

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14, 2004 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A102**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the meeting to order with the following members present: Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Roger Foster; GF Public Transportation; Ryan Brooks; EGF City Planning; Richard Onstad, GF County Engineer; Dennis Potter, GF City Planning; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); Steve Solwei, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); and Mark Johnson, FHWA-Bismarck (via conference call).

A quorum was present.

Guests present were: Cindy Voigt, GF City Engineering; Susan Moe, FHWA-Minnesota; Greg Waidley, FHWA-Minnesota; and Karen DellaPaolera, MNDOT-Bemidji.

INTRODUCTIONS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Potter, seconded by Brooks, to approve the December 10, 2003, minutes as read. Motion carried unanimously.

MATTER OF 2005-2007 T.I.P. PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this item tackles the last remaining section of the 2005-2007 T.I.P.. He referred to the staff report and information sheets included in the packets and went over them briefly, explaining that there is one Minnesota State program project within our MPO area that is identified. He explained that this project proposes to repaint the bridge on U.S. #2 (Gateway Drive) over River Road and 4th Street Interchange, and is part of a larger group of bridge repainting taking place in the district. He pointed out that the cost estimate for this project, which is funded solely with state funds, is \$146,090.

Haugen referred to the staff report and explained that Grand Forks has two funding programs available. He stated that one of these programs is the regular operating 5307 FTA Program, under which we have identified the three years of anticipated federal funding, and how the costs will be split; and the other program is the 5309 Capital Program, which is a statewide earmark program in which Grand Forks participates. He pointed out that a list of the projects Grand

Forks has submitted as part of the Year 2005 5309 Capital Program Application, and also what is anticipated will be submitted in 2006 and 2007, are included in the packets as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14, 2004**

Haugen commented that East Grand Forks' funding is a little different than Grand Forks'. He explained that East Grand Forks does get the 5307 Regular Operating Assistance, however, if you look at the East Grand Forks tables for 2005, 2006, and 2007, you will see that they are a little different than what was shown on the 2004-2006 T.I.P., and, it is his understanding that the reason for this difference is because the State Legislature has changed how the State funds transit in East Grand Forks so some of the costs were adjusted to accommodate that change, and also because East Grand Forks gets federal funds that they can utilize for capital projects. He pointed out that the major expense coming up is the replacement of the East Grand Forks transit vehicle, which has been delayed one year, to 2007.

Haugen stated that, as in the past, they would like to encourage East Grand Forks, and Minnesota, to take part in a 5309 request for Capital Funds for Transit by asking that the East Grand Forks Bus replacement for 2007 be looked at as a possible project for 5309 monies. Ehrenstrom responded that he would look into this possibility.

Ehrenstrom referred to the tables and pointed out that they were based the 2004 Contract, in which the local share is 10%, however, in 2005 through 2007 the local share will return to 20%, which was the State's mandated percentage. Brooks responded that what will happen, then, is that the 125.50 shown under State in 2005 will actually be 106.00, and the Local will be 39.00; and in 2006 the State will be 105.00, and the Local 40.00; and in 2007 the State will be 104.00, and the Local 41.00.

Ehrenstrom commented that one other thing to keep in mind is that the federal amount is progressively going up, that he currently estimates it at \$50,000, which is based on our contract. Brooks pointed out that his estimates are actually a little bit higher because he took \$10,000 and put it towards Dial-A-Ride, which actually decreases the State's portion.

Haugen stated that, because we need to have our T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. match, he would like to know which numbers should be used for federal, the ones currently shown or the ones Mr. Ehrenstrom is suggesting. Ehrenstrom responded that he feels they should be kept the same, that we should use the \$50,000.

Haugen asked if anyone had any comments or changes to the Grand Forks tables. There were no comments or changes.

Moved by Foster, seconded by Potter, to forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve the FY 2005-2007 Project Application (Transit and MN Programs) as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan and to give them a high priority ranking, subject to the changes being made to the East Grand Forks Tables as discussed. Motion carried unanimously.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14, 2004**

Haugen reported that the next step in the T.I.P. process will be to receive information back from both States indicating which projects have been funded, and for what amount. He stated that a Draft 2005-2006 T.I.P. will be available for review at our March Technical Advisory Committee meeting, then a public hearing will be scheduled for our April meeting, then the Draft T.I.P. will be resubmitted at the state level, then, finally, once we receive the Draft S.T.I.P.'s we can hold a public hearing on the final T.I.P..

Benning reported that they have received priority projects from all 13 Urban Cities, and they program is currently being reviewed by all of the Districts and Upper Management. He stated that it is hoped that they will be able to have Urban Program sheets available for the March Technical Advisory Committee meeting as well. Haugen commented that he knows that the Enhancement Committee is either meeting now, or has recently met, and he was wondering if Mr. Benning could report on their results as well. Benning responded that the Director's Task Force on Transportation Enhancement projects has not met yet, but that should be occurring in the next week or so, at which time they will finalize the Urban County Projects. Haugen asked if the results of the Director's Task Force meeting could be submitted to the MPO's by the end of January. Benning responded that he believes that may be possible, that it is his understanding that the only step left is for the Director's Task Force to score the projects submitted, and then to run those scores through the committee to approve the top five or six Urban and County Projects.

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE MERRIFIELD BRIDGE
FEASIBILITY REPORT**

Haugen commented that this item is at the request of the MPO Executive Policy Board, made a year ago. He explained that the reasons for the delay were because the final Long Range Transportation Plan was not completed until June, and he did not want to attempt to guess whether or not this would be an actual project, or would only involve corridor preservation; and the flood protection project has now been more finalized on this corridor.

Haugen stated that what was essentially being asked was that we take a compilation of all documents specific to the Merrifield Bridge, and put them into their own stand-alone document that can then be used by people who wish to pursue assistance, and particularly potential funding opportunities, for that project. He explained that, as everyone is aware, the MPO Executive Policy Board's motion was to approve two bridges, one at Merrifield and one at 32nd Avenue South, to construct the one at Merrifield as soon as possible, and then once that bridge is in place to consider construction of a bridge at 32nd Avenue South.

Haugen reported that this is a Scope of Work that is being funded through the MPO's Technical Assistance line item in it's current Work Program, and is being done in-house by basically

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14, 2004**

compiling all work already done that pertains to the Merrifield Bridge. He stated that there is one additional thing the MPO will be doing, for which they will be following the Interchange Feasibility report as the template, and that is to do a high level SOV letter to the Environmental Agencies in order to get a first cut environmental report on the bridge corridor.

Haugen commented that a copy of the Scope of Work was included in the packets. He added that he also identified this as an update to a Southern By-pass Study that was done in 1996, which concluded that Merrifield Road was the corridor of choice for a Southern By-pass, and this new report will be updating that document.

Voigt asked if the environmental study will be done in-house as well. Haugen responded that it will be done in-house. He added, however, that it will not be done at the same level as a Project Concept Report and Environmental Review.

Potter asked if this study only encompasses the bridge, or the connectors, essentially from the Merrifield/I-29 Interchange over to the connector to U.S. 2. Haugen responded that the traffic operations include the Interchange, the County 58 connections up to the by-pass, but the profile and comment is specific to the Coal Creek Bridge and the Red River Bridge.

Moved by Brooks, seconded by Potter, to forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve the Scope of Work for the Merrifield Bridge Feasibility Report.

Solwei asked if a Scope of Work could be supplied that addresses all of the items to be studied. Haugen responded that he e-mailed a copy, in addition to a hard copy being sent, and should have been included in the packet. Solwei responded that they did find a copy and will review it.

Benning stated that his only concern would be that the MPO make sure that all of the items are eligible for PL funding. Haugen responded that he is confident that all items are eligible for PL funding.

Motion carried unanimously.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that because the next agenda item is a visual presentation, which those members participating by conference call would not be able to see, he would like to suggest that we suspend the agenda and act on the next two agenda items. Consensus was to suspend the agenda.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14, 2004**

MATTER OF 2004 WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that because it is the start of the new year, he just wanted to highlight, and remind the committee of what our scheduled work program is for 2004. He added that he is also looking for assistance, volunteers, to assist him in developing a Scope of Work for the Washington Street Underpass reconstruction project. He asked who needs to remain involved on this project, whether or not the District needs to be involved, as well as Mr. Benning, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Solwei. He explained that the project entails replacement of the underpass, and to look at further refining, or conceptualizing the costs involved with the project. Solwei responded that they would like to remain informed on this project. Voigt stated that she would be happy to assist in the development of the Scope of Work for the project.

Haugen asked at what level BNSF needs to be involved at this time, and whether or not we should wait until the project is underway before involving them. Solwei responded that he doesn't know that they can really answer that at this time. Haugen stated that he would put together something for the volunteers to react to so that, hopefully by February they will have some kind of polished document available for the Technical Advisory Committee to consider. Benning asked what type of document that would be. Haugen responded that it would be a Scope of Work for the Washington Street Underpass Study, and will outline that activities that will be identified in the report.

Benning asked what is hoped this study will resolve. Haugen responded that he would have to look more closely at the MPO's Work Program, but as he recalls it would be to look at how it meets standards, and if it isn't meeting standards what it will take to bring things up to standard, and to refine the cost estimate. Benning asked what standards are you wanting to address, are you talking about clearance standards, or something else. Haugen asked what standards wouldn't they want to look at. Benning responded that when they did the Project Concept Report they addressed all of the existing conditions; the proposed improvements; as well as various options available, such as vertical clearance, capacity, etc..

Solwei suggested that a Scope of Work be drafted and distributed for comments at the February Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen asked that they also look at the write up on this project in the 2004 Work Program.

Haugen stated that the MPO will be working on the next two year work program, 2005 and 2006, assuming we will still be doing two year work programs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14, 2004**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **UPDATE ON REPEAT OFFENDER FUND**

Johnson reported that he is in the process of doing this research, that he found that these are Title 23 funds, and because they are Title 23 they are required to be in the S.T.I.P., therefore the DOT now has a line item in the S.T.I.P. for those particular funds. He stated that in chatting with Tim Horner and Paul Benning, it has been determined that once those projects are selected a letter will be sent back to the City of Sponsoring Agency to let them know that they have been awarded funding, and the MPO will be copied on the letter as well. He said that this would then leave it up to your discretion as to whether or not you want to add them to your individual T.I.P.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF PRESENTATION ON ICON PAVEMENT QUALITY
MANAGEMENT/DIGITAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMAGES**

Magnuson was present for a brief power point presentation on the Icon Pavement Quality Management/Digital Right-Of-Way Images System.

Presentation ensued.

Magnuson reported that the RFP for data extraction was sent out, that the deadline for submittals is 5:00 p.m. today, and that the selection committee will be meeting to look at all submittals tomorrow at 1:00 p.m., at which time a firm will be selected.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Brooks, seconded by Potter, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Administrative Specialist, Senior