

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 12, 2005 – 1:30 P.M.  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A102**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 12, 2005, meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Steve Salwei (Proxy for Paul Benning), NDDOT-Bismarck; Nancy Ellis, Polk County Planner; Wayde Swenson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Wayne Lembke (Proxy for Cindy Voigt), GF City Engineer; Dean Wieland, EGF City Engineer; Dennis Potter, GF City Planner; Richard Onstad, GF County Engineer; Mike Kamnikar, MNDOT-Bemidji; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Greg Boppre, EGF City Engineer; Lane Magnuson, GF County Planner; and Ryan Brooks, EGF City Planner.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Julie Romig, GF/EGF MPO Planner, Senior; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Craig Rasmussen, HDR Consulting.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2005, MINUTES**

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY POTTER, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2005, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF EGF U.S. #2 (GATEWAY DRIVE) ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Craig Rasmussen, HDR Consulting, was present for a brief update on the EGF U.S. #2 Access Management Plan Study.

Rasmussen referred to copies of a Technical Memo, included in the packets, and explained that it discusses the results of the public meeting that was held at the Alerus on August 17<sup>th</sup>. He stated that, basically, they condensed the comments they received from that meeting down to three main issues: 1) Access at Gateway Drive & 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue N.E.; 2) A connection at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W.; and 3) An industrial site access at 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E..

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 12, 2005**

Rasmussen added that they also discussed the role of the Technical Advisory Committee, and that is as the Steering Committee. He said that they essentially have Ryan Brooks as the project manager, but the Technical Advisory Committee is the guiding entity for the project. He stated that he would also mention that in terms of Mn/DOT's participation in the project, Mike Kamnikar, of Mn/DOT's District 2 (Bemidji), has been the lead contact, and did participate in the public meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>. He reported that a meeting was held prior to this meeting, with Mr. Kamnikar, to address some issues and concerns Mn/DOT has with this project, which they will address through the Technical Advisory Committee.

Rasmussen commented that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting they asked for approval of alternatives to be analyzed, which are illustrated in the handout he has available for review. He then distributed copies of the map illustrating the four alternatives they are studying, and went over each briefly (a copy of this map is included in the file, and available for review).

Rasmussen referred to the technical memo in the packet, and stated that he doesn't want to dismiss the idea of level of service and delay, but he will say that no matter what access configuration you look at, all of them meet the level of service "C" or better guidelines, which is important for the MPO to know in order to determine the level of congestion. He pointed out that we need to understand that many of the access alternatives are not really tied to fixing deficiencies from a traffic standpoint, but from an operations standpoint instead.

Rasmussen referred to page five of the technical memo, and explained that they monetized crash costs using the methodology that Mn/Dot's Office of Investment Management uses. He pointed out that the memo shows an estimate of crash costs by crash type. He stated that the idea with doing this is to show that when you see the dollar value, it doesn't necessarily mean that this is the amount of cash you will save by doing a particular alternative, but instead it gives us a comparison tool that is easily understood by technical staff and public alike. He then referred to Table TM-2, and went over the information briefly.

Rasmussen stated that they are not getting to the point of developing a draft document for the Technical Advisory Committee's review, and would like to get comments and direction from this body that he can take back and incorporate into that document.

Kamnikar asked if he was correct that the signal at 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue N.E. doesn't pull traffic out of the traffic stream from 220. Rasmussen responded that the way this is shown in the travel demand model is that the connection at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> are both in the model, but if you look at them more closely, you will find that the ADT drops dramatically at 220 after the connection is made, so it is reasonable to assume you will get some drop in traffic with a signal at 2<sup>nd</sup>, but it is mostly the connection at 2<sup>nd</sup> that makes a difference.

**MATTER OF INTERIUM GUIDANCE ON SAFETEA-LU PLANNING**

Haugen reported that copies of information pertaining to SAFETEA-LU that were included in the packets, and explained that with the passage of SAFETEA-LU, Federal Highway and FTA

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 12, 2005**

have issued some interim guidance documents. He explained that there were some new provisions in SAFETEA-LU that came with it's passage, however, the official regulations, of course have not been updated, therefore they are providing this guidance information to help bridge the gap between SAFETEA Law and the Federal Regulations.

Haugen pointed out that there are a few key things: 1) There is more public participation required of the MPOs, however, they are giving us until 2007 to implement these requirements. He stated that in the MPO's Annual Unified Work Program, in 2006, one of the activities is to update our Street and Highway Plan, so we would anticipate that we would have all of these requirements in place by the end of December, when they to the final adoption of the Street and Highway Plan; 2) Implication that the MPO must develop a Public Participation Plan, this was actually required under ISTEA, therefore, we have a PPP document in place, however, we will be reviewing that document, and making any necessary changes to it to insure that we meet all requirements; 3) Transit, and the fact that for specific programs there will be more funding available (shown on page 3), which means that we will need to create a coordinated transit plan to include Social Services, Northeast Human Services, County Social Services, etc.. He added that we will not only have to coordinate this plan, but we will also have to maintain that coordination with the help of our DOT agencies.

Haugen commented that the remaining information involves issues that really don't affect the MPO: 1) air quality, which doesn't seem to raise to many issues for us; 2) environmental provisions, which involves a lot of activities that do not pertain to the MPO; 3) Federal Highway, which is more specific to individual programs, how they are funded, what is eligible, etc..

Kamnikar stated that last week he attended the SAFETEA-LU update, and jotted down a few things from that, specifically ways to get the public involved, such as using the web-site more often, and getting material out to the public. Haugen said that the next agenda item involves the introduction of the MPO's new web-site.

Kamnikar commented that each state has to have a coordinator for the Safe Route To School Program, and Minnesota's is Kristie Billar. Salwei stated that North Dakota has not yet determined who will be their coordinator at this time.

Information only.

**MATTER OF INTRODUCTION OF MPO WEBSITE**

Romig gave a brief demonstration on the new GF/EGF MPO Website, [www.theforksmppo.org](http://www.theforksmppo.org), going over it's contents and links.

Consensus was that the website was very informative, and quite well-done.

**MATTER OF 2006 ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that several months ago we identified that the MPO does have a work program already approved for 2006, but questioned whether or not any updates were needed, as well as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 12, 2005**

whether or not there were any additional funds available that needed to be included. He said that, formally, he has not received any comments on additional projects, nor on any additional funds that may be available, therefore, he would like to remind everyone that they need to get this information to him prior to the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting, so if anyone has any projects they would like included, please let him know as soon as possible.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **MATTER OF T.I.P. SCHEDULE**

Haugen reminded the committee of the MPO's T.I.P. schedule, which is included on the new website. He stated that North Dakota's T.E. applications need to be submitted in November, and that at the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting the committee will need to determine which projects are in compliance with the plan, and how they should be prioritized for submittal to NDDOT.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY POTTER, TO ADJOURN THE  
SEPTEMBER 12, 2005, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:10 P.M.  
MOTION CARRIED.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant