in our work program, with the initial contract amount just over \$3,200.00. He stated that they did have Grand Forks Engineering staff review this and provide comments, and are recommending this body approve the Final Draft Scope-of-Work.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT SCOPE-OF-WORK FROM A.T.A.C. TO COMPLETE A TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM STUDY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF 2013 FLOOD OUTLOOK

Haugen reported that every March, since we completed the Bridge Closure Traffic Management Plan, we have highlighted the latest information available on the potential for flooding in the area. He stated that this is information that was released last Thursday, and it was based on conditions as of March 4th.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that if you look at the last line you will see that it shows the basic information for just Grand Forks. He explained that “CS” is the current statistical chance of the river reaching those different flood stages, and “HS” is the historical statistical chance of the conditions, so you can see that a minor flood, which may start to impact closure of some of our river crossings, is currently shown to be in the 50/50 percent range of occurrence. He stated that the best news is that there is a slight chance that we will reach a major flood stage.

Haugen commented that there is a weekly chance probability, and it indicates that it won't be an early flood if it does occur, but will most likely be a late April event. Romness asked how that will affect our traffic counts, aren't we doing them in April. Haugen responded that we aren't really doing many counts, and A.T.A.C. will get us primed and ready to do the count comparisons in the fall, so this shouldn't really affect us. Romness asked if North Dakota wasn't doing some counts. Haugen responded they are doing a couple of counts. Romness asked if this would be occurring right about the time we are talking major flooding it there is any. Haugen responded that it could potentially be an issue for them, however, as you get away from the River you start to not have the impact of bridge closure.

Haugen stated that the other part of this item is to ensure that the distribution of contacts is up-to-date. He said that they are in the process of checking the information and once completed an up-to-date list will be distributed.

Information only.

MATTER OF MAP-21 IMPLEMENTATION

Haugen reported that last month we spent a lot of time on MnDOT's guidance for the next T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle, and how they are holding pretty well on the current T.I.P. that was adopted last fall, and then also the changes that will start in 2017 as we start to draft the next T.I.P./S.T.I.P.

Haugen said that we are now spending a little time on the North Dakota implementation of MAP-21. He pointed out that included in the packet was a document that North Dakota called “Issues and Concerns White Paper”. He explained that part of what is being laid out here is, with the continued resolutions that happened primarily between SAFETEA-LU expiration and MAP-21 becoming law, North Dakota was having a hard time having their planning dollars match up well with what they are actually able to spend on the programming side, and in the end there was an accounting balance for the Urban Program that was quite substantial. He added that they were hoping that when the new authorized bill came through that there would be enough money to make that account balance full, but the reality is that this is just paper money so North Dakota was indicating that they needed to do an adjustment to their Urban Program, and part of that included they look at how MAP-21 consolidated many of the different programs that they traditionally using to pay for the Urban Road Program, so they identified a way, which is highlighted in Option 2, to actually more-or-less maintain the funding they had traditionally been

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

providing the counties and cities, with the slight difference of an increase in the city account will increase a bit at the expense of the county program.

Haugen reported that another part of the accounting issue is, planning wise they use apportionments for the most part, although they are now trying to the process with the actual obligational limits. He explained that Congress gives you, say \$100.00, but they tell you you are only authorized to spend \$90.00 of it, so if you start thinking you have \$100.00, but when you get to \$90.00 your told you can't spend any more, it tends to create some heartache.

Haugen referred to a spreadsheet, included in the packet, explaining that it is the work of the DOT and the thirteen, now twelve urban areas in North Dakota, and went over it briefly. He commented that in the end this means that instead of starting out in 2013 \$3,700,000 in the hole, we are starting out \$3,000,000 to the good, so when we go back to the T.I.P. document we just approved, we now have funds in our account balance that allow us to do the projects that are identified in 2013 and carry it forward into 2014, 2015, and 2016 as well.

Haugen asked Stacey Hanson, NDDOT, if they would be providing the other part of the spreadsheet soon. Hanson responded that they would, however they haven't completed it yet.

Haugen commented that the other information in the "White Paper" is a little bit of discussion on how North Dakota was going to implement the new Transportation Alternatives program. He said that one of the first decisions they had to make was whether the Recreational Trails program would remain, and you can see that they made a decision for this current fiscal year that it would, so they had to separate \$1,000,000 of the \$4,000,000 to make sure it was viable. He added that the remaining \$3,200,000 is distributed 50% statewide by population and the other 50% is available anywhere in the State. He pointed out that it shows that they are potentially transferring that 50% of the TA program into the STP program, or are taking it from the Alternative Transportation and putting it traditionally into Street and Highway Transportation. He added that, based on the fact that they have not solicited for the \$1,600,000 yet, it is most likely that they have made the decision to transfer those monies to STP.

Haugen stated that this focuses on the street side of North Dakota, and there is a conference call scheduled for next Monday between the transit operators and the NDDOT and Federal Highway, which is our lead federal agency, and FTA Denver, to start discussion on how MAP-21 is affecting the transit side of revenues, and programming and planning.

Haugen reported that another bit of information is that the NWATP in Minnesota is meeting tomorrow and will be making the final decisions on what the amount of flexed highway dollars to transit will be, and where it will come from.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that Teri Kouba, Planner, is going to walk us through work that our Intern, Amber Boll, has been working on, which is basically looking at our on-street, or when we do those turning movement counts we also count the bike/ped activity that is taking place. He explained that they have asked Amber to compare those activities with the off-street trail usage study that was done a few years back, and that is the information we are covering today.

a. Bike-Ped

Kouba stated that, basically, what Amber had started out doing was looking at the elements and then looking at what we've put into our Bike and Pedestrian Plan to let everybody know what has already been done and what we will be adding to it, which will be looking at what all non-motorized modes are doing, they're not just out on the trails, they are also out on the streets.

Kouba commented that they took their turning movement counts and they went through, and we have all these areas around our cities that we take all these turning movement counts at, but we are also collecting bike and pedestrian information. She stated that bikes are mostly on the streets, pedestrians are all on the sidewalks, but as we see there is definitely areas where there are more bikes, there's more peds, and where we really get into the nitty-gritty of the comparisons is when you start looking at what numbers are the bikes going to be there at the signal, where are most of our bikes moving from or moving around in, and we can see it is in the downtown, we can see it is definitely in the University area.

Kouba reported that most of our major areas are focused between DeMers and Gateway Drive. She said that it can lead us to a lot of wondering what times of days so we look at the times of days as well, and it is pretty even throughout the day but we do see a spike in the evenings, of course, with more recreational usage happening, moving from certain areas to where the trails are located. She stated, however, that once again the University area is pretty much steady all day long, all morning long. She added that they see a very similar accounting in pedestrians as well, once again we are still looking at the downtown, we're still looking at the University, anything between Gateway and DeMers, and we are seeing very similar timeframes that people are out and about walking as well. She said that they do see a slight spike in the late evenings where we assume there is more of a recreational use going on.

Kouba stated that they then took the counts and they kind of looked at what they did with our trail usage, and they found that they are pretty even; the usage for trails and the usage on-street is even, and that will allow us to focus in on being able to connect the two so that we don't have a focus on one or the other, we are going to have to focus on both, especially where are trails are and where our bike routes are as we do need to make more connections so that they are safer, and that will be a recommendation in the upcoming Bike and Ped Plan.

Rood asked if the counts were taken last summer. Kouba responded that they were taken last summer. She stated that they did do some comparisons between 2009 and 2012 on-street as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

well, but they are seeing an increase of usage. Rood asked, beside there being more usage in the evenings did you see any relationship between like the peak vehicle travel times. Kouba responded that that was the trend, it is harder to see as it just depends upon the area, like Central High School is a good example in that you can kind of see in that area right there, you see the morning spike, you see the afternoon spike, and those are your highest accountings, kids getting to and from school, and then, of course the evening one is a lot less, but just a few more blocks and you see that there is kind of a mid-morning and afternoon timeframe is pretty equal to your evening timeframe as well.

Romness asked how many times we have counted bike and ped. Kouba responded that any time we do a turning movement count we will do them as well. Romness asked if there has been steady growth. Kouba responded that from what they can compare, because they haven't done every intersection every time, so we can only compare certain ones. She stated that 2009 and 2012 are good examples of comparisons because they have many of the same intersections that were counted so there is a decent comparison. She added that they hope that with the traffic study, and what we are going to be doing with A.T.A.C., we will be able to do this yearly and definitely see trends.

Discussion on how various conditions/situations affect the counts ensued.

Haugen stated that this is the genesis of the MnDOT study, that they are trying to bring it up to a similar level of sophistication as with the factoring of two counts and turning movement counts are where you have your day of the week factors, your monthly factors, etc., and that is just lacking as a sophisticated program nationally, and MnDOT is taking a lead on trying to bring it up to a higher level.

Ellis commented that MnDOT is even doing modeling dependent upon the size of the city, so what they see in Fertile is going to be different than what we see in East Grand Forks, which will be different than what they see in St. Louis Park. She said that they are trying to figure out some sort of a statistical way that you can kind of figure it out, you can't model for the Cities and then take that model and use it for East Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that, corresponding with the increase in transit use, typically a transit user is a pedestrian or bicyclist at the start or end of their journey, so that trend will also support and suggest that there is more bike/ped activities taking place.

b. Performance Measures

Haugen commented that a few months ago we went through some fun discussion on performance measures, goals and objectives that were focused on the street and highway side. He said that the document that is before you today is trying to take that work and incorporate into it the other modes; bike, ped and transit, and come up with a ?? to our goals, the performance targets and monitoring activities that may be appropriate for us to consider.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

Haugen said that we started out with this document with the knowledge that MAP-21 is requiring us to do performance measures. He added that MAP-21 has a timeline in place that states that the MPOs can wait a few years before they actually have to formally adopt and/or identify performance measures, however we were encouraged prior to the passage of MAP-21 to do so, and were expected to come up with performance measures when we adopt this transportation plan this spring, so we have tried to take this approach on the street and highway side to focus in on just a vital few performance targets instead of trying to identify many and all, so that is what the document before you includes.

Haugen reported that during a brief conversation with Bobbi prior to this meeting, and with MnDOT being leaders in performance management, and with the drafting of these measures, they are going to request a meeting to help us get the proper syntax and nomenclatures. He said that they feel some of our targets are more strategies than targets, so we will be led by the performance management gurus to determine how to have a better document. He added that their thinking on this is that we have eight goals, but that perhaps we don't need to have performance measures for each of those goals.

Haugen asked that everyone please look at your individual interests, and once we have the meeting with MnDOT they will send out our improved work, but if you could provide some guidance that would be helpful as well.

c. 2025 and 2040 Loaded Networks

Haugen reported that last month he did a presentation on where the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks plan to grow in the years 2025 and 2040, and with that information they were able to load up their travel demand model.

Haugen stated that he would like to briefly go over the information included in the agenda packet, but will also augment it with some GIS work as well.

Haugen explained that one of the first things they do at a planning level is to compare what the future forecasts volumes are to the capacity identified. He said that the street network we have in 2025 consists of what is out there today, with what is in our T.I.P. that will be done in the next four years, and then when we have areas in the middle of a section where it is raw agricultural land, in order for us to assume there is going to be a couple hundred housing units constructed, there needs to be a collector type street system in place, which is traditionally done through local funding, so we include those collector type street networks where we have development occurring in section area land, so they aren't trying to create a street network that is implementing new river crossings, new interchanges yet, we are just looking at the base network plus the existing and committed improvements we know will be there.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation, and went over the information briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

Haugen summarized by stating that this shows that if we do nothing we will have a lot of congested areas the public will be telling us we need to do something with. He said that the next step is, and this is why we have asked for a special meeting next Tuesday, to start identifying what projects we want to consider to be addressed, not only for the issues popping up in the future, but also for the existing concerns as well.

Haugen stated that we will model the alternatives to see how they benefit, to what degree they benefit, and then we will start identifying what the costs will be. He said that we know what our total bank account is, we have that number from last month, so we can start adding up projects to the point where we are fiscally constrained, and that will become our recommended network, and those other projects we would like to have done, but don't have the funding to do, we will set aside as illustrative projects.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Special Meeting

Haugen reminded everyone that a special meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 19th, at 1:30 here in Conference Room A101 to further discuss the Long Range Transportation Plan Update.

2. Solicitation For North Dakota MAP 5310 Urban Area Elderly And Disabled Person Mobility Grant

3. RFPs

Haugen stated that there are currently two RFPs out, the Freight/Rail Access and the Right-of-Way Imaging projects. He said that interest has been expressed on both, and they are both due at the end of the month.

4. Congressional Update

Haugen reported that the House passed a proposed full 2013 budget with a slight decrease in transportation from MAP-21 levels, however the Senate is passing the full MAP-21 funding for transportation. He stated that at the end of the month Congress needs to do something otherwise there is no money, and sequestration will look like a small thing.

5. Bus Fare Increase

Rood reported that the new City bus fares will go into effect April 1st.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2013**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 13TH, 2013,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:52 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 19th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 19th, 2013, 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: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Parviz Noori, ND FHWA (via conference call); Les Noehre, NDDOT- Grand Forks District; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

Guests present were: Lance Bernard, Brian Shorten, and Nathan ??, SRF Consulting.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was not present.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON 2025 AND 2040 TRAVEL DEMAND FORECAST RESULTS

Haugen distributed copies of the agenda and discussion documents for today's meeting. Brian Shorten, SRF Consulting Group, was present via conference phone for a presentation/discussion on the 2025 and 2040 Travel Demand Forecast results.

1) Project Update

Shorten thanked everyone for attending today's meeting. He stated that they are happy to be moving forward with the update, adding that Earl had called them about two weeks ago to let them know that the modeling runs for 2040 had been completed, and he wanted to get the information to the Technical Advisory Committee as soon as possible. He gave a brief overview on what has transpired during the interim, and explained how some of their work aligns with Task 5, which is the range of alternatives, and which is what we will be discussing today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 19th, 2013**

Shorten commented that they did provide, in the packets, a project update memorandum listing what has been done to-date on the project, which has been kind of on hold while they waited for the model results to be produced. He referred to the memorandum and went over the tasks completed.

Shorten stated, again, that they are now beginning to work on Task 5: The Range of Alternatives Report, which they will be working on for the next month or so. He said that they will then work on the two remaining tasks for the planning process: Task 7 - which will look at the future network and implementation, and Task 8 - which is the draft and final report.

2) Overview of ATAC Model Assumptions/Outputs

Shorten reported that when they received the vehicle count (VC) information from ATAC, via Earl, they had a few questions as they wanted to ensure they understood the process as they began building this future project list. He stated that they were very comfortable with the assumptions ATAC used, but they had discussions with Earl and ATAC personnel in order for them to learn more about how ATAC did their forecasting and how the VC data was generated. He added that he does think they may want to have a follow up call with ATAC soon, but based on the most recent information forwarded to them they feel they have a pretty good understanding of how the VC data for 2025 and 2040 was calculated.

Haugen commented that they weren't planning on displaying any of the 2025 information today, but they do have it available if anyone wants to see it. Shorten said that it is his understanding that at your regular Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week Earl did present some of the VC data and the forecast data volumes posted on aerial photos, so you probably all had a chance to look at that information then anyway. He added that since that time they have been starting to do an analysis with that data to identify future project needs.

3) Review Old Long Range Transportation Plan Project List

Shorten referred to the packet and pointed out that the first two tables is actually a list of projects from the old Long Range Transportation Plan. He explained that what Lance and Nathan did was to take the list from the old plan and to go through it to update to 2013. He said that he really wants to emphasize that this is the beginning of a process here, that these are worksheets that are far from done, but they needed to put something together to get your reactions, and based on comments they have gotten from Earl over the weekend, and since last week, they have already been making a lot of revisions, which is what they wanted to do. He added that they also want input from everyone here today as well, so that they can continue to fine tune these matrixes.

Shorten commented that they do understand that there is a 2012 aerial available for them to use for this, however they did use a 2011 aerial here so they will transfer the data over to the updated aerial, but it didn't make sense to do it before this meeting as the information you have was already mailed and it would have made things confusing for this discussion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 19th, 2013**

Shorten stated that they are now beginning the process of project analysis through the range of alternatives. He referred to the old LRTP tables, and pointed out that under the project descriptions they do show that some of the projects have been completed since the last plan was adopted, so they obviously won't worry about carrying those projects forward. He added that there are some projects that they defined by general project type, as well as whether or not they still feel they are viable. He explained that Nathan took the new 2025 and the new 2040 VC information from ATAC and compared it to these projects to see, at least from a congestion/mobility standpoint, if they were still needed, so if you look at the "X's" in those columns, they indicate that they are still needed, they are still justified, and by what year. He pointed out that to the right of the "X's" you will also see a rationale, and, again using only the VC as a criteria, they understand that in this original project list some of the projects were generated and put in the fiscally constrained plan as a priority, not because of the VC, but maybe because of a high crash rate, or freight issues, or because they were in rural transition areas, etc., so it isn't just VC that determines the need for the project, however now that we have the ATAC data this is our first chance to use it as a first cut to see what remains from the old plan's projects that we still feel are needed.

Shorten pointed out that at the very right of the table you will see that Lance also took the project costs and updated them to 2013 levels, which will be the base we use to do year of expenditure later.

Shorten referred the second page of the table and pointed out that there are 2Map ID 33s, both 47th Avenue projects. He said that both of these projects probably should be included on the next matrix as well. He explained that when we now see the 2025 and 2030 VC numbers it looks like 32nd Avenue is going to be quite congested, and a way to relieve that congestion might be to add capacity to 47th Avenue and also add an access onto I-29.

Shorten stated that some of these projects that you will see on this matrix, and especially on the next matrix, which are the potential future projects, have not been tested thoroughly yet. He said that at this point they are just trying to get projects on the list for further analysis, so nobody should think that this is the list, it is just the beginning of a project venue that will be refined through the various technical steps that they propose to do in Task 5, and out of that will be a list of projects which then will be prioritized by you through a ranking process.

Haugen asked for an observation; he said it seems to him that a lot of the recommendations in our 2035 plan are addressing issues that are still showing up in the 2040 forecasts. Shorten responded that that is what they are finding. Haugen said that it seems to him that there aren't any projects that are no longer needed, based on what the new model is indicating so far. Shorten responded that if you look at this matrix, under the grey columns, the 2025/2040 VC columns, you don't see "X's" there, and they're not already completed projects, so what they have done here is to circle those in order to ask about them as they don't show up as VC issues. He referenced various projects and went over the rationale given to either keep them as viable projects, or delete them as not still being viable projects, pointing out that where you see "X's" they feel the project is viable, and where there aren't "X's" they wanted to ask your opinion as to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 19th, 2013**

whether or not you feel they are still viable knowing that they could be viable for reasons other than VC, which is the only piece of information they have at this time to measure the viability of the whole project list.

Shorten asked if the committee wanted to go over those projects without “X’s” to determine whether or not they should remain in the plan based on a justification other than VC issues. He pointed out, however, that there are still a number of analyses to be completed under this task: 1) Earl has several more runs from ATAC to analyze different project alternatives; 2) SRF will look at about five projects that may be bigger projects to see if their TSM alternatives; etc., so this is just the beginning of that, but if there are projects you feel aren’t needed we can cull them out at this point.

Noehre said that he printed out the attachments sent to him via e-mail, and he has two old Long Range Transportation Plan matrices, one has a subheading of short-range and the other doesn’t have a subheading, and he is wondering if they are identical except for the heading. Lance Bernard, SRF Consulting, responded that they are identical. He stated that if you use the one that does not have the short-range heading on it, that would be the one they would like you to focus on. Shorten added that in the process of working with Earl to get this information out to the committee, there were different iterations that were sent.

Discussion on projects that should and shouldn’t remain in the plan ensued.

Haugen referred to the table and pointed out that some project costs are incorrect: 1) Map ID 15 – the base project cost is \$7,000,000 inflated out to 2013 instead of \$23,000,000; 2) Map ID 33 – cost estimate is too low. Bernard responded that they were just trying to put a placeholder in there by using the Merrifield Interchange cost estimate until the actual cost estimate is available.

Noehre asked when they updated the cost estimates did you use the normal cost of inflation or what we have experienced within the State for construction cost inflation. Bernard responded that they used the normal inflation rate to get the numbers up to 2013, a 5% inflation rate was used. Haugen added that they did that for some projects, but for other projects like the Washington Underpass, the Washington CFI, they used the cost estimates from those reports, so it is actually a kind of combination of the two rates. Bernard stated that one thing he would like to point out is that the cost estimates they have provided are just initial costs estimates they used to try to get a sense of where things might start to be aligning based on some of the future revenue forecasting they have done. He said that once they have really refined this project list, and they know that these are the projects that they are going to incorporate into the plan, they will be using a more refined rate to ensure they are more accurately reflect what the costs will be.

4) Review New Long Range Transportation Project (Menue) List

Shorten referred to the new Long Range Transportation Plan matrix, and said that from Page 3 on they are all maintenance projects that the NDDOT gave them, so they aren’t really projects that will be programmed into the plan, but instead are projects that they have to account for so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 19th, 2013**

that they understand and commit resources to so that all needs are met for federal highway guidelines, and then the remaining revenue available can be used for expansion projects, new projects, crash projects, etc., so we will focus on Pages 1, 2, and part of 3.

Shorten commented that what they are trying to do with this matrix, somewhat like the old matrix, is to walk through it and get the committee's input as to how you want it refined. He stated that this list is built on what they have seen from the new Model's VC data; from information they have based on their existing conditions report and analysis, such as crash data, high crash locations, etc.; from public input; from work done on the University Avenue Corridor; from pavement management information; and from freight discussions. He said that they aren't suggesting that all of these projects are justified, this is just the beginning menu, but they did take the VC analysis that ATAC did, and looked at it to determine whether or not these projects did have a congestion or mobility issue, and reflected those findings here.

Shorten reported that there are some additional high crash locations that need to be added to the matrix: 1) 13th and Washington; 2) 28th and Washington; and 3) 31st and 32nd Avenue). He stated that these additions, along with the comments made today, will be implemented into the matrices.

Discussion on whether or not a project should remain on the list ensued.

Haugen asked what the difference is between preservation and maintenance projects. Shorten responded that he thinks the reason they are showing preservation projects on Pages 1, 2, and part of 3 is because they involve city roads, and the ones on part of Page 3, and Pages 4 and 5 are all State Highways. Bernard commented that in most cases the projects are the same whether we call them maintenance or preservation projects. Shorten added that what they were trying to do with the projects that NDDOT provided was to use the criteria of non-expansion, and over a million dollars in order to meet federal highway requirements for taking care of overhead and maintenance. Noehre stated that he would call most of what he sent preservation projects.

Discussion continued.

Haugen reported that he has already requested that ATAC run three more models: 1) all of the recommended projects in our current plan, with our 2040 forecasts; 2) all of the 2035 recommendations plus the 47th Avenue Interchange; and 3) all of the 2035 recommendations but with just 47th instead of Merrifield Interchange. He stated that this will let us see whether or not the Merrifield Interchange would relieve congestion on 32nd Avenue by itself; and we will see how 47th works with and without Merrifield.

Shorten asked how many more runs there are after that on the budget with ATAC. Haugen responded that there are eleven runs remaining. Shorten suggested that everyone pick a couple more runs they would like to see Earl give ATAC to do, there would still be a few left for some additional ones once we refine the list. Haugen commented that another sequence would be, we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 19th, 2013**

already have ATAC running with both future bridges, we could spend two runs on either or bridge if we want.

5) Next Steps

Shorten commented that this, then, takes us to our agenda item 5a – so defining these runs that you want to see done, and then with that information we will take all the comments made today, as well as that information and start culling more projects out of here.

Shorten stated that another thing they wanted to get input and direction on was; as he mentioned, CPS is going to do eight layouts, very conceptual layouts, but sufficient enough information so that when they come back for the public meeting they can show people what the footprint would look like, what the impacts would be right-of-way wise or section or cross-section wise, cost wise, etc., so he would like to know what your priorities are for those eight layouts. Haugen commented that he has already requested that they look in earnest at Columbia Road, both north of 32nd Avenue and also south of 32nd Avenue. Shorten asked if they would like to include the 47th Avenue Interchange as well, since it will a partner document with the IJR. Haugen responded that that would be fine. Shorten added that, particularly these projects on Matrix 2, and probably these ones that have capacity issues would be the ones that you would be most interested in seeing what the expansion needs would be. Haugen commented that another might be the University Avenue Concepts, Columbia and 42nd. He said that they already have some statements in the University Avenue study that was done, but they really don't have a good unifying conceptual document of those recommendations. Shorten suggested that the committee discuss this further and have Earl e-mail your decisions to them.

Haugen asked that on their matrix they refer back to the issues map and sort of identify what issues on that map these projects are trying to resolve. Shorten responded that they would do this.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***HAUGEN ADJOURNED THE MARCH 19TH, 2013, TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:05 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the April 10th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT- Grand Forks District; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Central Office; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; and Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineer.

Guest(s) present were: Nick West, KLJ; Troy Schroeder, NWRDC; and Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT – Office of Statewide Multi-Modal Planning. (via conference call).

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

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen referred to the agenda, and pointed out that changes were made to the Technical Advisory Committee membership. He explained that both county planners asked to be removed from the member list, and with our quorum issues, he decided to approach two other entities to take their places: Patrick Dame, with the Airport Authority, who is present today; and Nels Christensen, with BNSF, who was not able to attend today's meeting. He then asked, for Mr. Dame's benefit, that everyone please state their name and who they are representing.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 13TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ROMNESS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 13TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy

Haugen reported that, as previously discussed, one of the first tasks in the scope of work was for the consultant to look at Pier 6 on the North Dakota side. He stated that a tech memo has been drafted and reviewed by MnDOT staff, and presumably by NDDOT staff as well, which basically summarizes that the pier is still able to be adjusted by District MnDOT crews. He explained that going into the study one of the fears was that the pier has gotten to the point where local crews can no longer do adjustments, but that doesn't seem to be the case at this time.

Information only.

Sorlie

Haugen reported that at our last discussion on the Sorlie, NDDOT and KLJ were in the process of negotiating a contract for an EIS Document. He said that he still has not heard whether or not that has been accomplished. Johnson added that he still has not heard whether or not they reached an agreement, but he will check with their Bridge Division. Boppre said that they gave their last documents to John a week or so ago, so he assumes it is in the process of being completed. Nick, KLJ, commented that they have had a few go-arounds getting their scope of work put together, but it was submitted last week and a meeting has been scheduled, or will soon be scheduled to discuss it, so he would think that by the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting they hopefully will be going full steam ahead, scheduling public input meeting, or whatever the first step will be, so things are moving forward.

Noehre stated that he thinks there was some concern expressed by some, as well, that hadn't been contacted yet, that thought the project had been started, however that isn't the case, we really haven't started the project. Boppre asked if Mr. Noehre was suggesting that some entities hadn't been notified. Noehre responded that that would be correct, that they felt that they were being left out of the process, but the process hasn't even started.

Haugen reported that he did send an e-mail to Mike Johnson and Bobbi Ratzlaff, more to discuss our T.I.P. documents, than the actual improvements scheduled in 2016 or 2018. A brief overview on the T.I.P. discussion ensued.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2014-2017 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that last month we approved the North Dakota T.I.P. for 2013-2016; now we have, on the Minnesota side, the draft for the 2014-2017 T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

Haugen commented that in this draft there is not a project in 2014 showing the North Dakota contribution towards the project development phase of the Kennedy Bridge project, nor does it show any subsequent work on the Sorlie EIS document either.

Haugen stated that with the Draft T.I.P., and with MAP-21, there was initially some concern as to what was going to happen to projects in the first three years of the document, the 2014, 2015, and 2016 years, but staff has subsequently informed the Technical Advisory Committee, and worked with MnDOT and the ATP, to ensure that for the most part those projects in our T.I.P. are untouched. He said that 2017 is when we start to receive impact of MAP-21, so, essentially the first three years of the current T.I.P. are unchanged in this draft document.

Haugen referred to the document, and pointed out that the first three project in 2017 are all related to transit. He said that the first one is their regular fixed route operations; the second is their required para-transit, or dial-a-ride; and the third one is for East Grand Forks who is going to start helping with Grand City Area Transit capital needs, so you will see that East Grand Forks will be utilizing some of their funds to purchase replacement vehicles.

Haugen stated that there are no other projects in 2017 on the Minnesota side, but there was a project in 2016 that was on Gateway Drive/U.S. 2 that was actually part of a larger project that went all the way out to Fisher, but because of MAP-21 and some of the focus on certain projects, that has been pushed out of the T.I.P., so that is one project that is no longer being programmed in either 2016 or 2017. McKinnon added that they have been working on their list of projects for 2018 through 2020, based on existing pavement condition and which roads are anticipated to deteriorate the worst, and that project does not show up on any of the years from 2018 through 2020, so after they finish those years they will get started on 2021 through 2023, and he would imagine it will show up during that timeframe.

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion, and no comments were submitted prior to today's meeting.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2014-2017 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NDDOT FTA #5310 PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this is a new MAP-21 program that replaces the old New Freedom program. He explained that back in February/March we solicited all of the local human service

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

agencies and public transportation agencies to submit applications to try to obtain federal funding to assist them with their operations and capital needs. He stated that the only agency they received an application from was Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Haugen commented that their request is two-fold; their first priority is to fund a replacement para-transit vehicle, and the second is to continue funding their Mobility Manager position.

Haugen stated that MPO staff reviewed the request and found them to be consistent with the MPO's Planning Document, and concur with the priority order and recommend approval.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE 5310-ENHANCED MOBILITY OF SENIORS & INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES APPLICATION FROM GRAND FORKS' CITIES AREA TRANSIT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF MNDOT JURISDICTIONAL REALIGNMENT

Haugen reported that this is something MnDOT has initiated. He explained that it is a three phase study, of which they have completed the first two phases.

Haugen stated that the purpose of this study is to recognize that roadways that function as State Highways, but aren't State Highways should be realigned to become State Highways; and conversely roads that don't function as State Highways should perhaps be realigned to become something other than State Highways.

Haugen commented that they took the approach of trying to set up a methodology that is uniform across the State, and is a little more objective than subjective. He stated that they worked with this team, and the consultant Parsons Brinkerhoff, to come up with the methodology used. He added that this was Phase 1.

Haugen reported that the matrix shows how they are approaching this with a tiered approach as well. He explained that Tier 1 would be roadway segments that they have identified as having a high probability of being misaligned, and is shown in Red; Tier 2 have a medium chance and are shown in yellow; and Tier 3 have a low chance and are shown in yellow.

Haugen stated that this is meant to cover all the jurisdictional levels, using the methodology that they have established. He added that Phase 2 of the study, on the MnDOT side, is looking at their highway system and how it is and isn't misaligned. He said that after Phase 1 they met with the District Misalignment Review Team and asked if they agreed with the misaligned routes, and there was a general agreement that further study is needed. He added that he attended the meeting last week in Crookston, but had to leave early so didn't hear what the end result of that meeting was, so he will have to rely on Mr. McKinnon to identify if there were any substantial

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

changes to the MPO area. McKinnon responded that there weren't any changes, however there was some discussion on the need for further study of Trunk Highway 2B/Business 2 and MN 220 South. Haugen commented that US Business 2 is not currently including any portion of DeMers Avenue or the Sorlie Bridge, they are not being identified as being misaligned, so it actually starts at the intersection of 4th and goes out to Mainline US 2.

Haugen reported that some of the reasoning expressed at the meeting was because it was mostly local traffic, and he pointed out that it is actually half and half, at the far westerly end the 2009 ADT was roughly 4,000 cars a day, at the east end there are 2,000 cars a day.

Noehre commented that because the ADT was cut in half and went into the other he doesn't know if that would automatically qualify as local or not as it is coming from different directions. Haugen responded that if the west end was 10,000 and the east end was 2,000 then a good chunk of it would be local traffic, but because it is half and half he wouldn't describe it as mostly local on that segment of U.S. 2. Noehre stated, though, that you also couldn't say that 2,000 is not local either. Haugen commented that it certainly suggests that 2,000 is beyond the City of East Grand Forks, more regional.

Haugen reported that the other segment, as Mr. McKinnon pointed out, was Trunk Highway 220, from the Red Lake River/Mallory Bridge area to Climax. He stated that this segment was actually considered by Polk County a couple of years ago as a turnback, but they rejected it. He added that ten years ago this segment was up for turnback and he included some of that discussion in the Staff Report, but at that time they MPO prepared a Q&A format of what would happen if it became a non-trunk highway, and some of those answers are still germane in regard to the designation of US Business route.

Haugen reiterated that MnDOT is not identifying DeMers Avenue itself as being misaligned. He asked if MnDOT would pursue, as discussed, taking the rest of DeMers Avenue up to Gateway Drive as a flip-flop with 4th Street. McKinnon responded that that is what they suggested be part of the study of Business 2, should the length be from Trunk Highway 2 down DeMers to the Sorlie Bridge, should that be a State Highway because it goes through a major intersection to a river crossing, so that would be part of Phase 3. He added that before they go full-fledged into Phase 3, they are going to conduct a pilot study with a couple of counties to see how misalignment, funding, responsibilities, advantages and disadvantages shake out before they go statewide with it.

Haugen asked if Mr. McKinnon had any idea when Phase 3 would begin. McKinnon responded that all he has heard is that they do want them to wrap up the report for Phase 2, of what they produce, by mid-2013, and then they will get started on Phase 3 right after that, but he hasn't heard of a completion date for that. Haugen pointed out that in the Staff Report he attached the Executive Summary from their Phase 1 report.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that in the packet was clean-up materials from our special meeting, and he also has some additional clean-up material for today's meeting as well.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation, and went over it briefly

Haugen commented that previously they had shown results of what our 2040 data loaded up on a 2040 network would result in. He said that they have taken the next step and said we should take that 2040 street network, and utilizing that same 2040 socio-economic data, let's input all of the recommended projects from our current plan and see what it results in with the model run. He stated that this is just a listing of those projects, and the only update has been to the estimated costs to reflect 2013 cost estimates of all the projects remaining to be done in our current Long Range Transportation Plan.

Haugen referred to a graph illustrating the volume to capacity results and explained that they have converted it into level of service results since more of us are familiar with level of service results than we are with volume to capacity results. Williams asked what the "2040 ENC" is. Haugen responded that it is the existing plus committed network plus all of the recommended 2035 projects. He commented that while it solves some problems, it doesn't solve all problems.

Haugen pointed out that yellow indicates where we start, in 2040, seeing level of service at an unacceptable level; the lighter orange indicates the next level; the darker orange the next level; but the good news is we have no red areas, meaning we don't have grid-lock occurring. He stated that he could pull up the 2040 E+C network which would show you segments that are red, so the 2035 projects do make improvements to the network at those really hot spots, but it doesn't solve all issues. He said that you will also notice that with the significant change in the land use data on both Gateway Drive and down in the area south of 32nd and I-29 intersection we have probably more traffic issues than we were addressing in the 2035 plan.

Haugen commented that this does include two additional river crossings, does include the Merrifield Interchange, because those are in the current plan; and it does include some work on the DeMers/Washington Intersection and a 17th Avenue Overpass. He said that all of those projects are coded in the network, and this is the result.

Haugen stated that they were looking at projects that we are aware of, that have been identified as currently preservation type projects, or reconstruction of an existing roadway, and when they might occur, particularly those that could address the areas in orange.

Lang asked if the level of service shown occurs at peak p.m. Haugen responded that they are all daily volumes, so they have not been converted down to either an a.m. or p.m. peak.

Haugen reported that one of the obvious projects that we included in order to see how it resolved the 32nd Avenue area in particular was an interchange at 47th Avenue, and yes it does solve a lot

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

of the issues, particularly once you get to close to the 32nd Avenue Interchange, but there are still some problems occurring out there, plus it introduces some additional roadway issues as well.

Haugen stated that the only change they did to the previous network was to simply add in the 47th Avenue Interchange and beefed up the 47th Avenue Corridor between Columbia and the Interstate, made it a roadway similar to what 47th Avenue is shown as in the current Long Range Transportation, a three lane roadway.

Haugen referred to the last figure in the packet, and explained that it illustrates the previous network but instead of both Merrifield and 47th Avenue Interchanges, they took out the Merrifield Interchange. He said that, again, it re-introduces some concern at the 32nd Avenue Corridor.

Lang asked for clarification on what the assumption is for the existing street network, specifically at 32nd Avenue, are there no operational improvements. Haugen responded that at 32nd Avenue the three primary changes between I-29 and Columbia Road are construction of dual left turn lanes all around the Columbia Road/32nd Avenue Intersection; they are adding some turn lanes at 34th and 32nd; and are realigning the 42nd Street and the northbound on ramp configuration.

Haugen reiterated that, even if they put in our 2035 recommended projects, plus a 47th Avenue Interchange, there would still be some issues that would need addressing. He stated that this is the purpose of the packet he distributed earlier, to try to address those additional issues.

Haugen referred to the packet he distributed, and went over the information briefly. He explained that the first sheet is trying to describe out next steps in our Long Range Transportation Plan Update. He pointed out that they have already done the Year 2040 Existing plus Committed Network, and have included all the current Long Range Transportation Plan projects, but still see that there are issues around the 32nd Avenue and 47th Avenue areas in particular, so then they put in the interchange at 47th Avenue and saw those results; then we wondered how taking out the Merrifield Interchange would impact what we are doing in and around 32nd Avenue and 47th Avenue. He said that once they did this they saw that Merrifield helps with traffic issues that an interchange at 47th Avenue does not, so our next model runs will start incorporating the additional projects listed to see if they help some of the remaining issues identified around 32nd Avenue and 47th Avenue areas.

Haugen commented that for the Columbia Road and Washington Street areas that are highlighted as orange, they start adding in the projects listed to see what issues they might help solve. He said that the same goes for the DeMers Avenue and Gateway Drive areas as well.

Haugen reported that they are doing all this work outside of the real issue of fiscal constraint. He said that we still have to get back to the real issue of fiscal constraint because we may not be able to afford even those projects way at the top of the list, let alone the additional solutions we have identified, or still have to identify. Romness asked, then, if we would be doing new runs based

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

on those constraints. Haugen responded that ultimately we will be doing that. He added that we will build up to a model that resolves all known issues, without fiscal constraint, and then we will begin paring the list down until it is fiscally constrained.

Romness stated that he knows that at least some of the City Council is concerned about the cost of the 17th Avenue Overpass, so they would like to see what happens when it is in and when it is out. Haugen commented that a lot of what we see here are things interplaying between the east and west traffic of the interstate. He said that they added in a route to relieve traffic, and if we take that out we will be putting more strain on the existing networks. Williams said that they just need that documented. Romness added that it needs to be shown to the council, because of the cost of the interchange, they need to be shown the effect doing it would have on the network. Williams asked if the same could be done for the 32nd Avenue Bridge, to show the impacts on the network with it in and with it out. Haugen commented that without a 32nd Avenue Bridge we have a lot more colors throughout the network. Williams agreed, but said that we just need to document that.

Noehre asked if there was a map or spreadsheet that shows all of what was in the old plan and what is currently being looked at in the new plan. Haugen responded that so far we have a graphic that shows all of the projects that are in the current plan, as well as a list of those projects and whether they have been completed or not, and if they haven't been completed what the new cost estimate is to do so. He added that we also have a five page list, with the first couple of pages listing projects that would add capacity. He said that the only model runs they have done are the ones that include these two project that relate to the 47th Avenue Interchange, so we haven't run some of the other ones yet. Noehre said, then, that we don't have a map that shows projects 101 through 208, along with the 2035 plan, they are separate. Haugen responded that that would be correct. Noehre stated, then, that there isn't a combined on yet.

Williams said that it is her understanding that there were one or two project were removed. Haugen responded that he isn't aware of any. He added that there were some illustrative projects that aren't in the network. Williams pointed out that the 11th Avenue and 14th Street projects say they are to be removed. Haugen responded that they aren't model result based projects so they were removed because they have no relationship to the model output.

Noehre referred to Projects 13 and 11 on the 2035 plan, and pointed out that they intend to show a southend bypass. Haugen responded that they are part of the truck reliever route. Noehre said that, as discussed before, it isn't showing enough and the cost estimate isn't accurate, so if it is to be a southend bypass then we should show it as a southend bypass or truck reliever route, or whatever termini you want to use, and then capture all the costs involved. Haugen agreed. Williams asked if they are listed in the correct order, would we build the interchange and then the bridge, or the bridge and then the interchange. Haugen responded that there is no order to the numbering. Williams said she understands that, but what she is saying is that people are used to seeing things in order and it looks like those two are out of order. Noehre commented that Project 11 would have to be in for Project 13 to go in.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

Haugen summarized that this is where they are at with the update, our 2035 projects help tremendously, but they don't resolve everything, so we add in 47th Avenue since there is a huge interest in having an interchange at 47th Avenue, and it helps tremendously as well, but it also doesn't solve all of the problems, and may cause new problems. He said that if we take out Merrifield it doesn't help, it actually hurts the above list of projects and recommendations, so it has merit, from just the pure modeling point of view which is just one of the inputs into the Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that this is just basically currently where they are at with trying to come up with alternatives and model results. He said that they will ask ATAC to run a lot of these projects, and we will be asking for another special meeting in April, if possible to go over the results of those runs.

Noehre asked if with the southend reliever route in place, have you looked at the model and is it actually using County Road 5 and Merrifield Road and is it actually bleeding traffic off there, and everyone should know that the southend bypass would impact the intersection of County Road 5 and Airport Road. Haugen added that basically it starts west at the airport traffic signal and tries to divert truck and other traffic that wishes to go south on 5 to County Road 6, which is Merrifield, and bring them across the interstate, over the Red River to connect up at Polk County 58, north to connect with 220 to get you to 2. Williams asked if this does anything to 36th then, the north bypass, does it currently leave anything on that. Haugen responded that we aren't modeling that. Brooks commented that maybe what Mr. Noehre was getting at as well is that the light in front of the airport, if we do do the bypass improvements will have to be done there as well as we will have a lot more people wanting to make lefts on to Highway 2 going west. Noehre stated that improvements wouldn't just be needed there, but throughout the entire route, it is much much larger than projects 11 and 13, and the point he is going to keep pushing for is that if that is the project we are looking for then we need to capture it because if we don't then it isn't anywhere close to accurate. Haugen agreed that there are some hidden costs with this project.

Discussion on route issues ensued.

Williams referred to the spreadsheets and asked if the consultant could update them so that the nomenclature for the streets and avenues is correct because some of them don't have anything and some of them, are we talking north or south. Haugen responded he would make that request. Williams said that another thing is that there is a column there with volume capacity, and she would like to know if we can have the actual number and level of service put in there rather than just an "x" so we don't have to flip back and forth to get that information. Haugen responded that he would make that request as well. Williams stated that the only other thing she would like addressed is where they are listed as safety issues, do they have a report, a table, a list, or something that she can take a look at so she can see exactly what they are. Haugen responded that it was provided several months ago, but is available on our webpage.

Noehre asked again if there were any plans to combine the two maps, the blue and the green and orange maps so that all of the projects are on one map. Haugen responded that they will do that. He added that we will first get an un-fiscally constrained list of projects, then we will start

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

showing options of fiscally constraining and suggesting projects, so we will have a series of A, B, C, D maps that show a set of projects to remove because of fiscal constraint issues. He said that he envisions the need for a few iterations to make those trades to get things fiscally constrained, and to settle on what areas we might find acceptable level of service less than optimal.

Discussion on the fiscal constraint process ensued.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Solicitation Of Projects For ND 2014-2017 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that in 30-days they will be soliciting projects for a North Dakota 2014-2017 T.I.P., and hopefully we are just focusing on the year 2017, but North Dakota, on the Regional Highway Side is 2017 plus 2018, one extra year. He said that they will be submitting the solicitation letter hopefully by the end of April, have the month of May to process your projects locally through your respective agencies for submittal to the MPO in June so that we can have an approved Draft T.I.P. in June, and ultimately a Final North Dakota T.I.P. in July. He added that Minnesota T.I.P. might be on the same schedule, so there is still hope that our 2014-2017 T.I.P. will be a combined metropolitan T.I.P., and we hope to be back on sequence with our regular T.I.P. schedules this fall for soliciting 2015 through 2018 projects on both sides of the river for all of the funding programs that remain in MAP-21.

Williams said that she still has a question on the Long Range Transportation Plan. She commented that several weeks ago a map was went out that all of the 2010, 2025, 2040 ATDs, and she has gone through them and there is a large handful of places where traffic has actually decreased. She pointed out that one specific area is at Red River High School on South 25th where they have a current ADT of 2,500, and in 2025 and 2040 it is ????. Haugen responded that the 2010 counts in some areas would be higher than the 2025 counts because we have put in an improvement somewhere. Williams said, however, that that wouldn't affect the entrance to the high school. Haugen responded that they put in the 20th Avenue extension to Columbia Road. Williams agreed, but added that there aren't any numbers showing where this traffic goes, because all along 17th the traffic drops, and her question is can you have the consultant check to make sure that their attractions and production are coded correctly, because that is what it looks like, with all the east and west roadways decreasing, it doesn't make sense. Haugen stated he would do that.

Williams commented that the timeline for the T.I.P. project solicitation is really tight for them. Johnson responded that they understand at the DOT level that what they are asking puts you in kind of a pinch, but they want to try to get the T.I.P. process back on schedule, so anything you can do on your end to get this done on time would be greatly appreciated, but if you have any major issues let them know and they will see what they can do. Haugen said that they should

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

know by June about some of the projects they already solicited, and that are under review like the Transportation Alternatives, Safe Routes To School, the Safety Projects, all of those they solicited a while back should all be up for review and recommendations as to awards should be available by June so they are included in the draft T.I.P.

Lang asked if the MPO Annual Mid-Year Review has been scheduled yet. Haugen responded that they have not been scheduled yet, although some ideas have been floating out there, but he wouldn't expect them to occur in May. Johnson agreed, adding that while they usually hold them in May, that will not be the case this year.

2. RFP Update

Haugen reported that they had two RFP's due the end of March. He stated that for the Freight Rail Access Study the Selection Committee is recommending approving a proposal submitted by the team of Olson, with SRF; and for the Pavement Management Right-of-Way Study there were two proposals, and he believes the Selection Committee is recommending approving a contract with Goodpointe Technology, which is the current vendor of the ICON Software.

Romness said, then, that this means we will likely get everything set by December, correct. Haugen asked if he is talking about the right-of-way. Romness responded that they will get their images process by December. Haugen said that he thought they requested a fall completion on the imaging. Romness responded that the imaging will be done in the fall, but can they have it processed right away. Haugen stated that there is a separate RFP that will have to go out to do the processing, and also what software package we will still be procuring. Brooks commented that if we are using Goodpointe, isn't it decided since they have their own software. Boppre agreed, adding that they use ICON.

Williams commented that some of the images from the last run done are absolutely worthless. Brooks said that that is what makes him wonder why they were chosen again, but did we get any other bids. Haugen responded that they received two proposals. Williams asked that they be informed that this time if we find problems we will let them know, that we expect them to reshoot, because last time they did some so late in the afternoon that the photos were too dark to be able to see anything. Haugen said that the scope of work had tighter parameters on the work conditions this time, because they acknowledged the problems from the last run, so they tried to tighten it up to eliminate the possibility of that occurring again this time.

Boppre stated that he selected Goodpointe because of the ICON software, which they are now using it, and he didn't want to have to go back to the City of East Grand Forks and say that they switched to something else. Romness commented that it was his understanding that the imaging could be used by either software, that is why he chose the other firm because he didn't think they had all that great of service last time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2013**

Haugen reported that, again, the MPO is just contracting out for the functional class roadways, and there are option bids available to each City should they chose to have additional roadways done. Boppre stated that East Grand Forks has already agreed to have additional roadways done.

Information only.

3. Commissioner Zelle Appearance

Schroeder reported that Commissioner Zelle was in Roseau, Minnesota on Monday to visit with District 2 County Engineers to discuss the funding formula that is currently in place. He said that they are talking about a new transportation bill coming through to the Governor this year, tax increases, and how that impacts Rural Minnesota versus Metro Minnesota. He stated that they had a real good discussion, and although he has only been in office for two months, it appears that he will look after the whole state, not just the metro area, so he thinks everyone came out of it pretty happy.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 10TH, 2013,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:00 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the May 8th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:42 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer (via conference call).

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 10TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 10TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy

Haugen reported that he included in the packet the actual language MNDOT gave him regarding the Pier 6 Technical Report. He stated that the two major outcomes, as relayed to him by MNDOT, were that the pier is still functional, and MNDOT District staff are still able to service it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

Haugen commented that one other thing is that there is another Steering Committee meeting scheduled for May 22nd, in the East Grand Forks Training Conference Room.

Noehre stated that the deliverable for Pier 6 isn't completely done, the technical portion is, but it hasn't been formally written up yet.

Information only.

Sorlie

Haugen reported that he has been trying to communicate with Mike Johnson, who has been trying to communicate the Final Phase 2 Scope of Work, but that hasn't been accomplished at this time. Johnson added that he still has not seen anything on the final scope of work, just the original that was developed earlier.

Noehre commented that most likely part of the problem in getting the Final Phase 2 Scope of Work is due to the fact that the project manager for the Bridge Division is taking another job within the DOT. He added that they have actually lost three employees in the last three weeks, and with all the work they are doing he would imagine they are running behind.

Haugen stated that he knows that one of KLJ's Environmental Planner is crafting a mailing list for the EIS document, and he believes they are trying to schedule a June public input meeting. He asked if a date had been established for this meeting. Ellis responded that it has been scheduled for Thursday, June 13, 2013, on the Minnesota side and Wednesday, June 12th, 2013, in the North Dakota side. Haugen commented that that is interesting as June 13th is when MNDOT is doing their MnSHIP public hearing for their northwest region in Bemidji, he would have thought that someone in Bemidji would have mentioned that conflict.

Noehre commented that they are just about ready to send out the invitation letters to the cooperating/participating agencies on the Sorlie.

Information only.

MATTER OF FINAL NORTH DAKOTA S.T.I.P. DIFFERENCE WITH FINAL T.I.P.

Haugen reported that it isn't atypical to have some issues to resolve, and he thinks that Mike and himself will attest to the hard work they tried to put into this to eliminate differences, but we do still have them and we so still have to come up with a game plan as to how to address them.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation illustrating the differences between the North Dakota S.T.I.P. and the Final T.I.P., and went over them briefly (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

1) Grand Forks Project #8 – Columbia Road

Costs shown in red are what are in the S.T.I.P. Haugen stated that part of the issue might be that we have some funds in 2012 that we didn't carry over into the T.I.P., but perhaps the State did carry those funds over. Johnson responded that as far as he knows the final number in their S.T.I.P. just never got updated.

2) Grand Forks Project #9 – Slurry Seal on US #2
Grand Forks Project #10 – District-Wide Sign Retro-reflectivity

Haugen commented that these are two projects that don't show up in the District Side of the S.T.I.P., but they must be in the District 9 portion of the S.T.I.P.

Johnson responded that the sign project should have been included in the S.T.I.P., but he knows that the slurry seal projects will now be pulled out and included as just a line item in District 9. He explained that this will mean that he won't know about them until they get closer and closer to bidding them, and then they will need to get them in the T.I.P., so it will most certainly cause some issues, but they will do the best they can. Haugen agreed, adding that eventually, if federal funds are going to be involved they will need to be included in the T.I.P., so they will need to have good coordination so that they we are aware of them so many days in advance of bid letting, and so they can be identified in the T.I.P.

Discussion on how they will keep track of slurry projects ensued.

3) Grand Forks Project #13 – Replace Bridge Structure Over English Coulee

Haugen reported that this project was amended into the T.I.P. in January, but it isn't showing up in the S.T.I.P. Johnson responded that that is because it didn't show up in their 2013-2016 S.T.I.P. Williams asked if they show off-system projects somewhere else. Johnson asked if this project has been bid yet. Haugen responded that he doesn't think it has, unless it was done so very recently. Johnson said that he will have to check into why this project was not included in their S.T.I.P.

4) Grand Forks Project #14 – NEPA Document For Kennedy Bridge

Haugen stated that if he understands correctly, North Dakota doesn't separately identify NEPA documents in their S.T.I.P. Johnson responded that if they are of a larger scale they do. Haugen said, though, that they amended this project into the T.I.P. in December.

Johnson responded that they key with this project, and the English Coulee Bridge replacement project, is that it is very possible that the funding for both of these projects was authorized before their final S.T.I.P. was completed, and if that is case they won't double it up, so if they were authorized in the 2012 to 2015 S.T.I.P. they will not relist

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

them in another S.T.I.P., so that could be the reason for these two not showing up in this S.T.I.P., but he will check into this further. He added that he knows they authorized funds for the Kennedy Bridge. Haugen agreed, but added that that is separate from the Kennedy Bridge study we were just talking about, this is a separate study that is to be funded with this amount. Noehre asked what year it is scheduled to be funded. Haugen responded 2013 is what it is programmed for in the T.I.P.

Johnson reported that what happened was that NDDOT was supposed to have a cost share with MNDOT on this planning study, however they aren't using federal aid on their side, and we are, so they just assumed that we would pay them dollars and they sent out the RFP, but we hadn't authorized dollars, and we can't go back after they have already advertised the RFP and selected a consultant, so what they did was to authorize dollars for the environmental document so that they have money on the table, but it isn't technically for the planning study, it is for the environmental document. Noehre said, then, that it isn't another study, it is the continuation, and going into the NEPA process. Johnson responded that that is correct.

5) Grand Forks Project #17 – South Washington Street Rehab

Haugen stated that this project was moved from 2013 to 2014 also is shown to have a cost increase in the S.T.I.P., so he is wondering which amount is correct, the one in the S.T.I.P. or the one in the T.I.P.

Noehre asked if these tables were on the website. Haugen responded they were not. Noehre said that he looked over the S.T.I.P./T.I.P. in advance, but did not see this information, so he cannot answer at this time. Haugen responded that he would send copies of these tables out to everyone for review.

Williams commented that she would like to see the scope of work listed in the S.T.I.P. for it because all the traffic signal modifications didn't get programmed. She explained that once the left turn lanes are realigned then the traffic signals have to be modified to make that work. Johnson responded that the line item in the S.T.I.P. doesn't have any more information on this. Williams said that she put in a budget request for it, for the City to do that. Haugen stated that we have project scoping worksheets for this. Williams added that she knows that Chris is working on it also, but she isn't sure exactly what the project needs. Noehre stated that if you have the scope of work sheets, that is the scope of work.

Haugen stated that it appears that the T.I.P. needs to be changed for this project. Noehre asked why the T.I.P. is different than the S.T.I.P. Haugen responded that he doesn't have an explanation other than that it was originally programmed in 2013, in the draft, then it got pushed out to 2014 in the final, so he doesn't know if the cost differences came to light then. Noehre commented that the reason for moving the project from 2013 to 2014 was due to not being able to get the traffic operations study designed that quickly. He added that it might be showing the difference between the PE and construction amounts,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

pointing out that it shows the construction cost as being \$1.2 million. Haugen responded that the \$1.2 million is the federal amount. He added that the S.T.I.P. shows a \$1.5 million dollar total construction amount, while the T.I.P. shows a \$1.2 million dollar total construction amount. Noehre responded that the S.T.I.P. would include the PE.

6) Grand Forks Project #18 – Repayment Of Advanced Right-of-Way

Haugen commented that this is actually a 20-year old advanced right-of-way repayment, and it is not shown in the S.T.I.P. Johnson stated that he visited with programming and they didn't see a need, or know of a way to show this in the S.T.I.P. because this was a process developed by Federal Highway. Haugen responded that this is just like a typical advanced construction it is just that it has been twenty years since the advance, which is atypical.

Haugen pointed out that although we show this project occurring in 2014 in the T.I.P., it was actually planned to be done in 2013, so we hope to be able to just do an administrative modification to move it to 2013.

Noehre asked if only construction costs are shown in the T.I.P. Haugen responded that when they have the information they do show preliminary engineering costs, the right-of-way costs versus the construction costs. Johnson added that another thing to note is that line item PE in the S.T.I.P. are project specific only for the really large projects, otherwise they are lumped into a PE number that has been separated out.

Discussion on PE costs ensued.

7) Grand Forks Project #25 – Rehabilitation of DeMers Avenue From Washington Street to I-20

Haugen stated that this is a decrease in cost of \$50,000 on DeMers Avenue, all on the local side of the \$50,000 shows it is less.

8) Grand Forks Projects #26, #30, #31 – Install Dynamic Messaging Signs

Haugen stated that this project is lumped into District 9, but we still try to show them in our T.I.P.

9) Grand Forks Project #33 – Replacing the Kennedy Bridge

Haugen commented that there were some differences in the federal amount. He pointed out that the S.T.I.P. shows a slightly higher federal participation and a slightly lower local participation, not the typical 80/20 split we usually see. Johnson suggested that an 80.93 percentage be used instead of 80%, that should give you the number shown in the S.T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

10) Grand Forks Project #34 – Columbia Road Reconstruction – Phase 2

Haugen pointed out that the federal amount shown in the S.T.I.P. is the same, but the total project cost and the local share amounts are different than what is shown in the T.I.P.

11) Surprise Project

Haugen reported that the last project is one that it seems odd would be included at the last minute, not really knowing the project or the year.

Haugen commented that for all the other projects it seems that we can do a game plan as to how to reconcile numbers, and other issues, but this one we apparently have to wait for it to have the full project scoping work sheet submitted before we can do a T.I.P. amendment, and identify what dollar amount and what funding sources it will come from. Williams stated that they aren't going to do construction in 2013, it will most likely be 2014.

Haugen reiterated that it just seems odd that we would go through a full process, and then at the very end a project just gets thrown in, and then when we try to address it we can't do anything because we don't know the project details yet. Williams responded that this is one of those projects that is very, very, very unusual, probably a once in a lifetime project that will be done like this. She explained that they went out and monitored the poles, and when the last report came in it showed that something needs to be done as soon as we can, and there just isn't any way to plan for something like this, this is just an anomaly.

Johnson reported that his was just popped in on their end as basically a placeholder because they hadn't heard back officially from the City as to which year they wanted to do it in. Williams added that they weren't even sure about the funding as Stacey Hanson was still checking into that, so there were a lot of things going on that needed to be determined on this one. Haugen commented that it seems like a poor process. Johnson agreed, stating that it just didn't work out well, and it probably shouldn't have been put in until they knew for sure when it was going to be done, then the T.I.P. amendment could have been done to address it accordingly. He added that if it hadn't been shown in the S.T.I.P., then came to light later, it probably wouldn't have been as big a deal, but now it is causing issues.

Noehre commented, however, it has been under evaluation as to what's going on, understanding what's going on, and then figuring out how to solve the potential problem, and that is going to take some time to do, and it should take some time to do because you have to understand what to do before you do it. He said that in the end he would say that he agrees with all that was said, but about it being a poor process, etc., it is also a poor process to not put it in as well and lose it in the shuffle with five hundred other projects,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

so now that it is there it is in the shuffle, and it isn't lost, which happens equally as often. He stated that the smaller ones are actually the more challenging, it is easier to remember the big things. Haugen responded, however, that it could have been identified as either something pending, or something in the T.I.P., instead of not having any discussion whatsoever about it and then having it pop up in the S.T.I.P. without any discussion related to the T.I.P. Williams said, though that if the poles never got out, it would never be there. Noehre asked what kind of discussion should have taken place. Williams stated that you can't plan for it.

Haugen stated, however, that that the MPO finalized its T.I.P. on the 15th of March and on the 15th of April it is in the Final S.T.I.P., so on the 15th of March, or prior to that you had all this discussion about the potential of this, that's where he is saying there should have been some discussion of the potential of this happening rather than saying nothing and have it suddenly pop up in the S.T.I.P. Noehre said that he would agree with all of that, but hope that you can agree that thirty days later, when it was recognized that none of that occurred, that it still needed to be there. Williams said that it was an emergency repair that may or may not happen because if those poles would have stayed... Haugen said, though, that it is 2013 dollars what would have been spent someplace else, but now 2014 dollars will have to be appropriated for it and reserved for it so you are still going to have to do something to follow up on it anyway, so it doesn't quite cover everything, but this is a process that we keep working and improving on. He added that they will figure out when and how to reconcile these projects, and you have to remember that we are four months away from adopting a whole new T.I.P./S.T.I.P. document, possibly, so do we address only those that are in the annual element, the 2013, and let the rest go for four months, or not, that is also something to discuss as part of this process. Johnson said that he would recommend waiting and not do any more work than you need to. Haugen pointed out that the only real issue we need to address is to make sure we have the proper federal amount on Phase 1 of Columbia Road identified so that there are no issues with getting the full federal portion this year for that project.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON A.T.A.C. NEW SCHOOL TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY
PHASE I**

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a copy of the draft report. He referred to a power point presentation, which A.T.A.C. presented to the Steering Committee, and went over it briefly (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Haugen explained that the MPO, and A.T.A.C., were asked to look at the proposed street network to ensure that what is being proposed as the initial street network is enough to accommodate the traffic volumes that will be coming through, so that is what this report does.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

Haugen commented that the School Architect has been hired, and we will soon move into Phase 2 of the project, which involves looking at the actual site and the streets surrounding the school to come up with a safe traffic pattern for all traffic modes. He explained that they use a travel demand model sub-area analysis so we were just focusing in on this specific area to help us generate a 2015 travel pattern.

Presentation and discussion on street network options continued.

Johnson asked if any adjustments were made to the pm peak analysis since the pm peak for the school is quite a bit different than a typical pm peak on a normal roadway. Haugen responded that they had this discussion with the Steering Committee, and the pm peak of the school is more centered around the 3:30 p.m. timeframe, but there is still less traffic generated than there is during our pm peak, so our pm peak is still worse. He added that this new school site is not so remote that it is its own little special trip. Johnson said that he has seen that before, where that wasn't accounted for.

Williams reported that they didn't necessarily use the same peak hour at every intersection. She said that they used whatever that intersection's peak hour was, so it wasn't just 4:00 to 5:00 or 4:30 to 5:30 for all of them, which gives us the best picture possible.

Haugen stated that the next phase will, with the architect on board, involve the school engaging their school boards, and public input meetings with the neighborhoods being held, as well as getting more engaged with the on-site school siting and related issues right around and adjacent to the school.

Information only.

MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen referred to the packets and pointed out that the latest model runs were included. He then gave a brief slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over the information briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, at our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting we discussed an issue with intersection safety, specifically the fact that there were some intersections that were identified as having very crash rates occurring at them which was incorrect, so we made changes to reflect the correct information.

Haugen said that they also updated the projects that were identified, to-date, as costing \$1,000,000 or more in maintenance; which were primarily projects that Les gave us on the District side. He added that Les also identified the year the project would typically be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

programmed, and we adjusted the year of expenditure amounts for those projects to that year, which is why these projects tend to get quite costly.

Haugen commented that they are still hoping that the other jurisdictions will give us their list of roadways that they expect will cost \$1,000,000 or more in maintenance costs, not reconstruction with capacity improvements, just maintenance. Noehre said that the list he gave was just a look at each individual segment, and not a look at systems or cost per year, or those kinds of things. Haugen responded that he understands this.

Discussion ensued.

Haugen stated that back in April we met with MnDOT about our performance measures and targets, and they worked with us to review and renew them to bring them more into what the norm is for identifying performance measures and targets. He said that before we had a mixture of our measures in our targets, and so the information included in the packet shows the format we have been directed to use to properly identify performance measures, and to identify the target we are trying to meet with that performance, basically separating them.

Haugen summarized by saying that we simply can't do this update as we have in the past. He said that originally when we set up the RFP Scope-Of-Work we thought we could do what we did last time we did the update, and the is to review all the recommended plans to make sure they are still valid, and made very few changes to update to the current 2035 Plan, but we found that that is no longer the case. He explained that two things occurred; the downturn of the economy and MAP-21 was put into place, so it is no longer a simple matter of rolling over our current document into a new document and just making sure projects are still valid. He added that the fiscal constraint issue will be a challenge to deal with, and we are still trying to finalize our revenue streams as well. He explained that the North Dakota Legislature just convened and have made some changes to the formula for state-aid distribution. He added that Minnesota Legislature is still in session, and are still trying to develop a transportation package.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. NDDOT Delayed Traffic Counts

Haugen reported that NDDOT was going to start traffic counts a week or two ago, but have since decided to delay doing their traffic counts until fall, although he assumes this will be dependent on the status of the Columbia Road construction.

2. NDDOT Draft T.I.P. Solicitation

Haugen commented that he believes we are still hoping to formally solicit for a Draft 2014 to 2017 T.I.P., although we are getting pretty tight on the window of opportunity for that as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

Williams asked what the due date would be for getting this in. Johnson responded that he can't say yet as they haven't sent out the solicitation letter. Williams commented that she asked this because the staff report is due today if they are going to make a June deadline. Haugen responded that June 4th was the MPO's identified date. Johnson said that what will probably happen is that the language in the three MPO area letters will probably be worded a little differently than the other letters, asking if they could meet the June deadline or do they need until July.

Haugen said, then, that it is still tentatively planned for a formal solicitation, so we should continue to try to go through your local agencies to get your projects approved to be submitted, but make sure you inform them that it is subject to change, and you may have an opportunity to go back a month or two weeks later to suggest changes based on newer information.

Williams asked Rich if he has received the list of regional projects to put into the 2014 to 2017 T.I.P. Romness responded that he doesn't think he has that yet. Haugen commented that he thinks the expectation is that the 2014 to 2016 years are relatively unchanged, so they will be focusing on 2017 and 2018 for the regional projects. Johnson agreed, saying that that is what the letter will state, that in order to fast-track the process, and to not create a lot of confusion, they will be focusing on those years. Haugen said, however, that they still need transit projects to come up through that same timeframe.

Williams asked if they want them to update their estimates between 2013 and 2014, or will NDDOT do that. Johnson responded that they typically don't do that, that the dollar amount identified is the dollar amount used. Haugen added that the federal funds are basically capped right now for those years 2014 to 2016, so if your estimates go up or down it is just on the local side, except for the regional projects where the federal funds can fluctuate a little.

Information only.

3. MNDOT TAP Input Meeting – May 9th

Haugen reported that tomorrow afternoon, on the Minnesota side, they will participate in their Transportation Alternatives Program input meeting. He stated that as MAP-21 changed how enhancement, safe routes, and recreational trails are funded, this is MnDOT's effort to get input from all the stakeholders on this new combined program, how to shape it up and how to maybe draft up the eligibility process.

Haugen said that there has been some discussion on the North Dakota side to potentially something similar to this, and they would encourage that that happen.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 8th, 2013**

4. MPO Peer Exchange On Performance Measures – June 19th

Haugen reported that on June 19th the North Dakota MPO's, Federal Highway, and the North Dakota Department of Transportation have, essentially through Federal Highway, worked up a peer exchange on performance measures where we would bring in similar MPO's from across the nation into Bismarck to have a good exchange on performance measures. He said that they are still trying to work out logistics as to whether or not they will be able to video-conference that back there to the Districts, which would allow some of you to participate.

Information only.

5. MPO Bike/Ped Counting In Minnesota

Haugen reported that Stephanie is going to be doing some bike/ped counting in Minnesota in June. Erickson added that it will be taking place the week of June 17th, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Saturday. She said that the counts will be taken at seven different locations, at three different times; 10:00 a.m. to noon, 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., and 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Haugen stated that this is in conjunction with Greenway, but if you will recall Nancy did a presentation last fall about Minnesota trying to develop a similar count program as what we use for traffic counts where we do a live ped counts and can factor in the time of day, day of week, month of the year, so this is helping establish that data.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN HAUGEN DECLARED THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 2:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 12th, 2013, 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: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Les Noehre, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Patrick Dame, Grand Forks Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer (via conference call).

Guests Present were: Nick West, KLJ.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF PO Planner; and Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 8TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE MAY 8TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that because some members have to leave early he is going to suspend the agenda in order to discuss those items requiring action.

MATTER OF T.I.P. AMENDMENT ON FY2013 ANNUAL ELEMENT

Haugen reported that this amendment involves the Cities Area Transit. He explained that, if you will recall, back in January we amended the T.I.P. to include an award from the Veteran's

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2013**

Transportation Community Living Initiative grant, but at that time we did not include all of the award to the City of Grand Forks' Cities Area Transit, so this amendment is bringing in the additional \$300,000 in funds. He added that there was also a separate grant for \$50,000 for marketing purposes, so this amendment is also to double the values shown for the Cities Area Transit's share of the statewide grant and to add a new project for the marketing.

Haugen stated that the public hearing will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next week, so whatever action this body makes would be contingent on public comments.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO ANY COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THURSDAY, JUNE 20TH, 2013.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RE-ADJUSTING FEDERAL URBAN AID BOUNDARY

Kouba reported that every ten years, after a census is taken, the Census Bureau revises our urbanized area boundary using data that is mostly based on the population counts and residential population density. She explained that the Federal Highway Administration uses this data as a base boundary for its urban area boundary, and then gets local input from the MPO on how to best revise it in order to try to truly represent the Urban Footprint and functional part of the landscape.

Kouba referred to the maps include in the packet, and went over them briefly.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE URBAN FEDERAL AID BOUNDARY, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen commented that since there are meetings tonight and tomorrow on the Sorlie Bridge, he is going to have Les lead this discussion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2013**

Noehre reported that there will be a public scoping meeting tonight from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers; and tomorrow night from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers to discuss the proposed rehabilitation or replacement of the Sorlie Bridge. He requested that everyone try to attend, and to please pass this information on to everyone they know as well because the more people there the better.

Noehre commented that these meetings are officially kicking off the Environmental Impact Statement for the Environmental Process for the Sorlie Bridge. He reported that the objective of the meetings is to explain why we are here, to give some background information on the Sorlie Bridge, to go over the existing conditions of the bridge, and go over the NEPA process.

Haugen stated that there have been several comments from people wondering if there will be handouts at the meeting; and will there be a project website people can go to for information. Johnson responded that he isn't sure if there will be any handouts at the meetings, but there is a website: www.sorliebridge.com.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that included in the packets were copies of the meeting summary from Study Advisory Committee meeting held on May 22nd, along with copies of the presentation given at that meeting.

Haugen pointed out that the staff report indicates that there will be a public input meeting on July 16th, however it has been changed to July 17th instead. He added that they are planning on holding concurrent meetings, which will somehow be connected virtually, in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation, and briefly went over what has transpired to date on the Kennedy Bridge Study (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen reiterated that the next public input meeting is scheduled for July 17th, and the next Study Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for July 31st.

Information only.

MATTER OF PUBLIC INPUT MEETING ON CAT ROUTE CHANGES

Haugen distributed updated copies of the Proposed Changes To CAT Bus Routes document and explained that they are making changes to implement recommendations from our Transit Development Plan that we approved last year. He stated that the two changes involve implementing designated stops and making some modifications to the current route structure. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2013**

said that the public meeting is scheduled next Tuesday, starting here in Grand Forks City Hall and then moving to East Grand Forks City Hall in the evening.

Rood reported that the information just distributed is available on the MPO Website, at the Metro Transit Center, at the UND Student Union, and at both City Halls. She explained that they are hoping to get as much public feedback as they can on these so they will be taking comments until June 28th. She stated that the hope is that they can then take the final recommendations to the City Councils in July and have the new routes and designated stops in place before school begins.

Rood referred to the packet and highlighted the proposed changes.

Rood stated that they will be taking all the feedback they get from the public open houses and also from comment forms and e-mails, make any necessary changes, and will bring it back to this body and the City Council's in July.

Haugen commented that he thinks there should be a little more information given on what is being done with the current Route 7, that it is being combined with Route 5.

Bergman said that, just for your information, Ali did a count of all the designated stops in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and there were two hundred and three, and the projected costs are actually down.

Haugen reiterated that the public open house is scheduled for Tuesday, June 18th beginning at 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall; and from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. in the East Grand Forks City Hall. He said that written comments will be taken until June 28th. He reported that this information is located on the East Grand Forks Website, on the MPO Website, and on CATs Website as well. Ali added that it is also going out over the UND Website to try to get information from students that might be out of town.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MNDOT MNSHIP Meeting

Haugen reported that tomorrow morning there is a MNDOT Northwest Area presentation of the Draft MNSHIP document. He explained that MNSHIP stands for Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan, which is a twenty-year plan. He stated that they have covered this plan through its development, and the major change from the current investment plan is essentially the last ten to twelve years of the twenty year period, MNDOT has identified that 90% of their available funds have to go towards preservation of pavement, where it is currently 50% to 55%, and the preservation emphasis is reflective of MAP-2; but primarily of Accounting GATSBY 34. He added that the statewide bonds Minnesota issues are based on a financial portfolio in which

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2013**

MNDOT has identified performance measures that they tell the investors of the bond they are going to maintain and meet, based on what they have told the bond investors in the past to maintain at that level, that is where all the preservation comes into play, because of MAP-21 requirements. He stated that this is a State of Minnesota bond, but MNDOT, he believes, is one of the biggest players in that bonding, which is why it is reflected so heavily in their investment planning over the next twenty years.

Haugen reiterated that this meeting will be held in the morning, and in the afternoon the ATP will meet as well.

Information only.

2. Freight/Rail Access Study

Haugen reported that they have initiated the Freight/Rail Access Study, and are utilizing the Community Foundation's website that they established a year or so ago called: www.engagetheforks.com. He stated, again, they have just initiated the study and they have a couple of things here that people can use to give us some feedback, so he would encourage everyone to do so.

Information only.

3. Recreation Trails Program

Johnson reported that the NDDOT is holding a meeting on July 9th to talk about the TAP and Recreation Trails Program. He explained that they are going to be bringing what was the TE Director's Task Force, the SR2S Committee, and the Wet Trails people together to try to determine what we are going to do with the TAP and Recreation Trails Program moving forward, to come up with some recommendations they can give the Governor and the DOT Director to look at how to move forward with these programs.

Johnson added that he also has a pamphlet for a North Dakota Trails Conference that will be held next week, on June 18th and 19th, if anyone is interested.

Information only.

4. Long Range Transportation Plan Update

Romness asked for an update on what has transpired with the Long Range Transportation Plan Update over the last 30 days or so.

Haugen responded that their traffic modeler has been out of the country for most of the past 30-days, however staff has been working primarily with transit on updating the transit section; they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2013**

reached agreement on new financial tables; on the bike/ped side, Stephanie has been working on redrafting some of those sections, post MAP-21, so we should have a draft available next month.

Noehre asked if newsletter that was sent out was the first one. Haugen responded that it was the fifth one. Noehre said that he somehow missed the first four then. Haugen stated that he would resend them.

Information only.

5. Federal Highway Virtual Peer Exchange

Haugen reported that next week a federal highway sponsored virtual peer exchange video conference is scheduled to take place in the District's conference room, and the MPOs are invited to participate. He said that he is just wondering how many other people they could invite to attend in addition to the five MPO attendees. Noehre responded that something he has needed to do, but hasn't, is to establish a capacity for each of their rooms, so he is going to have to guess, and his guess would be twenty-five.

Haugen asked if there would be an agenda sent out. Johnson responded that he thinks he has a fairly up-to-date one, but he will check on this and get one out.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN HAUGEN DECLARED THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 2:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 10th, 2013, 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: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; and Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer.

Guests Present were: Mike Bittner, KLJ; Diomo Motuba, UGPTI/NDSU; and Vu Dang, UGPTI/NDSU.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 12TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 12TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that next Wednesday, and he hopes everyone is already aware of this, but the consulting team on the Kennedy Bridge Study is planning on holding concurrent public input

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 2013**

meetings at two different locations. He explained that the intent is to have both sites connected via the internet so that what is occurring at one site is visible at the other site.

Haugen referred to a copy of the public notice, included in the packet, and pointed out that one meeting will be held at the East Grand Forks Campbell Library at 422 4th Street N.W.; and the other in Grand Forks City Hall at 255 North 4th Street; both from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 17th. He added that the presentation will take place at 5:30 p.m. and again at 6:30 p.m. and will cover Pier VI information; what the project is trying to discover, via this study; and the timeline of when the next public meetings will take place.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that he did include the website for the Sorlie Bridge Study: www.sorliebridge.com; and that the materials presented at last month's open house are posted on this site for you to review. He said that the comment period runs until the end of July, plus they are soliciting for potential people to serve on a Citizen's Review Committee. Grasser asked what the criteria is to be able to be on the Citizen's Review Committee. Haugen responded that they only need to be interested in serving on the committee. Boppre added that he was told they are looking for anyone interested in serving on the committee, but especially downtown business owners and citizens. Grasser asked if anyone had contacted the Mayor's office on this. Haugen responded that he didn't know if anyone had done so or not.

Haugen pointed out that he also included a copy of the contract for Phase II that KLJ and their subs are under. He commented that the areas of most interest are traffic operations and the alternatives portion of it. He stated that they are going to use our 2040 Travel Demand Model, sort of what's our final recommended plan, plus the existing, plus the committed one. He added that they are also going to extrapolate, then from 2040 out to the end of a fifty-year forecast additional growth.

Haugen commented that they are using NDDOT criteria for capacity along the DeMers corridor. He stated that, again, the termini of this are North 5th Street in Grand Forks and 4th Street in East Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that as part of their traffic operations they will look at four different options for traffic control during any work:

- 1) Closed operation.
- 2) Staged construction.
- 3) Temporary lower crossing.
- 4) Temporary structure adjacent to, assuming similar level profile to the existing structure.

Haugen stated that under Task 10, Preliminary Bridge Alternatives; there are five sets of alternatives that they will look at:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 2013**

- 1) No build.
- 2) Rehab on existing alignment.
- 3) Replace on existing alignment – keep at existing level or raise three-feet on ends.
- 4) Hybrid where they rehab the existing structure and build a new adjacent structure
- 5) New alignment either up-stream or down-stream.

Grasser asked where they came up with the three-foot raise. Haugen responded that he isn't privy to that information, he didn't attend the scoping, Teri did, so he isn't sure if they went over it during the scoping at all. Boppre commented that they are part of the team, but he isn't even sure where they came up with that number either. Grasser stated that he would suggest they look at all alternatives, but he was thinking they would look at some ranges and impacts as well.

Haugen said that this, then, is the EIS Phase II Scope of Work that was included in the packet.

Haugen commented that the timeline is included in this document, which is available on the website at: www.sorliebridge.com.

**MATTER OF LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE
2014-2017 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that North Dakota has been informally advising us to inform our partners that they will soon be formally soliciting candidate projects. He said that this was released late last month, and the MPO sent out its solicitation letters identifying July 8th as the deadline for the North Dakota Candidate projects, however we have received no projects so it is difficult for us as a Technical Advisory Committee to provide any review and comments to the Executive Board.

Grasser commented that the City of Grand Forks has a list of projects that they are working through their legislative sessions right now. He said that they went through Service Safety last night, and will go to the City Council next week. Haugen added that these are urban side projects, and that he hasn't seen the regional side projects yet.

Haugen stated that these projects missed the deadline, so the best advice would be to get them in as soon as possible so that, hopefully, by next Wednesday at this time the Executive Policy Board has information that we can ask them to act on, after which we can forward their action on to the State of North Dakota.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED CITIES AREA TRANSIT (CAT) ROUTE CHANGES AND
DESIGNATED STOPS**

Haugen reported that last month Ali went through and identified incorporating the designated stops and some route changes to ensure travel time. He said that they did hold a public meeting, and he believes a handout was distributed prior to today's meeting that Ali will go over briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 2013**

Rood referred to the document (a copy is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Questions/Comments/Discussion on General Positive Feedback, General Negative Feedback, and Expanding Service and/or Hours of Operation:

Grasser asked, out of curiosity could you charge different fare rates for different times, say if you tried to expand and needed more money, could you charge a different fare. Rood responded that they could, but added that their fare recovery right now is so low that it wouldn't really help.

Grasser asked if the additional costs were caused by overtime for the driver. Rood responded that it is based on per hour and per mile.

Questions/Comments/Discussion on Specific Concerns, Requests and Suggestions:

Rood pointed out that all of the changes that were discussed are included on the attached maps. She stated that these final recommendations will be submitted to Service Safety and the City Council, and staff is requesting approval from the Technical Advisory Committee subject to approval from the City Council.

Haugen asked about Routes 4 and 6, and if any modifications were made to the proposed routes based on comments received. Rood responded that no changes were made to Route 4; but for Route 6 heading westbound on University Avenue, they had been planning on heading north on Columbia Road to 6th, but are going to stay on University Avenue to Harvard and then head north so they can serve the Hamiline Shelter westbound and the Union Shelter eastbound.

Haugen referred to Routes 10 and 11 and asked Nancy Ellis: Do we identify designated stops, and you have your sidewalk project going on, did anyone contact you about possibly putting in different paths as part of that project. Ellis responded that no one had contacted her about that. Haugen stated that someone would be contacting you shortly possibly putting in, so we have a designated stop on the east side of Central Avenue, and your putting in the sidewalk along there, to try to coordinate, or maybe expand a change order of some sort or something. Boppre asked if he was talking about the one on the east side or the west side. Ellis responded the east side, the transit sidewalk. Boppre commented that the bid on that one came in extremely high. He said that he talked to Lou, actually, before he came here and he is trying to find them some more federal dollars, although he doesn't know if he will be successful, but the last bid came in extremely high.

Discussion on the cost of concrete and bituminous materials ensued.

Lang asked, on some of these responses where you say this stop has been removed, has it actually been implemented already. Rood responded that it has been removed on the maps, because right now they don't have any designated stops. Lang asked if they had done anything

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 2013**

in the field that has actually changed the way the bus is operating based on what you had suggestions for. Rood responded that they haven't, not yet.

Haugen pointed out that on the cover page of the document it shows the City approval process: Today's Technical Advisory Committee meeting, Service/Safety Committee on July 23rd, City Council on August 5, and MPO Executive Policy Board on August 21st. He said that they hope to get this implemented as soon as possible, hopefully before school starts.

Rood reported that they have an RFP out, with a bid opening of July 16th, for the actual signage, so depending on how quickly we select a vender, and with their turn-around time, it will impact the live date.

Haugen stated that these will be implementing the changes as suggested in the TDP, and in working with CAT staff on the financial implications of MAP-21, and in August they will be rolling out to the Technical Advisory Committee what that means to the rest of the recommendations in the TDP and how we may have to delay some things, but still hopefully get to a 30-minute headway for all services by the end of the five year period.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED CITIES AREA TRANSIT (CAT) ROUTE CHANGES AND DESIGNATED STOPS, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that he invited A.T.A.C. to attend today's meeting to go over the 2010 Base Model Calibration Validation Report that was included in your packet. He explained that this is the model then that we worked with the 2025 Network and 2040 Network to identify our hot spots.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he highlighted the fact that, as per our previous discussions, we are using Fargo-Moorhead's Household Travel Survey, and using the signal timing plan as a constraint on the process, but also identified, and in your packet are maps that detailed the difference of capacity on the different links from our 2005 Model versus our 2010 Model, and that is something he asked Diomo to focus on today.

Diomo Motuba, A.T.A.C., was present for a brief presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 2013**

Haugen commented that the thing we need to focus on as we go into next month, and we start presenting the 2025 and 2040 Forecast Volumes, is the whole concept of volume to capacity, and what our past models had and what this current model has. He said that, at first blush, our volume to capacities indicate that at gross level we have a lot of capacity concerns in our model, and so as we look at those things he would like everyone to keep in mind that the model is just one of the outputs that we use, and we will take that volume to capacity ratio and other things, and knowing that we have the Synchro files, the Signal Timing Coordination files, that we know that some segments of the roadway are already having volumes greater than the volume to capacity that we are highlighting from the model output.

Haugen asked Diomo to come up here to set the stage so that when we look at the 2025 and 2040 volume to capacity ratios that we are presenting, we know that it is just telling “A” story, it isn’t telling the whole story and we have to look at, again, some of the more detailed corridor studies that we have in place and the volumes that are being generated to really get an idea as to whether or not those are really future hot spots or are they just modeled hot spots.

Haugen stated that he thinks, again, that A.T.A.C. has produced a model that is validated and calibrated beyond the criteria that would need to be met in order to have it be useful to us.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. August Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Haugen reported that in August they hope to be spending considerably more time with the Technical Advisory Committee on the 2025 and the 2040 Network Alternatives and our list of projects in order to start getting us to a recommended Long Range Transportation Plan, along with the Transit Development Plan Update and the Bike/Ped Plan so that we have a Multi-Modal Long Range Transportation Plan.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 10TH, 2013,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:47 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 14th, 2013, 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: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; Shawn Morrell (Proxy for Joe McKinnon), MNDOT Office of Transit; and Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer.

Guest(s) Present were: Mike Bittner, KLJ.

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

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 10TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE JULY 10TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

a. New Schedule

Haugen stated that, as noted at our July meeting, the end of July was our deadline for completion of our Long Range Transportation Plan update, which we missed. He said that during the month of July the NDDOT, Federal Highway, and other partners contemplated what should occur in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

regard to our missing that deadline, thus our receipt of the letter that was included in the packet indicating that January 31st is now our completion deadline for the Long Range Transportation Plan update to be done.

Haugen commented that the letter also discussed that, because of the schedule change, we needed to do a revised scope and schedule to show how we will accomplish meeting the January 31st deadline. He said that they wanted this information by Monday this week, so in working with SRF and the NDDOT, we were able to come up with a revised scope of work to accomplish this.

Haugen reported that he has a short power point presentation illustrating the new scope of work and schedule that he would like to go over. (A copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen went over the schedule briefly. He explained that January 2014 is held in reserve for Federal Highway and FTA to have a 30-day review and comment period, so that means for us to meet the deadline, the MPO Executive Board, at their regular December 18th meeting, unless a special meeting is held, is when the update needs to be adopted. He stated that this means that in November we need to be processing preliminary approval of a document, which means that we actually need to have a draft completed in October for the public review process to begin.

Haugen stated that in November we will be going through our Public Participation Plan's process of going to each Planning Commission and City Council for preliminary approval, and then in December we would go through those same steps for final approval of the document so that on December 18th we can hopefully have the MPO Executive Policy Board adopt the plan, and submit it for the 30-day Federal Highway/FTA review period.

Romness asked how early in October will the draft plan likely be available. Haugen responded that it won't likely be available until later in October. Romness stated, then, that we are really looking at having only a month and a half to get it through the council, because he knows they are going to spend a lot of time on it.

b. T.I.P. Impact

Haugen reported that the other action taken, as a sort of incentive for us to meet the January 31st deadline, is that they have frozen our T.I.P. document. He referred to information included in the packet, some clarification questions/answers, and pointed out that it explains what this means to us.

Haugen explained that the freeze, in essence is affecting us in that we can't formally adopt a new 2014-2017 T.I.P. document, however we can adopt a draft of that document, and, in-fact MNDOT already has a draft document adopted, and we adopted our Minnesota side. He stated that yesterday, and today, he received from NDDOT what they are suggesting be the projects to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

include into our draft, so in September we will be approving a Draft 2014-2017 T.I.P. He added that it still yet to be known when the NDDOT will formally adopt a Final S.T.I.P.

Haugen commented that, as the letter clarity indicates, because of how late this is coming in the T.I.P. cycle, while normally when they freeze a T.I.P. they say that the current year is frozen and no changes can be made, but because 2013 is almost complete, the current year of the T.I.P. will be FY2014, so projects currently listed in the 2013-2016 T.I.P. in FY2014 can proceed as if there is not a freeze. He added that they are also allowing a one-time amendment to occur to our document; so, potentially by the Technical Advisory and Executive Policy Board September meetings, we will be processing that one-time T.I.P. amendment to the 2013-2016 T.I.P. document.

Haugen said that his last clarity question was that it is only allowing our State Agency Partners and our Transit Operators to propose T.I.P. amendments for this one-time opportunity, so until January of 2014, from September to January that freeze means that there cannot be any additions to the T.I.P., there can't be any modifications of projects. He added, however, that if a project is dropped, that can still occur regardless of the freeze.

c. Financial Forecast Revised

Haugen referred to a slide from our current plan, and pointed out that we always tried to highlight that as we go out to the outer years our purchasing power erodes. He explained that under our current plan we were assuming a 2% rate of growth in revenue, with a 4% cost escalation, so that is why as you get further out the band gets wider, we can't purchase as much with the revenue that we currently can. He added that originally when we were starting this update we were told we could use a 3% rate of growth, but were told last Friday that we now need to use a 1.5% rate of growth on our revenue, so we actually have gone backwards with this purchasing power graphic, we will have less revenue coming in than we previously thought, and certainly from what we have in our current plan.

Haugen then referred to a slide illustrating the revised rate of growth in revenue, and went over it briefly. He pointed out that instead of having somewhere in the neighborhood of a quarter of a billion dollars to work with we are down to two-hundred million total.

Haugen commented that this gives us a comparison of where we were at in our 2035 plan, and where we are not at in our 2040 plan, and that is a loss of roughly a hundred million dollars. He stated that adding another five years to those costs means that our purchasing power erodes even more, so we are in a financial pinch more so than we were prior to Friday's events.

Haugen referred to the slide presentation, and explained that the next few slides capture the financial picture we are in. He stated that the first slide is just recognizing that as we do long range transportation plans, these are emphasis that we are told in the federal regulations and rules of how we are supposed to develop the Long Range Transportation Plans; preserve the existing and emphasize the national regional transportation facilities. He added that prior to MAP-21 the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

feds were a little more flexible with their funds, but with MAP-21 and the National Highway Performance Program, they have really infused 60% of their funds to that program of National Highway's routes.

Haugen said that when we started this process we asked our member agencies to give us a list of projects that would preserve the system, originally costing over one million dollars, and NDDOT provided a list in which Les identified four major reconstruction projects, that if possible he would like to have occur before 2023.

Haugen referred to the project lists, and went over the current project costs, as well as the actual inflated costs, explaining, however, that if you look at where we are at with our financial picture, our short, mid and long term, our short term is inflated to \$41,000,000 because of the two bridge projects that are in there, so if we subtracted those two projects it would go down to \$15,000,000 for the regional system. He then went over the various projects, and their costs, pointing out that this means that on the regional system we are really basically only able to meet four projects for reconstruction, none of the \$66,000,000 that Les identified of reconstruction needs in 2012 costs, so as we escalate those costs out to 2040, depending on where they fall during that time frame, it is more than \$66,000,000, plus he also identified \$28,000,000 in just maintenance types of activities such as concrete panel replacements, mill and overlay, etc.

Haugen summarized that right now we are standing at a fiscally constraint issue where we are really following the MNDOT model, with their MNSHIP document that we have been discussing at our Technical Advisory Committee meetings, where because of their financial picture as well, preservation has been the outcome of their MNSHIP Plan.

Haugen stated that some other things we have agreed to help grease the wheels so that we can meet these deadlines, previously we were talking about identifying projects above a million dollars, that are preservation type projects, we have now raised that value up to five million dollars. He explained that the five million is taken from MAP-21 in several places, but the one place he hooked onto is under five million in federal participation is almost an automatic category exclusion to the project so the environmental process has been streamlined at that value so that is where the five million came from.

Haugen commented that we now need to finalize our list for our other agencies that haven't submitted their list of projects to identify all those five million or more type of preservation projects. He said that the one project on the Minnesota side would most likely be the slide repair on the Point Bridge; and on the North Dakota side there are several streets that perhaps would come up to that five million dollar mark as well, with the obvious one probably being the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor, since, while the mill and overlay gave it some ride ability for a while, it probably won't last out to 2040.

Haugen summarized that in any event we need to finalize these lists so that we can show the feds that we are preserving the system, which is a requirement of theirs, that we identify these major projects to show that we are preserving what is in place. He added that because we are sort of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

relaxing the one million to five million, our current plan sets aside, as you see, dollars annually so that we would have monies to do these preservation type projects, so even though we are saying we are going to identify these five million or more projects, we know that every other year, or every year there will probably be a desire to have less than five million dollars flowing towards preservation type projects so we need to identify what amount, if we have anything left after we do these major projects, we can have set aside so that we still ensure that we have a way to still do annual operation and maintenance type activities as well.

Haugen commented that we will probably have a couple of meetings in September to make this October work, so hopefully you can all reserve some time to be available early in September. He said that they are suggesting we do a day long type of activity with the Technical Advisory Committee to try to work through as many of these issues as we can as a group. He reported that we also need to hold a public open house. He explained that the real purpose of this open house is to sort of portray this financial picture he just gave the committee that the public is more aware of where we are at financially with our plan. He stated that it may take more than one day to get this all done we may need to take the latter half of the regular Technical Advisory Committee meeting to hold the remainder of the special meeting.

d. Update Transit/Bike/Ped

Haugen reported that we are also updating our Transit Development Plan (TDP). He referred to a slide illustrating the schedule for that update, and added that we are also going to update our Bike/Ped component as well. He stated that those two documents will be on a month-earlier timeframe than our Street and Highway Plan. He added that they have been working with the groups on these and they essentially have the drafts completed for the public open houses to occur in September, and then to seek adoption of them in October and November.

Noehre commented that in regard to the reconstruction projects that were identified, you still have to preserve the system so therefore we might have to look at preservation methods rather than reconstruction methods for some of them at least.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there really isn't much to update on the Sorlie at this time unless NDDOT or KLJ has anything.

Noehre commented that they are still in the preliminary stages of beginning work on the EIS document. He said that they are trying to set up a meeting for the Citizens Advisory Group sometime in September.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that a public input meetings were held on July 17th. He pointed out that he included copies of the summary of those meetings in the packets. He stated that, ironically, they had nine people on the North Dakota side attend, and nine people on the Minnesota side attend.

Haugen referred to the meeting summary and reported that he doesn't think there was anything surprising in the comments they received. He went over the comments briefly, summarizing that it is safe to say that everyone feels that we need to maintain the crossings we have, but if we can improve the bike/ped accommodations that is important. He said that they also had some historic preservation perspectives discussed at the meetings as well.

Noehre commented that he just wants to emphasize that now is the time for comments and questions and input on both bridges. He stated that once the construction process begins, that, unfortunately is the time we get most of the comments and questions, but by that time it is too late, so he would like everyone to encourage your family and friends to speak up now and make their feelings and desires known for both structures.

Haugen reported that there was an advisory committee meeting held on July 31st, and somewhat giving us the feedback they got from the public at that meeting, one of the questions was "is the Kennedy Bridge worthy of being on the National Register of Historic Places", and our study committee spent a lot of time discussing the historic considerations of that structure, and in the packet was that information. He commented that they did another inspection recently and the results confirmed what they already thought was going on with the bridge, there were no surprises, no shocks as to what the condition is. He said that it is eligible for the National Register based on the engineering significance, and it has a significant role in the expanded transportation network.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation, part of which discusses historic resource considerations we need to look at when doing these types of projects, as well as issues and concerns with the bridge structure, proposed addition of a multi-purpose trail to the side of the bridge deck, etc., and went over the information briefly. (A copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Haugen reported that the next Study Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled to take place on September 25th. He stated that they will present a lot more on the bike/ped accommodations, as well as the bridge replacement alternatives. He added that they will then meet in November and December with the public to show what their study conclusions are, and then that will lead into the project development process in 2014 that will help reach a 2016 implementation date of something to improve the condition of the Kennedy Bridge crossing.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

MATTER OF LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLANS

Haugen reported that the NDDOT is updating their Strategic Highway Safety Plan. He explained that they spent most of last year working that document, but they have not finalized the document yet, however, as part of the updating of the Statewide Strategic Highway Safety Plan the crash data was telling them that there is a good portion of crashes occurring on the local system rather than on the state system, so they hired the same firm that did the Strategic Highway Safety Plan for the State to come into each county wishing to participate and develop a local road safety plans that are somewhat mirrored images of the State Plan, but is specific to that county.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that included was the e-mail details within counties that include one of the 12 urban cities. He said that if that county agrees to participate then the local safety plan will go into the urban city and do a critical analysis of the crashes occurring in the City.

Haugen commented that Grand Forks County has indicated that they will participate. He said that they also indicated that they will absorb the 10% cost of \$3,000.00, so he believes that means that in September they should be starting activities on the local road safety plan that would include Grand Forks County, as well as detailed information on the crashes occurring with the City of Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that as far as the Long Range Transportation Plan is concerned, we are required to have a safety component that sort of takes out of the Statewide Strategic Highway Safety Plan those pertinent sections that apply to our urban area, so with this local road safety plan occurring, that is really addressing our crash history, that will establish those projects that are most likely the best candidates for the Highway Safety Improvement Program, which funds safety improvements across the state, so even though we might have a December deadline, depending on what happens with these local road safety plans, and the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan, there may need to be an amendment occurring soon after the December deadline or adoption of our Long Range Transportation Plan because this safety component is not synching with our timelines.

Haugen reiterated that it is this safety component that is driving the projects that will be the best candidates for the Highway Safety Improvement Program funds, and in North Dakota that is roughly an \$8,000,000 annual pot of monies that safety projects compete for.

Information only.

MATTER OF NDDOT TRAFFIC COUNTING

Haugen reported that this is just a reminder that the NDDOT was originally going to be doing their tube counts this spring, but because of the weather, and then with the construction season starting soon after, they were delayed until this fall, so by the last week of September they hope

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2013**

to be back in town laying down all their tubes. He explained that, unless something happens, all of our major construction projects, with the exception of the English Coulee Bridge and Campus Road Replacement, should be done, so our traffic flow should be somewhat back to normal.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 14TH, 2013,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:16 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 11th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:46 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT – Grand Forks District; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Dave Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 14TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 14TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the Sorlie Bridge has been formed. He pointed out that a copy of the roster was included in the packet.

Haugen explained that their first meeting is scheduled to occur tomorrow night at 6:30 p.m., and will be an organizational meeting of sorts.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

Haugen stated that also included in the packets was information that was handed out at the scoping meeting explaining what the Citizen's Advisory Group would be doing, and asking for people to serve on that committee.

Haugen referred to the list of projects included in the packet, and stated that there will need to be some coordination between the Minnesota S.T.I.P. and the North Dakota S.T.I.P. because of the MPO T.I.P. He explained that on the North Dakota side their Draft S.T.I.P. is showing that there is a possibility that in 2017 the North Dakota funding portion might come into play, and because it is showing up in 2017 on the North Dakota side the MPO will have to show it in 2017, as will MNDOT, although they will show a zero contribution amount.

Noehre reported that "P" means it's pending, which means it may or may not end up in that year. Johnson commented that he thinks it is starting to show up in here for environmental clearance issues. He added that you can't get the Federal Highway Administration to buy in on any kind of environmental document unless it is shown in the S.T.I.P. Haugen responded that they already have, in the T.I.P., which should be in the S.T.I.P., the environmental study that is going on. Johnson agreed, but added that he thinks they want to see the actual construction project as well, and he thinks maybe that is one reason that this was thrown in here like this, although he can't be positive.

Haugen reiterated that the understanding is that the "P" means that it has a chance of being funded in 2017, but it also has a chance of not being funded in 2017, but it is showing in 2017 so it has to show up as such in all the documents.

Haugen stated that he just wanted to ensure everyone understands why the Sorlie Bridge is now showing up in 2017, in our programming documents, even though the actual work is still likely to occur in 2018.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2014 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen reminded the committee that although our T.I.P. has been frozen, we were told we had a one-time only opportunity to amend it for our State DOT and Transit Partners. He referred to the packet and pointed out that a list of amendments was included in the staff report.

Haugen stated that one amendment he still has questions on is the metro reflectivity district wide project as we have a project in 2013 already, so he is wondering if this project is just getting pushed back to 2014 now. Noehre responded that it is.

Haugen commented, then, that we have a push back of one year for that project; in North Dakota we have I-29 work that is new, not previously showing up in T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P.s; and then the South Washington Street project had an updated cost estimate.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

Haugen stated that for MNDOT projects, they are moving a 2015 Railroad Crossing improvement into 2014.

Haugen reported that for the transit projects, Grand Forks was awarded New Freedom funds, and are also doing their designated stops locally; and East Grand Forks is doing their designated stops locally as well. He added that they also show that only half of their JARC request was awarded, so we will bring it into the T.I.P., but it is just like the I-29 projects in that it may or may not get spent or used in 2014.

Haugen stated that this information was not worked out in time to hold a public hearing at this meeting, therefore a public hearing will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday, so any motion this entity makes today would be subject to any public input received.

Haugen reiterated that these are the projects that we will be amending into our T.I.P., some are new, some are just moving into the 2014 year, but they are all fiscally constrained.

Williams said that she has a question, kind of like at yesterday's meeting when she was asking if you can carry over funds from one year to the next, how does that work, it is her understanding that we couldn't. Haugen responded that the State can. He explained that there is a difference between who has the funds and what can be carried over and what can't. He stated that when you are a sub-recipient of the State you have your one year opportunity to spend the money, and if you can't deliver, then those monies will be spent elsewhere because if you're the State you have many projects to use that money for, and the money is spent the year it is programmed. Williams asked if this is a Federal Mandate or a State Policy. Haugen responded that it is probably a State Policy, spend the money the year you get it, and not have anything left on the table and then hope that at the end of the fiscal year other States leave money on the table so you can get some of those monies when they are redistributed. Noehre commented that there are never any funds fiscally banked. Williams said that she was just thinking that if there were extenuating circumstances, if you started a project but weren't able to complete it in one year, you could carry over funds to finish it the next year because you can't pay for stuff that isn't complete, but yet we still need to complete the project, and that is why she asked if it was a Federal Mandate or State Policy, because if it is just a policy then she is assuming that if there were extenuating circumstances it could be reviewed. Haugen commented that obligation is probably the word you are talking about. Johnson stated that once they obligate monies, right before it is bid, then the dollars can be carried over into other years of construction, but whatever fiscal year you have it designated in for bidding it has to fall within that year, but once it is bid you can carry over funds to the next year.

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS SUBJECT TO ANY PUBLIC INPUT.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

MATTER OF DRAFT UPDATE ON TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Haugen reported that we are starting to implement some of the requirements of MAP-21, and just as we have with our Street and Highway Plan, we also have performance measures and targets for our Transit Development Plan.

Haugen explained that we adopted our Transit Development Plan in early 2012, but so we had to come back and identify performance targets for the transit side of our Long Range Transportation Plan, and these are included in the packet.

Haugen commented that we also had to go back and look at our financial plan as well, so we worked with Transit Staff and developed these performance targets, assigned to the goals we had, and many are things that were already in the document, but weren't labeled as such, but are things we hope to address.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the financial plan, and explained that he did not, for whatever reason, include the old financial plan in the packet, just the new one, but he shows both here. He stated that when they did this they were still hoping, or were still under the old philosophy that there were a multitude of grants available that the State of North Dakota and individual properties within the State of North Dakota were successful in getting funds out of, so they were programming a lot of their major capital purchases as illustrative so that they could show that although we didn't have the exact funding to do them, but we were hoping to get the funding to be able to do them, but with MAP-21 all of those programs went away, and there is really only one state-wide \$1.25 million dollar pot available for capital projects, so one can easily see that there isn't enough money available for all of the transit capital needs, so we had to re-vamp our financial plan.

Haugen reported that one thing that occurred was that the State Legislature did significantly increase some State dollars, not millions but hundreds of thousands of dollars, so a lot of the capital purchases are now being shown, particularly when it involves the replacement of vehicles, as being funded with local dollars, and we also approached East Grand Forks, and they are now committing some of their federal dollars to assist in the replacement of the Demand Response Vehicles as well.

Haugen stated that what this financial plan now shows is that we are able to preserve and maintain, in good repair, all of our rolling stock, as well as our security systems, etc., but we still have some major capital expenditures that we can't include in the new plan, that will still need to be shown as illustrative, including the maintenance, or rehab of the maintenance garage.

Haugen reiterated that we are now showing a lot of what were previously illustrative projects, particularly those that were state of good repair projects, as being funded locally so that we are meeting MAP-21's expectation of state of good repair, with the exception of the bus barn.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

Haugen commented that is still the intent, that even though we show that we have the capability of local dollars to replace fleets, that we will be applying for our portion of the \$1.25 million that is competitive state-wide, but you can see that these dollar amounts are much higher than would be covered by the \$1.25 million in any one year.

Haugen stated that this is, then, in essence the amendments to our TD; inserting the actual terms “performance targets” to things that more or less are already contained in the text, and then revamping the financial plan to show how MAP-21 changed, particularly how capital expenditures are financed.

Haugen said that they aren’t asking for any action today, and the next line of business will be to schedule a public open house type meeting to present this to the public of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks; and then starting in October going through the formal adoption process with each City Planning Commission and City Council; with final adoption occurring in November.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT BIKE/PED PLAN UPDATE

Erickson reported that the Bike and Pedestrian Plan is updated every five years. She said that the plan will increase the accessibility and mobility option for people by providing transportation choices not only for the residents of East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, but for visitors exploring the cities as well.

Erickson stated that this plan has targets and goals, similar to those of the Transit Development Plan, which she can go over if desired.

Erickson referred to the Existing and Planned Bikeway Network Map, included in the packets, and explained that the solid lines indicate the existing system and the dashed lines what is planned to be added to the system on both the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks sides. She pointed out that it also shows more shared paths, bike routes, bike lanes, and the newest, Sharrows, which are shared lanes that are marked with bikes and arrows in the lane itself.

Erickson referred to the cost table and reported that in terms of cost, a lot of factors go into play, but this gives us an idea of which options are the least expensive, and which ones are more expensive. She stated that this will add 125 miles to the system, 60 miles on the Grand Forks side and 65 miles on the East Grand Forks side. She added that a lot of the costs go into the multi-use paths, which are \$100, give or take a few dollars, per linear foot.

Williams commented that you can’t put green lanes on the street. She explained that the MUTCD says you cannot unless you specifically do a special request, so that should not even be in there. Erickson responded that they aren’t in the plan, she just put them in the financials in case someone had a questions as to how much it would cost to put one in. Williams stated that it isn’t \$20.00 a linear foot, it is \$20.00 per square foot, and that is a very big important difference.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

Williams stated that Sharrows are traffic control devices that are operational items, and you cannot plan where those go, there are specific ways that they must be installed and the streets in our downtown are much too narrow to be able to put them in, as you have to have them so many feet away from the cars, and you'd end up putting people in the opposite lanes if you put them in, and that is not appropriate to have in a planning device, it is strictly a function of operations as to whether we install a traffic control device or not.

Noehre asked what a Sharrow is. Williams responded that it is a shared road. Erickson added that it has a bike symbol with two arrows above it on the pavement. She said it just shows that the bike would ride up through the middle of the arrows, so bikers know where they need to be and vehicles know where to expect them to be. Williams stated that most of our streets are not wide enough for them, and it is in the MUTCD as to what you're supposed to do. She added that it is also in the MUTCD as far as where you should use them and not use them, there are places that you can't use them, so that should not be part of the planning process at all.

Ellis asked if the roads are wide enough in Downtown Fargo for Sharrows. Williams responded that she doesn't know if they are or not, she hasn't seen them yet. Ellis stated that they have Sharrows in their downtown. Williams said that what you're supposed to do is your supposed to have eight feet for a vehicle to park, and then allow at least four feet for the vehicle doors to open up, and then the sharrow would go in after that; well, Downtown Grand Forks, by the time you do that they would be located in the middle of the street, and she doesn't think that is where you want someone riding a bicycle. She said that she doesn't know how they installed them in Fargo. Ellis responded that they have diagonal parking there. Williams commented that if you have diagonal parking that is an entirely different story, and that's why it is an operational function not a planning function, because there's lots of different stuff that has to be considered before you can, you can't just put them in. She added that it also says that there is supposed to be a demonstrated need for them before you install them. Ellis asked, though, if they can't propose them on streets that have diagonal parking even though they are operational. Williams responded they can't, adding that that type of device is just the same as a stop sign. Ellis said, then, that you can't plan for them, you just have to say operationally, when they are needed they would be installed. She asked who decides when they are needed, can't you still plan for them. Williams responded that your traffic engineer, your engineer, it just isn't part of the planning process, it may be part of the City's process of looking at stuff, but it is like trying to put on this map where I should be putting stop signs in, it is the same thing, it is a traffic control device that is not a planning type thing unless it is like, we've got traffic signals that are warranted, and we know for sure that in a certain number of years we are going to need a signal there.

Haugen reported that the planning document is trying to establish a network to guide riders from parts of town. Williams said that it could be listed as a route, and then it would be up to operations to determine what is the most appropriate traffic control devices to install on the route, so, yes, you can list them as routes because routes are not striped as a lane, so that's where you can definitely do that. Ellis asked if you could put a route/sharrow if engineering approves, or something like that. Williams responded that, no, what she would do would be to write it up to say that some of the items that could be used on routes is bike signs, sharrows, etc. She added

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

that bike symbols are not even listed in this, the sharrows got listed but there are no bike symbols or anything. She said, again, that it can be marked as a route and then list sharrows as one traffic control device option.

Noehre asked if this update process is just starting, or are you near conclusion. Erickson responded that this is a draft.

Haugen referred to an illustration of a sharrow and explained that the difference between it and a bike lane, that in a bike lane you would have at least one solid striped line, and you could have the bike symbol but you wouldn't have the chevrons, the share symbol. He added that with a sharrow you aren't giving bikers their dedicated physical space, your guiding them as to where the most appropriate place might be for them to ride on that surface, plus you're also informing all users of the surface that this is part of a bike facility as well as a vehicle.

Noehre asked who they would provide input to so that things are on the map. Haugen responded that Stephanie would be the person to provide input to. He stated that the next step is to schedule a public open house. He said that Stephanie has met with the Greenway Trail Users Group and the Tech Committee and Neighborhood Groups. Stephanie added that there is an information fair for all the Neighborhoods that she will be attending as well. Haugen stated that you have ten days or so to provide feedback to us.

Williams commented that they discussed this a little bit this morning, and one of the things, she hasn't had a chance to go through it, so, sometimes you can't always just put in a bike lane, and she knows there are a couple of council people that wants bike lanes, but it is impossible to put them in without widening the road, and if you're going to widen the road just to install a bike lane, that should be the cost of the bike lane, it should include the cost of widening the road. Stephanie asked what she was referring to when she says widening the road, taking out parking. Williams responded that she isn't talking about taking out parking, take Columbia Road, there already isn't any parking, but in order to put a bike lane down Columbia, you would have to physically widen the street, and if that is being done specifically to put in bike lanes, than that is a cost of the bike lane, it isn't a function of the street. Erickson said that she was looking at all of that, and taking into consideration the width of roads, and trying to keep the width of the roads between 11 to 13 foot lanes.

Williams said that the other thing that they would be discussing is, that this what FHWA recommends, is that you may want to be able to get from here to here on a bike, but you may have a parallel facility that is more appropriate to stripe bike lanes on, or something like that, but the intent of the plan is to get people from here to here, and we may have to move the routes. Erickson responded that she agrees, that she did consider this and did use a bike route instead of a bike lane because of the amount of traffic and the width of the streets.

Haugen stated that the challenge is the old part of both communities, how do we establish a network within the old parts of town where boulevard trees are too precious and mature to remove in order to get space for a shared use path.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

Haugen said that we are distributing this to you for your comments, but they aren't saying that this is your one and only chance to give feedback, they are actually asking for more feedback on specific things.

Haugen stated that it is their hope to have preliminary approval in October, and final approval on this part of our Long Range Transportation Plan in November.

Information only.

**MATTER OF IMMEDIATE FEEDBACK FROM LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION
PLAN UPDATE OPEN HOUSE**

Haugen reported that there were three different meetings on this agenda item held yesterday, and all of them were on-time. He stated that the materials that were presented focused on the Minnesota side, specifically the sub-target funds East Grand Forks gets every four years, roughly \$500,000 to \$750,000. He explained that we need to start identifying specifically what projects would be utilizing those funds, so it is pretty simple on the Minnesota side.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side they are just giving information that the financial forecasts are such that we will have a challenge financing even rehabbing the State Highway System, let alone doing any of the wish lists, that Terry Bjerke kept reminding us, but we think we were able to convey that message well.

Haugen commented that they also tried to iterate that we are talking just about the pavement when we talk about these costs, we aren't talking about anything like widening, or intersection improvements, or safety fixes, just pavement surface issues.

Haugen stated that at the Open House at the Grand Forks Herald they had the Merrifield Interchange Bridge parties show up, and that was about it as far as the public was concerned. He said that they were already informed that there aren't any funds to do this project, as we are having a hard time funding what we can put on the surface let alone make improvements to the system.

Williams asked what the deadline is for comments on this. Haugen responded that they would like them sooner rather than later because they are pushed for time. Williams said, however, that they just received the information Friday, so that doesn't give them much time to go through it. Haugen commented that information was given out yesterday, and there will be revisions to that information based on the comments received at the meetings. Williams asked if Alternative 3 would be sent out because she didn't receive a copy of it. Haugen responded that he would do that, but he knows that Mr. Noehre is working on some changes. Williams said that they are working on changes too, but you have to start someplace, so she would like to be able to see what there is right now. Haugen commented that all they have on Alternative 3, the Hybrid, is just sort of taking some of the reconstruction projects in the first timeframe from Mr. Noehre's first version, and putting them into his rehabilitation, and then there is one project at the very end

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

where they moved over reconstruction on Gateway Drive, just State Highway Projects. Williams said, however, that there isn't any reason to reinvent the wheel when they can take what Mr. Noehre has already worked on and they can have their comments taken care of, it will maybe reduce the number of comments you get back on this.

Haugen reiterated that this was the feedback they received from the three meetings. He added that they will get Alternative 3, or the Hybrid Alternative, and suggested that everyone watch the video on the Grand Forks side on Channel 2, which will be posted on the website as well.

Discussion ensued on when the video would be rebroadcast, and placed on the website for viewing.

Information only

OTHER BUSINESS

1. TAP

Haugen reported that next month, both States have sort of provided some guidance and decisions on the new TAP program. He explained that the TAP program is a combination of the old Safe Routes To School, Enhancement, Recreational Trails, and Scenic Byways programs.

Haugen stated that one of the first decisions both States had to make was whether or not they were going to allow recreation trails to be set aside as its own program under the old rules, and both decided they would do this so recreational trails will see very little difference from how it has been operated in the past. He added, however, that he hopes one difference we will see is, because it is federal funds, that it goes through the planning programming process.

Haugen said that the Scenic Byways is really not carried forward as its own program, even under the new TAP, so it is really an expired program.

Haugen commented that this, then, leaves us with Enhancements and Safe Routes To School. He said that the next decision was, after you take out recreational trails, that of the remaining funds, 50% have to be distributed around the States for TAP projects, and the other 50% the State can decide where to spend it or if they want to flex it completely out of the TAP program into something else. He stated that Minnesota is keeping it in the TAP program, and North Dakota is taking it out and spending it elsewhere.

Haugen reported that with this in play we will have to develop an application form that covers the old Safe Routes to School and the Enhancements into one form. He said that on the North Dakota side they have not had any soft funds set aside but they have on the Minnesota side, 15% for Safe Routes To School to ensure there are still some Safe Routes to School activities taking place out of the TAP program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2013**

Williams asked where the Rail Crossing Safety program ended up. Haugen responded that it is still in programming, it is still a subset of the HSIP as it always has been.

Haugen stated that next month we will have to distribute out the new application form for review and approval. He added that he believes that North Dakota still has the ability to solicit projects in order to get back to their normal T.I.P Cycle, S.T.I.P. Cycle. He explained that North Dakota has only been programming these one year ahead, while Minnesota has programmed for the full four year cycle, so there a possibility on the Minnesota side that it gets skipped this year in order to allow for everyone to get their Safe Routes to School and Enhancement forms and such wrapped up into one document.

Haugen commented that one thing we have to think about in Grand Forks is, because the Safe Routes to School, there is a whole other group that has been submitting projects under the School District, and they are no longer an eligible recipient, so everything has to flow through the City to the MPO, so we will have to make sure all the people involved in the enhancements in the past, and all the people involved in Safe Routes to School in the past get into one room at one time and prioritize projects and submit them to the council for approval.

Haugen stated that State DOTs are no longer eligible recipients of the TAP funds, so if the District wants to do a welcome sign on North 81, they will have to find a local sponsor to apply for TAP funds.

Haugen said that next month we will have changes to the TAP program. He added that maybe by then the ATP in Minnesota will have decided if they are soliciting or not.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2013, 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
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 9th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT–Grand Forks District; and Teri Kouba (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Cities Area Transit; Dave Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-District 2; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority.

Guest(s) present were: Kim Greendahl, Grand Forks Greenway; Nick West, KLJ; and Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT-St. Paul.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KOUBA, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that the staff report states that NDDOT selected Kadrmas, Lee and Jackson to complete Phase I, and that the Citizen’s Advisory Group held their

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

first meeting on September 12th, however few members were able to attend. He suggested that for further information on the Sorlie project a person should go to the website www.sorliebridge.com.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen stated that there was an Advisory Committee meeting held last Thursday. He said that a lot of the materials presented at that meeting were included in the packet.

Noehre commented that last week he met with the Near Southside Neighborhood group to give them information on both the Kennedy and the Sorlie Bridge projects. He said that he would be willing to do that for other neighborhoods, or other organizations if any are interested. He stated that he will do this; not to take away from any public meetings, or visiting websites, but to actually help give people additional information so as to allow them to really understand what these projects entail, where the projects are today, and to encourage their further involvement in the project processes.

Williams asked if there is a timetable as to when they might see some costs for all these different alternatives. McKinnon responded that for the Kennedy the first report is supposed to be done in December, so he would think that there should be something available sometime in December. Noehre added that the alternative cost ranges, and these are very preliminary numbers, are: 1) replacement - from \$20,000,000 to \$33,000,000; 2) very minimal rehab - from \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000; and 3) a moderate rehab – from \$13,000,000 to \$15,500,000. He stated that this is what they covered at the Study Advisory Committee meeting.

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

Presentation ensued.

Haugen pointed out that one thing that the presentation focuses on is addressing the bike/ped accommodations, as most of the other things have been covered in previous presentations.

Haugen commented that MNDOT, after the I-35W Bridge collapse, bonded for bridge repair across the State, that is what the reference to Chapter 52 in the presentation is referring to. He said that within that State Law, if they are using funds out of this bonding, and if the bridge is located in an urban area, and there isn't another bridge located within a quarter of a mile, they have to accommodate bikes and pedestrians.

Haugen reported that there are two types of rehabilitation alternatives; one they referred to as minimal and the other as moderate. He stated that minimal is what they can get by with as a short-term solution, and moderate is addressing the issue in a more robust manner by doing what really needs to be addressed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

Haugen commented that Alternatives 2B and 2C deal with different ways of how to accommodate bikes and pedestrians; and one is located on the outside of the truss system and the other inside the truss system.

Haugen referred to a slide of an overhead aerial view outside the truss; and pointed out that it shows where they would physically, for the truss system itself, attach a bike/ped accommodation to the truss system. He added that on the approach spans for various technical reasons, they would be building stand-alone structures. He stated that this is just a general layout of how it would look.

Haugen pointed out that the remaining slides discuss inside the truss system. He stated that replacing the deck brings this from a minor rehab to a moderate rehab. He added that replacing the deck wouldn't change the driving lanes much, but it would create a lot of changes to the rail system on both sides of the bridge. He said that the rail system itself is a large part of the deck, which is why they are looking at a different rail system as well.

Haugen stated that there are a lot of ways that they can try to address a bike/ped facility within the truss system. He referred to slides illustrating the different options, and went over them briefly.

Williams asked, on a U.S. Highway, is there a minimum lane width when there are a certain percentage of trucks using it, is eleven feet okay? Noehre responded that probably require some sort of design inception. McKinnon commented that twelve feet is a standard, but they have gotten by with eleven feet in some instances.

Haugen reported that shared bike lanes are fourteen feet wide, that is the minimum allowed for a designated share lane.

Noehre commented that they are coordinating with bicycle groups, and that is why some of the early options have been eliminated.

Haugen stated that the next few slides discuss replacement of the bridge, and the different types of replacement alternatives. He referred to those slides and went over them briefly.

Williams asked, if you require a biker to dismount and walk across the bridge on a sidewalk rather than providing a bike lane or such, does that address bicycle needs, or are we supposed to make them stay on the bike. Haugen responded that on a historic structure you have some leeway, so that is one of the benefits of this now being classified as an historic structure.

Williams asked, if it is cantilever, that would put the railing between the pedestrian/bicycle users and the traffic, correct, the railing would stay in-tact. Haugen responded that there is the option of doing the minor rehab, we are not replacing the deck and doing the cantilever of the bike/ped, but in that case you would leave what is there and cantilever over so the separate bike/ped would have its own rail system on both sides. Williams stated that she is just wondering, they have this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

little chart for the likelihood of meeting historical regulations. Haugen responded that is what he was just displaying on the last slide.

Williams asked if there was another column that rates safety of these different options. Haugen responded there is not. Noehre commented that he is a bicycle rider, and he would be hesitant for himself to go across this bridge, much less letting his grandchildren go across. Williams agreed, adding that she isn't looking for a number, just good, better, best, or something, there has to be something with this historical nature of it that would kind of weigh it against something else, and in her mind weighing it against safety.

Haugen commented that the next few slides sort of set the stage of what is next. He pointed out that they indicate that bridge rehabilitation has less risk assigned to it. He stated that if you decided on replacement you have to basically prove that there isn't another feasible alternative, which might be difficult to show since they have already shown us several things they can do to the bridge, outside replacing it.

Haugen reiterated that a copy of the study document should be available soon. He stated that between now and then there will be some additional public input meetings, and the draft report will be out beforehand so people have a chance to review the draft study. He added that the study wasn't meant to recommend a specific project, it was just to lay out options. Noehre commented that a minimal rehabilitation would probably offer more or less a ten-year solution so spending \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000 for a ten year or less solution, as well as the cost/benefit of the other options is something that will have to be looked at.

Johnson asked if there has been any talk during this, since the bikepath outside the structure for a large portion on either side of the river has to be a separate structure, to make the bike/ped a separate structure altogether. Haugen responded that he has heard some discussion on that option, but it isn't part of this study.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2014-2017 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.

Haugen stated that this is the Draft 2014-2017 North Dakota side T.I.P. He reminded the committee that the Minnesota T.I.P. was approved back in April, and, if you recall there were some amendments made last month so the Draft Minnesota side has had some amendments made to it, but this is the first time we are considering a North Dakota side T.I.P. for the next go-around, 2014-2017.

Haugen commented that because of the amendment that just happened, most of the new projects in the first three years of the T.I.P. were known and identified so unless there are some specific questions he will be focusing on the last year, 2017.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

Williams said that none of the dollar amounts or project descriptions have changed since the last meeting, correct. Haugen responded that there are some questions that he will go through. Noehre stated that South Washington's cost estimate is different. Haugen agreed, but added that it was amended into the T.I.P. last month, so is already included in this one.

Haugen pointed out that we originally said that the Sorlie Bridge project would not show up until 2018, however North Dakota is currently showing it in their Draft 2014-2017 S.T.I.P., so in order to have the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. mirror each other our Draft 2014-2017 T.I.P. shows it as a 2017 project with all sorts of notations saying that it is put in year 2017 because North Dakota may want to have some of its federal share taken out of FY2017, but the Minnesota share will be coming in 2018, so in 2018 we will show a flip of this so that zero dollars are shown on the North Dakota side and all the dollars are shown on the Minnesota side.

Haugen commented that on the City side, or on the Non-State Highway System, two projects that were submitted for consideration, and they both received funding. He added that there were also some HSIP projects that were awarded funding, and they are all showing in 2017.

Johnson stated that, it should be noted that on the HSIP projects, that even though they showed up in NDDOT's list, the final HSIP has not been approved by Federal Highway yet.

Haugen said that there are some questions; in past T.I.P.s, and he carried it over into this T.I.P., they had some individual dynamic message signs along the interstate, and then with those projects we just amended in last month a lot of them talk about some ITS components, are those wrapped up into that project, or are these DMS signs still separate. Noehre responded that the DMS signs are separate from the other project.

Haugen reported that the public hearing for this item has been advertised to occur at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

Noehre commented that Sign Metro Reflectivity Projects, the way it is currently sitting it will most likely not touch the MPO area. He added that they are probably only going to look at the I-29 Corridor from the South Dakota border to the Canadian border, and then possibly Highway 2 if funding is available, however all of the signs on Highway 2 and I-29 in the MPO area have already been done.

Johnson said he has one minor comment on the Illustrative Project list, just a clarification thing. He said that he thinks that with respect to 42nd Avenue, you note that it is listed as illustrative due to an EA still being prepared, it is now a PCR, not an EA. Haugen asked if it still needs to be listed as an illustrative project then, because it was originally included because of the need for the environmental documents to be signed off on, and it has been signed off on, so does it still need to be included. Johnson responded that he isn't sure that it has been signed off on yet. Williams said she would check to see if it has been signed off on.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION
TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2014-2017 T.I.P. SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF ANY PUBLIC INPUT RECEIVED AT PUBLIC HEARING NEXT WEDNESDAY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen said that the question that is out there is, currently the MPO has a frozen T.I.P., and we can't approve anything more until we have adoption of our Long Range Transportation Plan, so both States are probably trying to process an approval of their S.T.I.P., and with our MPO T.I.P. frozen, the question is how are those documents addressing what we just adopted as a draft. Johnson responded that the S.T.I.P. the North Dakota side is going to send to Federal Highway will be all inclusive of everything they have given the MPO, and that is already in place, but the request for approval is going to seclude the MPO area and that MPO area will be working of the 2013-2016 T.I.P., which is why all those projects were amended into it.

Johnson added that all the projects identified in the T.I.P. amendment for the 2013-2016 T.I.P. will still be able to move forward, as they are all listed in the 2014-2017 S.T.I.P., but the action will be taken off the 2013-2016 T.I.P. until completion of the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Williams asked if he is asking for automatic approval once our Long Range Plan is completed. Johnson responded that he isn't asking for that, that we will need to do a secondary approval, and a letter will need to be sent to Federal Highway letting them know that the plan is now completed, and we would like to now have full final approval of the 2014-2017 T.I.P.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF PROJECTS FOR 2015-2018 T.I.P.

Haugen distributed copies of the MPO 2015-2018 T.I.P. schedule. He said that this is an update to the information that was included in the packet.

Haugen reported that they just finished the Draft 2015-2018 T.I.P. document, and they are trying to get back, particularly on the North Dakota side, to what has been our traditional T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle; soliciting projects in the fall, developing a draft in the spring, and finalizing that document over the summer/early fall, so we are not formally announcing that we are back on that schedule on the North Dakota side, and also announcing Minnesota things.

Haugen reminded the committee that generally everything, every project that is in the gray area needs to be shown in our T.I.P. document. He said that this includes anything that involves a Federal Highway decision, so back to that illustrative project, it is in there because Federal Highway has to make a decision on the environmental document. He added that anything that is federally funded, regardless of the funding source; and regionally significant projects regardless of funding source should be in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that the timeline for the different programs, that he could identify, the traditional street and highway type projects, both sides have begun their solicitation. He said that on the North Dakota side they are due to the MPO by December 4th; and on the Minnesota side they are due by February 5th.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

Haugen briefly went over the solicitation schedule for each funding source (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Information only.

MATTER OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that he included the packet, both Stephanie and Teri have been taking the preliminary approvals for the Bike/Ped Plan that we discussed last month. He referred to the packet and pointed out that he included a copy of the presentation and other materials they are presenting. He said that he did not intend to go over this information at today's meeting.

Haugen commented that Federal Highway asked for the matrix showing when everything was due for their meetings, and this is where we are at in that process with those documents.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the packet and available upon request), and went over the information.

Haugen stated that on the Street and Highway side, last month we were left with the conundrum that we had with financing. He referred to a slide that showed three different alternatives that they have been working with NDDOT District Office on, and went over each briefly.

Haugen commented that they have gone through some various iterations with this, and he thinks they have come to some terms with Mr. Noehre on a list of projects that focused on the rehabilitation with the new cycle legs, making sure they have identified all possible projects.

Presentation ensued.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2014 UPWP

Haugen reported that it is that time of year when we are finishing up the first year of a two year work program, so we are asking this body to spend the next month or two to look at the list of projects we identified for 2014, to determine if they are still the valid project you want us to study, and if there is something new you would like us to consider, let us know.

Haugen referred to the project list, and pointed out that the projects shown highlighted are what we plan on doing in 2014: 1) Transportation Plan Update and Implementation – ITS Regional Architecture -- he explained that in reality the Long Range Transportation Plan update is our ITS Regional Architecture; 2) the Gateway Drive Access Management study, potentially west of the Interstate to the Airport, however the boundaries have not yet been defined; and 3) Traffic Incident Management Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2013**

Haugen commented that, as the staff report notes, our pavement management will be carried over into 2014, as well as our traffic counting program. He stated that the funding we had for those in 2013 will carry over in 2014, so they don't displace any of the 2014 projects, so staff is asking you to consider this as what we identified in our approved work program to start next year, and unless we hear otherwise, it is what we will do next year.

Williams asked if there was any estimation of when these will start. Haugen responded that the Incident Management and Gateway Drive Access projects' RFPs will probably go out within the first two months of 2014, with a consultant on board by April, and they would have a completion date of December.

Haugen reported that we are going to be utilizing ATAC again for the Regional Architecture plan, however he hasn't discussed how this fits their schedule yet, so he doesn't have a start date for this project at this time, but if we go with the same schedule as last time it was a four month process.

Haugen commented that we will need to write an amendment to carry over the pavement management and traffic counting program funds from 2013 to 2014. He stated that at that time they will make sure that there are funds available for activities if we need to finalize the 2040 plan.

Information only

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 9TH,
2013, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:05 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 13th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT–Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Dave Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-District 2; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority.

Guest(s) present were: Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT-St. Paul.; Brian Shorten, SRF Consulting; Nathan Koster, SRF Consulting; and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that everyone please state their names and the agency they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 9TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY DAME, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 13TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that within a month there will be a public input meeting held to discuss the results of the study. He stated that the draft study report should be available soon for review.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that they are still working on the Purpose and Need Statement.

Information only.

MATTER OF STATUS OF LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that it includes three presentations; Transit Development, Bike/Ped, and Street and Highway sections.

Haugen reported that this evening they are holding a public open house on the Draft Street and Highway Plan update in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room at 5:30, with a presentation at 6:00 to 7:30.

Haugen stated that the Transit Development Plan Update has gone through all the preliminary approvals on both sides of the river, as has the Bike/Ped Plan Update.

Haugen reported that the Street and Highway Plan Update received preliminary approval at the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission meeting last Wednesday; there is the open house tonight ; and tomorrow it will be presented to the East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission tomorrow for preliminary approval; and then next week it will be presented to the City Councils as well.

Haugen commented that the Grand Forks Planning Commission did give final approval to both the Transit Development Plan and the Bike/Ped Plan Updates. He stated, however, that there was a slight issue with the East Grand Forks Planning Commission, the public notice did not get published in time, thus final approval will occur in December instead. He added that this will put them on the same approval schedule as the Street and Highway Plan for final approval in December, however they still expect that next Monday night, in Grand Forks, the resolution ordinance approving these plans will be granted.

Transit Development Plan

Haugen stated that they did some revisions to the performance measures and targets in the Transit Development Plan document, and also had to rework some of the financial information. He explained that they are delaying the 30-minute headway in order to allow them to purchase

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

some additional vehicle replacement coaches. He said that they do have East Grand Forks and Minnesota now participating in the Dial-a-Ride and Senior Rider coach replacement program, so they are able to show that they can fiscally replace, maintain, and operate their current system; and can fiscally afford to implement the 30-minute headways in 2015 now and fully in 2016, but they still have some unmet needs out there of expansion of the system as both cities grow, there are some areas that under this plan they cannot provide service to. He added that they also need to do some work on the bus barn, and UND has a shuttle system that needs its coaches replaced as well, so they weren't able to address all of the fiscal needs in the transit system, but they are going to show how they can maintain the current operation, and that they can replace the current existing fleet within the system.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Bike/Ped Plan

Haugen reported that the Bike/Ped Plan Update has gone through the preliminary approval process, and received final approval from the Grand Forks Planning Commission. He stated that this presentation has been shopped around, and in addition to the local agency meetings, Stephanie has received Resolutions of Support from UND and the Greenway Trail Users Group.

Erickson commented that just from the public alone, they have received thirty-five plus comments, and they have all be very positive, they like what is already in place and are looking forward to what the future will bring. She added that the public has offered lots of ideas, and are very excited and happy with what is already in place.

Williams asked if they had added the caveat that states that these facilities will need further study to determine precisely what type of facility is eventually needed. Haugen responded that they had.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT BIKE/PED PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Street and Highway Plan

Haugen reported that Brian Shorten and Nathan Koster, SRF Consulting Group, are here today to give a brief presentation. He stated that what is being presented today is slightly altered from what was included in the packets.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

Shorten stated that they did get the draft plan completed by the deadline, and it has already gone through a couple different iterations of review at the MPO level; and it appears that Federal Highway delivered some comments based on discussion they had at, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, a North Dakota Management Committee meeting, via conference call, a couple of weeks ago. He said that they would like to highlight some of the key elements today.

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

Discussion/Comments

Williams asked, on University Avenue, the memo prepared by SRF said that these were potential alternatives, and that prior to making any decision there should be further studies done on it, and she doesn't think it is appropriate to list those items as something that we are going to proceed on prior to have the additional studies done. She said that there are some very, very specific recommendations in there, the UND Transportation Committee endorsed some of them, but it was not a unanimous decision by any means, there were several members of the committee that wanted further study before doing any of it, and she totally concurs that we need to review that area, and we need to do something, and there is some stuff that needs to be done, but she is not sure that it is appropriate to specifically list lane widths in a Long Range Transportation Plan, or lane assignments and that sort of thing. She added that she would prefer that it be something like pedestrian improvements, and congestion management improvements, etc. She stated that she just isn't sure this is appropriate. She added that there were also a couple other things in the list of items where it said to do a two lane road and a forty-foot whatever, well forty-foot isn't one of our City standards, so she would prefer to have them just say that we need two lanes, or we need three lanes striped, or we need left turn movements at the intersections. She said that we may want to do left turn pockets at intersections and install our on street parking in the middle where there are no driveways. She stated that getting real specific kind of ties their hands sometimes in trying to do what is best in terms of congestions and parking and pedestrian facilities, and once again, although she agrees we need things done at intersections, but it doesn't make any sense to put in a continuous left turn lane when there are no driveways in the area.

Williams stated that another comment she has is that a couple of times she got lost, and that is unusual for her as she has a pretty good sense of direction, but she thinks the biggest problem is that the nomenclature that was used; its 32nd Avenue South or its South 34th Street, there is 34th, there is 34th Street, there is South 34th Street, and they are all used, so one time she was trying to figure out where something was and she discovered it was 32nd in East Grand Forks, so that was kind of confusing.

Shorten responded that this is why they are here talking about this instead of asking for adoption, there is another whole month before they do that, so he would have to turn this over to Mr. Haugen as far as discussion about how you want to approach University. He said that they can certainly bring it down more general if that is the intention, and they did include those projects on the Illustrative List, so their dollar amounts don't affect anything, so they can make adjustments. He agreed that Ms. Williams is right, and they may have gotten a little ahead of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

themselves, and he knows that one thing that came out pretty strongly was that there be no closure. Williams said that that was probably the big issue they wanted to resolve so they could move on because she thinks they all recognize that there are some things going on over there that need to be done, but she isn't sure it is the place for the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and the Counties to be paying for a parking study for UND to resolve the issue of congestion management, that is kind of a UND item and she isn't sure that that really belongs in there. She added that, once again, it could be simply replaced with congestion management type things, for one thing the traffic signal wasn't looked at for the one intersection, you can control the traffic and the pedestrian by putting up signals and telling them they can't, and then they can be cited for jay walking, so there are a couple of things you didn't have time, or you weren't asked to look, and she just totally agree with the memo that they need to further explore this whole thing prior to making any firm recommendations as to what exactly needs to be done with that corridor, but something does need to be done.

Shorten stated that Mr. Haugen mentioned that the Bike/Ped Plan is also in the process of being updated. He asked if that also addresses this area. Haugen responded that it did not. Williams commented that she thinks it recognizes that there are bike lanes on University Avenue already, and that is still in the plan.

Shorten said that he thinks that also in that process they talked about the decorative fence to avoid crossing mid-block, and he remembers the second open house there was some support of that, and some not. Williams agreed, adding that there are different things, and it may not be the same treatment for the entire length of the corridor, we may want to just do something for a certain area, or such.

Shorten stated that they are here to take direction from this group, and they can talk to Mr. Haugen after the public meeting tonight if there is more input, but he sees there is a way, especially since this is on the Illustrative List, that they can make these more generalized to give more freedom to City Staff to be able to do further analyses, and make the ultimate decisions. Williams agreed, adding that what makes this difficult is that things change, development changes, there are zoning changes made, and all sorts of factors occur, so to nail something down to something specific it makes it necessary to do an amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan, so being a little less specific makes sense.

Presentation on Recommended Network and Implementation ensued.

Discussion/Comments

Noehre asked what the purpose of having an Illustrative Project List. Koster responded that the Illustrative Projects will be identified by the plan, and could be amended into a time period, but at this time there isn't any revenue available to address them within the fiscal constraints. Haugen added that it addresses two things; one is that a lot of the funding sources that you might be seeking for these Illustrative Projects want to know if it is in the plan or not, and this is the only way it can be shown in the plan. He added that this is very similar to our T.I.P.s, where we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

see an Illustrative Projects list, which is done so that a project can go through another process of approval for possible funding, so that is one reason we do this; another reason is these projects all solve an issue or a problem with a deficiency out there, they are all thoroughly good projects, we just didn't have the fiscal ability to fund and recommend them, but those projects just don't disappear, they are still good projects, they are still solving a need out there, so by having it included as an Illustrative Project it allows a stronger ability that the revenue should be made available to help us fund them.

Noehre referred to Number 22 on the Issues and Opportunities Needs Map is the Southend Bypass. He asked if there were any projects in the Illustrative List that deal with the Southend Bypass other than the Merrifield Interchange and the river crossing. Koster responded that there were. He pointed out that there was a project that had been on the Range of Alternatives that they moved to the Illustrative Project list, and it involves paving the one mile segment that is gravel right now, and a few spot treatments for turning lanes.

Noehre stated that it shouldn't be a surprise to anyone that this concerns him. He explained that the fact that there is an intersection at Highway 2 and County Road 5 at the Airport that certainly requires some improvements be made to it by adding turning lanes and signal upgrades, etc.; and there are five intersections on the North Dakota side alone; DeMers and 32nd Ave., Merrifield and County Road 5, Columbia Road and Merrifield, Washington or County 81 and Merrifield Road, that all need at least some turn lanes, widening radii, potential signals at \$500,000 apiece, it is 15 miles long and there is probably on three to five miles where there are actual shoulders. He added that U.S. 2 has no seasonal load restrictions, and he has no idea what seasonal road restrictions are for the County, but even if there aren't any he would imagine that it doesn't take the same type of truck traffic that U.S. 2 does so that could potentially mean looking at pavement thicknesses, widening the roadway, and there are residential areas that, according to the current rules, would add capacity so you might be looking at noise abatement solutions, but that is just a couple issues for 15 miles of the Southend Bypass that are not addressed in this Illustrative Plan. He said that there are some odds and ends addressed in the plan, but this is demonstrating to the public, to elected officials, a very disingenuous picture of what a Southend Bypass would really entail, so now we are putting it on an Illustrative Project list that can be moved easily, and could look for additional funds, and could easily be moved into the Long Range Transportation Plan, with a bridge and interchange, and that is just scratching the surface.

Noehre commented that the MPO pushed for an interchange and a river crossing, and the Southend Bypass Coalition keeps writing letters to the Editor about a Southend Bypass, and really the issue is the interchange, and so we say we need a Southend Bypass, but really what we are looking for is an interchange, so he thinks when these kind of discussions come up we should be able to point to the plan and say here is what a Southend Bypass entails, and here is what it costs, and if that is what we want to do he doesn't have an issue with that, his issue is saying here are two projects that equal a Southend Bypass when in fact they do not.

Haugen responded that, as you heard it is an expanded list, however there is a disagreement between the County Engineers and you as to what the design of that bypass needs to be, and so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

because it is a county system, they have relied on the County Engineers to identify what the needs are on that system. Noehre commented that they have been doing bypasses all over Western North Dakota, he thinks they can figure out very quickly what the needs are. Haugen responded that he understands that they are doing bypasses with State Highway designs, but this would be on the County system. Johnson stated that they are turning county roads into state highways, and he doesn't necessarily think that they would be doing anything different here, if we really wanted trucks to be here, he thinks that that would be a two road bypass around town.

Noehre said that, again, he is only scratching the surface because now it is looking at ownership, and that question is going to come up, and now you're taking the traffic volumes that it currently has and magnifying them and that takes additional year-round maintenance, from pothole repairs to snow and ice control in the winter. Haugen suggested that with the possible retirement of Richard Onstad tomorrow, Grand Forks County might have a different engineer who will advise differently on this. Noehre commented that he doesn't know that anybody has really looked at all the issues, and his point has been, and he is sure, again, it is no surprise as he has been bringing this up for months, that without it, when it comes up for a vote today, he won't be representing the department, he will be representing the district, and he will vote against approving the plan because we keep talking about a Southend Bypass, and we're not addressing the Southend Bypass. He said that in his mind this is similar to saying let's address the Sorlie Bridge by looking at the first intersections on either side of the bridge, that isn't addressing the bridge.

Noehre stated that, just covering what is needed in North Dakota, let alone MnDOT District 2. He said that there is an illustrative project in the list currently for a 32nd Avenue river crossing that has a signal on U.S. 2 and 220, but there isn't an illustrative project on the Minnesota side for a river crossing at Merrifield. Haugen responded that volumes don't warrant a signal at 220 South. Noehre said, again, that is why he will be voting against approving the plan.

Haugen commented that there is no doubt that the discussion with the County Engineers shows that they deal with their roadway system and spine to function as a bypass with those modifications we have identified. He added that it will never rise to a state highway jurisdiction or a state highway. He said that we can be thankful that we aren't talking about doing four of them as was the case ten years ago. Noehre stated that all the residents that live along DeMers, 32nd Avenue, County 81, South Columbia Road down by Merrifield, they are going to be fine with all-way stops, or just stop conditions and now turn lanes or signals, it is possible, but he doesn't think so, he would be very shocked. Haugen responded that there are already turn lanes on Merrifield, Columbia, Washington and Belmont. He suggested that maybe we can stall this part of the flood protection project. Johnson stated that he would have to second what Mr. Noehre is saying, he is concerned with this as well. He suggested that it may just be more of a terminology issue, maybe it is more of something that we say the ultimate goal is to implement a southend bypass, and they have identified these projects as a couple of the pieces needed to get there, but it will not officially become that at completion, and there are also some other outlying projects that will have to be identified later, because, beyond the Southend Bypass he thinks there are other needs for those projects identified as well, other than just the bypass, because

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

there are a lot of open ended questions. He stated that the ownership issue is a big one because as of right now it is looking like they are going to keep a lot of the bypass as they build, and if they are going to look at bypass and Highway 2 truck traffic he would assume there will need to be a conversation as to who will own it, because adding it to the state system would be an issue as well. Haugen commented that he isn't aware of any discussion from either the State or County about the possibility of transfer of jurisdiction, the County has never indicated that they were looking for the State to take over the County Highway System, for this concept. Johnson agreed, but added that the intent is to redirect U.S. 2 truck traffic down this road, that conversation would have to occur. Noehre added that there is no method to enforce its use either, other than declaring U.S. 2 and County Road 5 as no truck traffic, and that isn't going to happen. Dame asked what that would do to the Airport intersection, and he knows that Mr. Noehre brought this up, but, again, would that intersection be built up, would it be dealt with a turn lane. Noehre responded that it would have to be looked at, but he would imagine that at a minimum the turn lanes would have to be dramatically lengthened, and they would probably have to add signals.

Noehre stated that traffic studies, traffic forecasts, and the design, AASHTO design, all those standards would have to be provided to determine what it would actually look like. He added that in going through the analysis, and he can't imagine how it could possibly stay the way it is today and still offer any kind of relief as a truck bypass. Haugen commented that there is a difference of opinion as to the design that needs to be done, and he isn't aware of any real concept that that would turn into a State U.S. Highway 2. Noehre said that he can't imagine that the County Commissioners would be real enthused about having U.S. Highway traffic moved onto their county system, and then just absorb the cost.

Noehre reported that the point he is trying to make is that all those things are hidden in the Illustrative Project list, all those things are hidden and letters to the editor, and all the other discussions, none of this gets brought up, it is all things that have to be discussed and evaluated, figuring out what the costs are and who is going to pay them, that is why he is going to vote against recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve it, because their hidden. Haugen suggested that a recommendation could be made to line this out of the plan and still adopt the rest of the document. Noehre commented that that is another alternative, either put it all in, or take it all out.

Shorten asked if there has been a corridor study done to look at the overall system and cost. Haugen responded that there was a mid-1990s one that sort of identified the Merrifield location as the preferred route; then there were the early 2000s where it was reconfirmed as the preferred route; and there were individual Interchange Justification Reports, plus the Bridge Feasibility Report that were done to try to get the State DOTs to designate it as a four-lane U.S. Highway 2 in the mid-2000s that was way out of whack in terms of cost as you would have to four-lane and rebuild bridges over the interstate and neither the Red Lake or Red River Bridges could accommodate four-lane traffic, so that was when the focus was directed back on a county road route with a few improvements at spot locations, with the two major improvements being an

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

interchange and a new bridge over the Red River with the rest of the system being able to handle the traffic.

Discussion/Comments

Shorten commented that reauthorization is supposed to take place in September, but that isn't something they are thinking about right now, but as we all know MAP-21 provided a lot of guidance on performance measures and state of good repair, but no increase in money, will they ever get around to that, let's hope. He said that in talking to Mr. Haugen, the thought is that someday they will have to deal with these national assets and these State and Local assets, so there could be some more money some new authorization, and then a lot of these recommendations, and Mr. Noehre's comment about Illustrative Projects and why have them, if all of a sudden funds were made available, it isn't hard to amend this plan and move some of those priority Illustrative Projects into the fiscally constrained program based on the new revenue source, so we are hopeful, but given the circumstances we have now, we can't be sure.

Shorten stated that he has been doing MPO planning for 30 years and he never ended up with a plan that looks like this, but it is a new world, so if it kind of a shock to some of you that have been around for a long time, this is based on the parameter that we are all working with, and the limited resources that have been provided at the State and Federal levels. Johnson said he has one caveat to add to that, and that is that he thinks what is being shown here is also a possibility of what could happen with the feds moving forward, their idea of throwing more money at it would be to remove the opportunity to use it on the Urban Roads system, so the only money we get is the NHS only, that would be their way of providing more money, so we have to be careful. Shorten agreed, stating that they could continue this theme, NHS is really the feds responsibility, everything else we devolve down to the States taking care of State Trunk Highways, locals take care of roadways all the way down to the Township roads. He said that we know what happens in that process, everyone gets hurt. He added that it could be called rebalancing or resetting, but it certainly goes against probably 30 or 40 years of federal/state policy about partnerships in transportation.

Noehre said that he thinks the plan shows what we recognized a number of years ago, the DOT commissioned Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute to study just the State Highways three or four years ago, and at that point we were getting \$240,000,000 a year in federal aid, and their report was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$550,000,000 that the State needed to spend on State Highways just to maintain the state of good repair, with zero expansion projects, so we were spending less than half of what we actually needed to keep them in a state of good repair, and so you plan has caught up and is reflecting that.

Shorten stated that he knows this could make this a little worse, but in Minnesota, as MnSHIPs having traction all the way down to the City and County Commissioner level, there is really a push, and actually Governor Dayton asked Commissioner Zelle to help promote this, going out and educating the public about why there is a need for more money, telling people that if they want the world to look like MnSHIP, or preservation only, that is your choice as voters, but if you want these other things that improve safety and improve mobility and reduce congestion and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

drive time, etc., you are going to have to pay more, so get serious about taxes. He stated that, maybe this finding and this report can be a springboard to action to educate people.

Noehre said that even getting into the values used in the plan involve more than a little risk, extending those time periods out past what we generally see on much lower volume roads. He stated that they took higher volume roads and stretched that state of good repair dates out past those, so there is risk involved, but hopefully it becomes a reality.

Haugen reported that in his presentation to the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee last night he did point out that if they are looking for new revenue the first three things to look at in this plan would be the \$40,000,000 that was shifted from the Urban Roads to the Regional side, we can easily identify that they could replace that; the other was that when the State Highway System first came out we took away \$200,000,000 for the reconstruction to the rehab, and only brought back in \$20,000,000, so there is still 90% of your need that you first identified that this plan doesn't address, and he is sure that if they asked that 50% of that 90% be given back, that would be justified because of the risk of extending things out. He added that he also said the City did the same thing with their state of good repair, there is probably a project or two that they would rather reconstruct and address rather than just treat it, so, while he didn't give a number it is probably total of at least \$100,000,000 worth of projects that are still a kind of state of good repair type project that could be identified and could be done, and he didn't even get to the Illustrative list. He stated that he hopes they are hearing this, and aren't just focusing on the illustratives and saying this is our need and these are the projects we spend the money on.

Haugen stated that they will try to pursue working further with Mr. Johnson on how to identify the Illustrative Projects.

Haugen said that they do have the draft out, and have received some comments. He added, again, that they are presenting the draft to the public this evening for input. He stated that they will be seeking final approval next month so that on December 18th the MPO Executive Policy Board can adopt it and submit it to the DOTs, Federal Highways, and Federal Transit for their 30-day comment period so that we can meet our January 31st deadline.

MATTER OF LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that, as you saw on the last slide, they are going to amend the Long Range Transportation Plan and incorporate the results of the Local Road Safety Plan.

Haugen stated that the NDDOT has hired the Consulting Firm CH2M Hill, with SRF as a subcontractor, to prepare Local Road Safety Plans. He said that, to give you some idea of what these plan documents will look like, he did include a copy of a slide presentation given to local lead staff people.

Haugen commented that they do intend to identify specific projects, and also have all of the information of that project available so that simply a county engineer can submit that page out of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2013**

the plan to the State for consideration of the Highway Safety Improvement Program funds, so these plans will be very project specific, with cost estimates, so that the project can just be taken from the plan and submitted as an application.

Haugen reported that Grand Forks will be holding a full-day workshop on December 6th, from 9:00 a.m. out at the Public Works building, and lunch will be provided. He said that invitations were sent, and he hopes that most of you received one, however if you did not receive one and are interested in attending let him know and he will get one to you.

Haugen briefly went over the information in the packet.

Haugen commented that he believes that by April we will have a plan adopted. He said that the reason we will adopt this into our MPO plan is primarily because it is introducing all of the Highway Safety Improvement Program funding, as a new revenue source, and these projects then would be able to be consistent with our planning documents and meet the T.I.P. programming process. Noehre stated that we probably wouldn't become eligible for funding until 2018 or 2019. Haugen agreed, explaining that they are currently soliciting out to 2018, and projects are already pegged all the way out to 2017, so there are 2018 dollars in play now.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Annual Unified Work Program 2014

Haugen reported that he just wanted to remind everyone that we do have solicitation again, and if the 2014 Annual Unified Work Program needs to have any changes done to it we need to know that soon so that we can make those changes in December, so that when we start the new year we know what activities we are pursuing.

2. Solicitation For Next T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we do have open solicitation for projects; the first critical date is Friday, Notice of Intent for the TAC on the Minnesota side has to be submitted then, but the rest have to be submitted by early December.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY MCKINNON, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 13TH, 2013, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:04 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 11th, 2013, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT–Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Dave Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-District 2; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; Nels Christianson, BNSF; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; and Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District.

Guest(s) present were: Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT-St. Paul; Kim Adair, NDDOT; and Barry Wilfahrt, Chamber.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that everyone please state their names and the agency they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 13TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 13TH, 2013, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that next week there are two open houses scheduled that will focus around the city council meetings in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He stated that the first one will be held on Monday, December 16th, beginning at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room A102, moving to the City Council Chambers at 5:30 for a formal presentation, than returning to conclude in Conference Room A102. He said that the second one will be held on Tuesday, December 17th, beginning at 4:00 p.m. in the Training Conference Room, moving to the City Council Chambers at 5:00 for a formal presentation, than returning to conclude in the Training Conference Room.

Haugen reported that he included a copy of the Kennedy Bridge Project Fact Sheet in the packets, however an updated version has been released. He stated that the updated document has essentially the same information included as the earlier version, just using a different format.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there is nothing new to report on the Sorlie Bridge project. Noehre commented that they are still working on the Purpose and Need Statement.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN
UPDATE STREET AND HIGHWAY ELEMENT**

Haugen reported that a draft document was available last month for review, and was processed through the local planning commissions and city councils. He added that they also received some good comments and input from both DOTs and Federal Highway.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he highlighted some of the more significant issues. He went over the information briefly.

Haugen pointed out that the first change was the result of the City of Grand Forks switching two of their projects; the Columbia Road Overpass and the North 42nd Street Reconstruction. He stated that this switch impacted the table in that they previously showed a negative number in the short-term balance, and a larger negative number if the mid-term balance, and a larger still negative number overall; but with the switch the 42nd Street project had a lower base cost estimate than the overpass so as you can see it now shows a positive number in the short-term balance, and they are still within 1%, which was the agreed to fiscal constraint; and the negative

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

mid-term number has been reduced significantly, and the overall balance is now a positive \$210.00.

Haugen reported that the second change was due to discussion held at the Technical Advisory Committee regarding the Southend By-pass Concept. He stated that in working with Mike Johnson and Les Noehre on language they would accept, it now states that the MPO will conduct a follow up analysis to address concerns and will work with our partners on the scope of work as to what it all entails and what the resulting document will be, so it didn't leave this as nothing, it did say that there would be a follow up report done that will address all of the concerns/issues that are identified and agreed to in the scope-of work.

Magnuson asked if he recalls correctly that the Southend By-pass would continue to be a portion of Merrifield and County Road 5 would continue to be a county road. Haugen responded that that is what the concept has been, but when they do further analysis there will be discussion as to whether or not there is the desire to raise it up to a State Highway. Magnuson said that the intent might be for it to remain a County Highway, but before you do a study it might be a good idea to get confirmation as to whether or not the County Commission still supports this concept, simply because there has been a lot of residential development in that area, and he foresees there being some issues with that. Haugen stated that he was before the Commission last week, just to go over the current plans, and they didn't oppose the future study from being done. Magnuson stated that he just doesn't want the study started and then need to make changes, so it might be wise to get some kind of indication from the Commission that they are still on the same page.

Haugen stated that some of the other comments were, individually, the first one from Federal Highway, North Dakota, where they questioned our Goal 4, asking whether we have air quality problems. He said that the response was that this really wasn't geared towards a concern about air quality per se, not that we might get into a maintenance, or non-attainment area. It more has to do with the MAP-21 goal of environmental sustainability; and further that Grand Forks has a Green 3 Action Initiative, UND has a Climate Action Plan, and the State of Minnesota has a Climate Action Plan, so this goal of trying to protect and enhance the environment with more energy conservation, and improve the quality of life, and develop methods to reduce carbon emissions, and so is not so much geared, again, towards air quality problems or concerns that we might get into, maintenance or non-attainment, but it has to do with trying to support the overall environmental sustainability goal MAP-21 has.

Williams pointed out that in the performance targets it states that it is a 50% below 2007, and in the Mayor's Initiative, and in the UND, 50% is referring to all sources of CO₂, including buildings and everything else, and mobile sources aren't separated out into a percentage. She stated that with current technology and everything, she doesn't see being able to reduce it by 50% with our population growth, and added that all of the things she has been able to find at FHWA all refer to "per capita", and not just a blanket percentage. She added that she wants to make sure that we are adopting things that are reasonable, so she would like to suggest that we reword that from 50% to 10% with the idea that with the next update we will go through it and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

renew it if warranted. She stated, again, that the other ones the 50% is referring to buildings and everything else, which we won't get credit for if it is just transportation related.

Haugen responded that the 50% was the low end, again from his research on Federal Highway sites, and others, in-fact the percentages were actually in the range of 60% to 80% for the transportation component, to reduce down. Williams asked if this was mandated. Haugen responded it was not, not yet but we know MAP-21 has a goal and performance measure requirement. Williams commented that that is the thing, she wants to keep the goal in there, but if we put 10% in there it is really a placeholder and then once this MAP-21 thing settles out, we can go back and update the percentage. Haugen stated that we did do an update to the 2007 baseline, the difference between the 2012 numbers and 2007 numbers was at a 2% decrease already, so in that five year period we decreased by 2% so 10% might be low, by 2040. Williams said that she thinks that the table being referred to is on Page 89, and she would like the consultant to double check the average miles of travel per gallon of fuel consumed. She stated that the information she found was that the 2010 is not exactly the same as the 2006, it is actually 21.5 so actually it would increase our reduction, so if they could just double check those numbers that would be great.

Haugen stated that there is a proposal out to the Technical Advisory Committee to change 50% to 10%. Williams agreed, adding that it should also include the caveat that with the understanding that we are going to revisit it as MAP-21 progresses, with our next update. Haugen said that all of these performance measures and targets are correlated to MAP-21 results, so that doesn't necessarily need to be tied to the 10% or 50%, it is already subject to MAP-21 implementation. Williams said again that she would ask that we use 10%.

Noehre asked what would happen if we didn't meet the goal. Haugen responded that we can obviously adjust the target, but there will be periodic reports that will be produced on all our performance measures as to how we are achieving our targets, so it won't come out of the blue five years from now where we are at with our targets, we won't wait until 2040 to see how we are with our performance, so it is just a starting point, and whether we want to start at a 50% reduction rate now or a 10% reduction rate, is up to us.

Dame asked what we can control that will change that. Haugen responded that the transportation plan and the land use plan have been trying to work hand in glove, if you will, so controlling growth horizontally, or sprawl, is one thing that can be done; multi-modal planning involves promotion of transportation choices by having optional facilities available so that people don't always rely on a vehicle for their trips; those are some of the ways we can control this.

Noehre commented that, correct him if he is wrong, but with these goals, aren't we ahead of the curve, if you will, and they are not mandated by Federal Highway yet, they are in the bill, but the final guidance on targets aren't out yet. Haugen responded that performance and targets are mandated, just what exactly they are hasn't been processed through everything yet, so yes, we are a little ahead.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

Williams stated that her concern with this is that as we work through projects, and everything, if there is a target review and of course we are going to be comparing projects to targets and everything, it's going to be difficult to show that a project is going to do a 50% reduction. Haugen responded that it is not just one project that will get you the 50% reduction. Williams said she understands, but do we have to sign something that says that we are in compliance with the Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen said that it will say that it has an ability to reduce the carbon footprint.

Bergman reported present.

Williams said that she agrees with Mr. Noehre, that we are kind of ahead of the curve, not that we are not recognizing that something is coming, but just setting arbitrary numbers is kind of..., and she really doesn't feel comfortable adopting something with that "well can we do this or not" idea.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE
50% REDUCTION IN CO₂ TO 10% REDUCTION IN CO₂.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen reported that the next comment came from North Dakota about the cost estimates on the two interchange projects. He said that their response to those comments is that those cost estimates were arrived at similarly to how any other projects cost estimates were. He stated that they do know that on the 47th Avenue Interchange there is a quasi IAR being developed, and by quasi he means it isn't going to the full documentation, it is doing a lot of the work but it isn't meant to be a complete IAR, so they haven't had any update in the dollar amount to work with. He said that the comment was that in other areas, particularly in the western part of the state, there are higher dollar values than what we were showing for interchanges, but staff felt that because they were based off the methodology all the rest of the cost estimates were derived from, they were reasonable for the plan, and as cost estimates are revised and updated, the plan would have to be revised and updated as well, particularly if they move from the illustrative list to anything that becomes programmed.

Noehre asked what the cost difference is between the \$30,000,000 and what is in the illustrative list. Haugen responded that the illustrative list shows \$23,000,000 for 47th Avenue, and \$9,000,000 for Merrifield. He stated that the difference with Merrifield is that there is a structure overpass already, whereas 47th Avenue would need new everything. Noehre commented that the Merrifield Bridge would have to be replaced, so essentially the only thing that is there is the County Road leading to/from. Haugen said that that is not what the analysis led us to believe, that the overpass has to be replaced. Noehre stated that they went through that a number of years ago, 2002 if he remembers correctly. He explained that it was determined that the vertical curve of the bridge for a rural interchange would have to be lengthened. Haugen said that that is not what the report states, not what the IJR states. Noehre stated that he just looked at it and an interchange was allowable, that was most certainly in the documentation for design review,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

DOT, and he remembers having colored layouts and plats set out on a table for review. Haugen reiterated that it isn't in the report, so he doesn't know where it would be. He added that the report had a detailed cost estimate, part of the report also went into benefit to cost ratio besides just the IJR aspects, so the cost was based on not replacing the bridge structure, it was based on finding that the bridge structure could stay in place and essentially to build the ramps, so that is what the cost estimate is. Noehre stated that it was first adopted in 2001, and we have gone through a Long Range Transportation Plan update after that, it might have been during the last Long Range Transportation Plan update for 2035. Haugen said that he doesn't recall that, but it would be part of the Southend By-Pass Concept Analysis that we are doing anyway, so we will be doing a revision of the whole concept so we will update the cost as well. He added that it is an illustrative project, so nobody is programming dollars off of it tomorrow, or yesterday.

Dame asked if Mr. Haugen was indicating that the estimates are too low, or too high. Haugen responded that NDDOT was indicating that they are too low. Dame said that this is based on what they are seeing. Johnson reported that they are building a brand new interchange west of Dickinson, and they are right around \$30,000,000 right now, and it would be similar to putting one in at 47th Avenue South.

Dame commented that based on their projects, they aren't seeing any cost savings in this side of the State versus what we are seeing historically over the past couple of years on the western side of the State. He said they are paying as much, if not more, because there is now more competition and more workers out west than there are here.

Johnson stated that the only real caveat he would suggest is probably different is the cost of right-of-way. He said that they are paying roughly \$25,000 an acre out west, so that would be the one caveat, that they aren't buying enough for \$7,000,000 worth, but that would probably come out of your study as well, to firm up a dollar amount for that, depending on how fast the city grows some of that land might get commercialized, and become more expensive and creep up to that amount anyway. Haugen stated that he thought the Merrifield cost estimate included right-of-way, but he isn't sure what is included in the 47th Avenue cost estimate.

Haugen said that they can certainly ask to revisit the costs, and put down that further study is taking place on these estimates, and they are subject to change. Johnson responded that that would work for him, that he wouldn't mind a footnote to that effect.

Haugen reported that the next comment MnDOT provided regarding how we use Smart Principles, and how it was written in the document. He explained that they apparently felt it was used inappropriately, so we simply just deleted that entire section from the document. He added that this change did not affect the goals and objectives, performance measures, etc.

Haugen stated that MnDOT also provided comments on performance targets in general, and they are trying to make sure that we are readily identifying what were true performance measures. He pointed out that we do have some things identified as action initiatives, things that we may not have the ability to measure currently, so we have an action initiative to start collecting the data

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

and so on, and your response is that we spent a considerable amount of time with MnDOT in getting the document performance measures and targets to what they were in the draft, so we were somewhat surprised that they came up with the comment they did, and as MAP-21 is better known and further implemented, there will be more lessons learned about performance measures and performance targets, so we are saying that we know that these are all subject to change with MAP-21 implementation, so we are out there ahead of the curve.

Haugen reported that MnDOT questioned whether one of our targets, the one that states we need to reduce VMTs 10% below the 2010 levels. He said that we determined that this might be a challenge, and we do know that comparison of VMTs in 2006 to 2010 that there has been a reduction. He added that others have formally adopted reductions higher than 10%, so again we are almost back to 50%, or not 10%, or not what's the number, 10% we felt was an okay number to start from. He said that, again, back to an earlier comment, we did work with MnDOT, the 10% has been the value for over 12 months now, in the document. Williams commented that she thinks what has changed on some of that is that we are growing faster than what we had originally anticipated five years ago, so that is why she was thinking using a per capita rate would recognize our changing growing population and yet we would still have a goal. Haugen said, then that she is suggesting we reduce daily vehicle miles per capita traveled by 10%. Williams responded that this is what she is suggesting. She explained that most of the stuff she found at FHWA mentioned per capita, it is repeated several times throughout that information. Haugen asked if the rest of the Technical Advisory Committee was in consensus of using the term per capita. Noerhe stated that he just wants to note that the overall traffic, statewide since 2009, has increased by 22%, and out west by 53%, so. Haugen agreed, but said that the traffic in the Grand Forks Urbanized Area on the North Dakota side has, between 2006 and 2010, dropped 1.5%. TAC was in agreement in using the term per capita.

Haugen summarized that those are comments that they received throughout the public input process, and the public hearings that have been held on it to-date. He stated that they haven't really received much input either way on the draft plan, most of what was received was from staff changing projects around, discussion with the Technical Advisory Committee, and detailed reviews from both State DOTs and Federal Highway provided, a lot of good editorial corrections and so on. Noehre commented that he is satisfied with the language on the South End By-Pass Concept; adding that it doesn't answer any of the questions they have raised, and it mentions more that need to be raised, but it didn't anticipate how our Long Range Transportation Plan, at this point, answers those questions specifically, and now what it does do is say that we need to go forward and ask the questions, and to the best of our ability find some answers for those questions, so he is satisfied having that language in the document.

Haugen said, then, that this is the 159 page Draft document, without appendices, that was available to the committee for review. Williams asked if the appendices were available yet. Haugen responded that some are, however the big one that isn't yet available involves all the public input, which you all have seen and experienced. Williams asked if they could be placed on the website. Haugen responded that they would be placed on the website when completed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

Kuharenko referred to Table 23, Existing plus Committed Network as well as State of Good Repair Projects; and stated that at the last meeting Jane commented about the specific natures that were called out in some of these projects, particularly calling on two-lane, forty-foot wide cross-section, and that is not a standard section, so he is wondering if those details are going to be removed from this table. Haugen responded that they need to provide a level of detail that establishes the basis of the cost estimate, so. Williams asked if they could re-word it to say that they are going to install a two-lane urban road, and forty-feet was used as the assumed width, because what this does, the way she is looking at it, is say “construct two-lane, forty-foot cross-section northbound collector”. She said that forty-feet is not the City’s standard width, and what if they determine that they want to put bike lanes in there, they won’t fit in forty-feet, so the forty-feet just strictly is very, very confining as far as what they can do, and then when they do a project report, is it in conformance with the long range transportation plan, and it isn’t, so if they could just put an asterisk by those and at the bottom explain that a forty-foot cross-section was assumed for cost estimate. Kuharenko agreed, saying that then this is handled, and they still have some level of detail in here, however when they get to the Project Concept Report, they can still say in it that even if they are doing a different section, they are still in compliance with what is in the long range transportation plan. Haugen responded that the forty-feet is not the important part, the two-lane versus a three-lane or a four-lane versus a six-lane is the important part.

Kuharenko said that his other question has to do with moving the 42nd Street project into the short-range list, has it been done because he didn’t see that change in here, and he just wants to make sure it is done. Williams pointed out that it is still listed in the mid-range list. Haugen responded that they aren’t showing projects under \$5,000,000. Kuharenko said that he isn’t describing the summary table, he is talking more the larger more detailed plan. Williams commented that it just isn’t reflected in Table 23. Kuharenko asked if it could be updated, to show it is in the short-range. Haugen commented that it used to show up in Table 37 as one of the two significant projects, and now that it was moved to the short-range, because it is below \$5,000,000 it is not shown in Table 23, but it is reflected in the total expenditures columns.

Williams asked if Table 23 was updated at all after last month’s discussion. Haugen responded that it probably has not yet been updated. Williams asked if they could take a look at an updated one, as she thinks that might alleviate a lot of their questions and comments.

Williams referred to the last page of Table 23, and asked about the Mill Spur, and the fact that the rational says that it has an above average crash rate. She said that she couldn’t find any crashes at any of the crossings, so she is wondering if it refers to that whole Washington/North 5th/Gateway Drive corridor as having higher than expected crash rates, because it is kind of misleading as this particular project is a quiet zone, and although she agrees that gates and lights and such would improve safety there, but we have no crashes there now. Haugen responded that if does include the section of Gateway Drive/North 5th/North Washington as part of the overall concept of the Mill Spur. Williams stated, though, that that was mentioned before so you have it in there twice, if that is the case, because it is already listed on Gateway, at North Washington and the mill, as a \$25,000,000 project. Haugen responded that it is in both places. Williams said that she is just having a hard time justifying this is a real project for safety when it’s a real

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

project for a quiet zone. Haugen responded that it is a real project for safety that also gets it eligible for quiet zone potential, but the report was done as a railroad crossing safety study, with the quiet zone being as side benefit to it. Williams said that the other thing is that staff has been working on trying to implement some of the items that were in the recommendations in the report and they are getting a lot of push-back from the public now as far as street closures and which ones and such, so she is wondering about using the term “pursue” recommendations so that staff can continue to work on whatever they can in that area. Haugen agreed.

Kuharenko said that he is looking to clarify if the safety and crash analysis, which starts on Page 51, is being updated. Haugen responded that it is. Kuharenko asked, referring to Page 55, where it lists 20th Street and 32nd Avenue as showing the actual crash rate as being the same as the expected rate, and the reason he wants to clarify that is because in the High Crash Report that came out that intersection is number six in the one year and number seventeen in the three year. Haugen stated that the work has been done to update this, but hasn't been incorporated into the draft yet.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN SUBJECT TO NOTED CHANGES.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE 2015-2018 T.I.P.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that there wasn't much information available in your packet on this agenda item. He stated, however, that he did distribute copies of a presentation prior to today's meeting (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen explained that what it is the MPO is supposed to be doing when we receive candidate projects is to review them for consistency and prioritize them, then we submit them to the State then work on drafting a T.I.P. document between now and spring.

Haugen referred to the presentation slides and pointed out that the map illustrates the updated study area, and the Urban Federal Aid Adjusted area, that we worked out last year, so now we have slightly revised adjusted Federal Urban Aid Boundaries.

Haugen explained that, as usual, we get done with one T.I.P. process and move right into the next T.I.P. process. He added that it may not be new for North Dakota, but this is the second year we have almost all the projects at the same time, whereas in the past we had varying deadlines for the different programs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

Haugen stated that there is still a lot of implementation to be done with MAP-21, so what we do today is subject to change as MAP-21 gets further implemented, or come the end of September if a different Federal Highway Bill is passed in its place, but our T.I.P. is covering all those years that are still truly unknown, but we are making an assumption that MAP-21 is continuing with planning levels that have a 1.2% growth in revenue and a 4% growth in costs.

Haugen stated that in going over what we have there really hasn't been much change in the projects that are currently programmed, primarily because, as you will recall, in September we did a fairly extensive amendment to our T.I.P. to include projects in 2014 and 2015 on the North Dakota side so we are really focusing on the end years of the T.I.P., and then on the Regional side we also go to the end of the T.I.P., plus one additional year to 2019.

Haugen commented that the new set of projects that were submitted are now Transportation Alternative Program projects, or TAP projects. He explained that this is a combination of the old Safe Routes to School, Transportation Enhancement, and Scenic By-way Programs. He said that the Recreational Trail is still a separate program, and at the end of the agenda you will notice that we are announcing the solicitation for Recreational Trail Projects in North Dakota, so that may be next month's activity.

Haugen stated that the other significant change with the TAP program is that projects can only be submitted through the City, they can no longer be submitted by others to the MPO or to the State, they all have to come through the City.

Haugen reported that the City submitted four projects, the priority order is as shown:

1. Shared use path along South Columbia Road between 36th and 40th Avenue South at a total cost of \$162,000 with federal request of \$129,000.
2. Shared use path along DeMers Avenue between South 48th and 55th Street at a total cost of \$490,000 with federal request of \$290,000.
3. Citywide remote control school beacons at a total cost of \$120,000 with federal request of \$96,000.
4. Solar powered speed minder radar signs at a total cost of \$20,000 with federal request of \$16,000.

Haugen said that to give you some idea where the two site-specific projects are; project priority number one is on South Columbia Road. He explained that the City is urbanizing a stretch of Columbia Road, and the request is just for the side path along that section of roadway. He added that in the T.I.P., in 2017, there is the urbanizing of the rest of Columbia Road, and the cost of that side-path should be included in that T.I.P. project.

Haugen stated that for the DeMers Avenue Project; Phase 1 used to be from 42nd Street west to 48th Street, but it is now 48th Street over to 55th Street, and Phase 2 will be the east half. He reported that the other two projects are more city-wide, and not site specific.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

Noehre asked if there is a reason for swapping those phases. Johnson responded that it was due to right-of-way issues.

Haugen commented that the only real change to the current T.I.P. projects are; Columbia Road, Phase 2, on the Urban side, which is essentially the 11th Avenue to 14th Avenue reconstruction. He explained that it was originally programmed in 2014, and then in subsequent T.I.P.s it was pushed out to 2016 by the State; however the year of expenditure was not adjusted, so what we have in the current T.I.P. document is that a federal dollar amount of \$4,028,000, when in-fact the amount should have been increased to today's dollars, therefore the City is still trying to request an adjustment from the State, either a credit or a reallocation of monies to cover the cost increase. He commented that the State has asked that we put this in as an illustrative project, so the T.I.P. will still contain this 2014 estimate in dollar values as the programmed amount, we won't change the T.I.P., but we will ask that the State consider adding \$800,000 in federal funds to the project cost.

Haugen reported that on the Regional side the I-29 projects are being delayed a year, they were amended in September from 2014 to 2015.

Haugen stated that the new projects include the 42nd Street Reconstruction on the Urban side; and North Washington Street, a surface treatment project. He said that those are the requested changes to 2018, but they will be requests that will be programmed if awarded funds through the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. development process.

Haugen commented that one year out, 2019, the project is North 5th Street, or Business 2, between Gateway Drive and DeMers Avenue, a mill and overlay project; but we are not going to be formally programming 2019 projects, but we are giving a heads up as to what may be coming down the road in 2019. Noehre added that the rationale behind that is due to bridge work on the Kennedy and Sorlie, and the additional traffic those projects will most likely create on 5th. Haugen said that once the bridge projects are complete we will go back and make necessary repairs to North 5th Street.

Haugen reiterated that this is the TAP and the new Urban and Regional Road requests. He stated that they are all consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and there are no issues with the priority order, thus staff recommends the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the list of candidate projects and give them priority ranking.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY DAME, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2015-2018 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

MATTER OF FREIGHT RAIL ACCESS STUDY

Haugen reported that last week had a public meeting on our Freight Rail Access Study. He said that he included a copy of the letter of invite sent to specific property owners as well as the methodology used to highlight those properties that have more initial viability to having increased freight/rail access to them.

Haugen pointed out there were three maps included in the packet: 1) the first map shows the north side of Grand Forks; 2) the second shows the southwest side of Grand Forks, and 3) the third shows the east side of Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that they held a public meeting with individual property owners last Thursday, with about six owners in attendance. He said that they own the larger chunks of property in the study area, and all of them expressed some interest in having their properties go to the next stage, which would be to conceptualize how rail could be accessed into the property, and, if those are the properties that we do eventually get rail access, how does that spill back, or affect back on the transportation system.

Haugen reported that the only real input they received was from the University of North Dakota who has continued concerns about increased rail use on 42nd Street, and how it might divide their campus with some of their facilities on the west side of 42nd.

Haugen stated that the next stage will hopefully give us a conclusion, or help us identify those properties that people have a willingness to have a concept of how it can be developed and laid out on their property, and then determine how it might impact the street and highway system, and the bike/ped system and report those findings back at future meetings.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN

Haugen reported that he included some information on the packets from a meeting that was held last Friday. He stated that there was a lot of valuable information distributed at that meeting, however he does not have the power point presentation, nor the information distributed, available for today's meeting, but, again, the purpose of the Local Road Safety Program, and as they again reminded us Friday, is that they are going to produce a document that will have project specific forms already filled out so each year as the request for Highway Safety Improvement Program projects are solicited, people can just take a specific project out of that report and submit it as their SHIP project submittal. He stated that he will distribute out this information as soon as it is distributed back to the people who participated in this effort on Friday.

Williams commented that she feels this is a really good program. She stated that the State has done a lot of work, and done a lot of research and found that a little over half of the severe crashes are actually happening in local jurisdictions, so she thinks this is really good as she doesn't think any jurisdiction could do this on their own with the intense methods they are using, so she is very appreciative of it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2013**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Solicit For North Dakota FTA 5339 Program

Haugen reported that the 5339 Program is the Capital Program for Transit. Adair commented that projects have to be submitted by January 22nd, and she knows that Mr. Johnson did send this information out already. She added that she will have Jamie do a press release just to back them up to let the MPO's know that the submittal date is January 22nd, and they will be meeting with Steve Solwai to discuss how they will be dispersing these funds statewide, because everyone has needs, both rural and urban, and they want to ensure the funds are distributed as efficiently and fairly as possible.

2. Solicit For North Dakota Recreation Trail Program

Haugen reported that many of the side paths, or multi-use trails are also eligible for funding out of this program as well. He stated that this is a \$2,000,000 program for which they are soliciting projects for. He said that these projects are also due to the MPO in January, after which they will be submitted to the Park and Recreation Department, although it is still a federal program.

Haugen stated that this is for both motorized and non-motorized vehicles, so if you have any ideas for either please submit them for consideration.

3. Solicit For MPO Work Program

Williams asked if the MPO had, or would be sending out a solicitation for MPO Work Program projects. Haugen responded that the MPO sent out a project solicitation a couple of months ago and they were due today. Williams said that she would like to request the MPO consider doing a study of Reeves Drive. Haugen suggested she put together a staff report and run it through the City Council process and submit to the MPO and we can see if it can be amended into the 2014 Work Program.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 11TH,
2013, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager