

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 13, 2005 – 1:30 p.m.  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A102**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 13, 2005, meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ryan Brooks, EGF City Planner; Mike Kamnikar, MNDOT-Bemidji; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Dean Wieland, EGF City Engineer; Wayde Swenson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Nancy Ellis, Polk County Planner; Cindy Voigt, GF City Engineer; Richard Onstad, GF County Engineer; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); and Mark Johnson, FHWA-Bismarck (via conference call).

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Julie Romig, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Wayne Lembke, GF Civil Engineer; Mark Engel, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Executive Assistant.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 8, 2005, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Voigt referred to page four, line three of the minutes, and pointed out that the word “paving” should be changed to “painting”.

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY VOIGT, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 8, 2005, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUBJECT TO THE AFOREMENTIONED CORRECTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY FINAL FY 2006-2008 T.I.P. TABLES**

Haugen commented that, in preparation of approval of the final MPO T.I.P. in August, he went through the information in the April draft MPO T.I.P., the draft North Dakota S.T.I.P., and the draft Minnesota S.T.I.P., and found some differences, which he hopes to have clarified.

Haugen stated that the only additional information he has, that wasn't included in the staff report, was, with reauthorization almost upon us, it appears that North Dakota is using estimated reauthorization numbers, and Minnesota is using TEA-21 numbers yet, is that correct. Kamnikar and Benning both responded that that was correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 13, 2005**

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, and he did talk to Mr. Ehrenstrom earlier about this, but, in addition to some transit issues, the only difference he saw between the MPO's draft T.I.P. and the A.T.I.P. was with the east-bound U.S. 2, Business 2 to Fisher, reconstruction project, and the conversion of federal dollars to state dollars.

Ehrenstrom agreed that he did discuss this with Mr. Haugen prior to this meeting, and he feels that they are on the same page. He explained that because of some federal funding issues, the MPO has to build its T.I.P. in a different manner than Minnesota's A.T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., so the two are probably never going to look exactly the same, specifically that the operating numbers are slightly different. He referred to East Grand Forks Project Number 2, which is a paratransit operating contract, and explained that in the MNDOT Contract there are no federal funds built in, but Mr. Brooks has put \$7,100 of federal funds into the T.I.P., just to be able to apply for it, but they don't show that in any of their contracts.

Haugen commented that when he sent this information out a week ago, his biggest concerns were how to address several projects on the North Dakota side in which different years are now being shown, as well as projects that were not even included previously. He pointed out that copies of e-mails discussing this concern were included in the packets, however, those discussions actually made things less clear to him, so he hopes that this can be resolved, if not today, within the next two weeks.

Benning stated that, in regard to the Highway 2 issue, he really can't give any guidance at this time. He explained that they are working on determining the appropriate year, whether it will occur in 2006 or 2007, but the description and dollar amounts are correct. Haugen commented that he thought there was also a difference in the dollar amount. Benning responded that the dollar amounts are correct. He pointed out that the S.T.I.P. showed the project broken into two individual project, but when you add the two amounts together, they come to the same amount shown on the MPO's T.I.P.. Haugen asked if the MPO should only include that portion of the project that is within its study area, and exclude the \$217,000 portion of the project, which is located several miles outside of the MPO's study area. Benning responded that they could do that.

Haugen said that it is his assumption that the enhancement project is also under discussion, as to what year it will be programmed as well. Benning responded that that would be correct. Haugen asked if Mr. Benning had any idea when a decision on this might be made. Benning responded that he did not, but that he would check with Mr. Kubishta on this. Haugen added that Ms. Voigt had received correspondence regarding this that indicated it now had a 2007 application date instead of a 2006 application date. Benning said, then, that that is probably the decision that was made on this project.

Haugen asked about some of the other projects, such as the cross-overs and reconstruction of the interstate, which are now showing up in the draft S.T.I.P., but which, according to Mr. Noehre's e-mail, won't actually be programmed those years. Benning responded that the MPO doesn't have to show those cross-overs in their T.I.P.. Haugen asked if that included, in 2008, the I-29

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 13, 2005**

reconstruction project. Benning responded that they currently don't have a highway bill, so he can't say for certain that they won't occur, but most likely they won't.

Haugen asked if, in 2007, the approach slabs on the Interstate, with the interchange project should stay in or be taken out. Benning responded that he isn't sure if they will be done in 2007 or not, so he would suggest not including them for now. He explained that the Grand Forks NDDOT is working with their planning division to determine where these projects should be programmed. He added that they hope to get a highway bill approved soon so that these projects can be programmed, and when that occurs, an amendment can be made to the T.I.P. to reflect those changes that are needed. Haugen commented that we just talked about the fact that NDDOT is programming projects based on what they think the highway bill will be, but now you are saying you are waiting for a highway bill to be approved, so he is somewhat confused. Benning responded that they are hoping that the highway bill will be around 200,000,000, but what happens is that the States that don't spend the money will return it to Washington, and they reprogram those funds. He said that last year North Dakota received some of those monies, which we weren't expecting, so maybe we will receive some again this year.

Haugen stated that staff will keep working on the T.I.P.. Benning commented that he thinks it looks pretty good right now. Haugen said that the big question is whether a project will be programmed in 2006 or 2007, as 2006 is the committed year, and we don't want to amend the T.I.P. if at all possible.

Haugen reported that the only other thing he would like to make sure we have is, and he knows that Grand Forks has some projects that have draft project concept reports on, and he needs to know if the dollar amounts will remain the same, or will they need to be increased at all. Voigt responded that she thinks they are okay as shown at this time, however, they will know more in a couple of weeks and will let Mr. Haugen know of any changes.

Haugen reminded everyone that the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting will be held one week later than usual, so it will be held on August 17<sup>th</sup>, following the Mid-Year Reviews, which gives us an additional week to clarify these questions. He added that the public notices, however, need to be published ten days prior to the meeting, so they will need to publish them on August 5<sup>th</sup>.

Ehrenstrom referred to Page Twelve of the T.I.P., Project Number Nine, and pointed out that Mr. Brooks built this with an 83/17 match, but nowhere in the regulations has he been able to find anything other than an 80/20 match. He added that he did find information stating that they can use a 90/10 match, but only for vehicle related equipment attributable to ADA Compliance, or the Clean Air Act, but the vehicle itself has to be split at 80/20. Haugen responded that he thinks that they allow you, for simplification purposes, to use the 83/17 match instead of having to itemize those items for ADA accessibility. Ehrenstrom said that he hasn't been able, in the S.T.I.P., to find this information. He added that he also talked to federal representatives as well, and none of them ever heard of doing it this way either. Brooks stated that they did this in the last T.I.P. as well, and they signed off on it. Ehrenstrom said that he will need to discuss this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 13, 2005**

with their MNDOT Federal Representative, and look into this further. Brooks added that he would contact the Denver office, and get this information from them.

Haugen referred to the Illustrative projects, and said that they are continuing to show them. He stated that East Grand Forks has their 13<sup>th</sup> Street extension in the House Bill, and the information they have received is, that through the Conference Committee, the House's high priority projects were cut somewhere around 40% to allow the Senate side to have some money for earmarking, but that hasn't been finalized yet. He added that this was the only project that he heard was included for any earmarked funds. He said that they haven't gone with the 2006 appropriations yet, so we don't know what will be included for those items, which is why we continue to show them as illustrative projects, however, if we know better by August we will show them as programmed projects, but if we don't have a bill by August, and do in September, then we will need to amend the T.I.P. at that time to bring them in.

Kamnikar asked if Mr. Haugen had received an appropriate answer to the funding question regarding the East Grand Forks Highway 2 project. Haugen responded that he had.

Voigt referred to Page V-10, and asked about the reason for the comment on the Point Bridge Painting project, specifically the question of how the \$1.85 million will be split. She said that she was wondering why that was included as the construction projects don't really explain the project. Haugen responded that at an East Grand Forks City Council Work Session, which Grand Forks Councilmember Curt Kreun attended, this was the dollar amount discussed. He added that they agreed not to do the slip-plain fix at this time. Kamnikar asked if the project, then, only included the painting of the bridge. Haugen responded that it also included some minor structural repairs, but the biggest portion of the project involves repainting the bridge. Voigt asked if the question is what the new split will be if we do a certain alternative. Haugen responded that the original dollar amounts were split off the \$2.139 million dollar estimate, but now that there is a new estimate of \$1.852 million, what will the new split be. Voigt said that she doesn't think that they would do anything different in the T.I.P. than the did with any of their other projects, that this is still a budget number, and she wouldn't amend it as the project hasn't gone through a public hearing, and they haven't picked an alternate, so they don't know if that project isn't \$2.139 million yet, it's too premature. She asked, then, that this remark be removed.

Haugen reiterated that staff is trying to get the T.I.P. ready for final approval at the August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, so he would appreciate it if everyone would get corrections to him before August 5<sup>th</sup>. He added that he will also be contacting both agencies for the status of their 2005 projects as well.

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

Brooks reported that back in March the Technical Advisory Committee forwarded a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve the RFP for the U.S. #2 Access Management Plan, which they did. He said that they interviewed four firms, ranked them, and went into negotiations with the top ranked firm, whom they were unable to reach an agreement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 13, 2005**

with, so they then negotiated with the second ranked firm, HDR Engineering, with whom an agreement was reached. He pointed out that copies of the scope-of-services, and a schedule were included in the packets, and explained that it is hoped that this project will be completed by the end of the year.

Kamnikar stated that because he had been out of the office for the last couple of months, he wasn't able to really look at the information provided, and therefore wasn't able to determine whether or not the information compared to the comments Monty and himself provided. Brooks responded that he knows that they had mentioned the possibility of doing a gap analysis, but the project boundaries are pretty much all within City limits at this time, however, if there should be a need for a gap analysis in the future, an amendment can be made to the contract. He said that they would keep MNDOT informed of what is going on during the study.

Information only.

**MATTER OF 2005 TRAFFIC COUNT LOCATIONS**

Romig gave a brief power point presentation on the proposed 2005 traffic count locations, explaining which intersections NDDOT will be doing counts at, which ones we would like to see NDDOT do counts at, and which ones the MPO would be doing counts at.

Haugen added that for Grand Forks they will be doing all the counts that have been done in the past, except for a couple areas along the river which no longer have functioning street, plus we are going to ask NDDOT, on the functionally classified roadways, to add a few more locations due to the growth of the City, and, also due to the growth of the City, the MPO will be using NDDOT's equipment, once NDDOT is done, to do some additional local streets. He stated that Ms. Romig will be visiting with staff from both sides to make sure we have the appropriate locations counted.

Haugen reported that these will be 48-hour counts, and will begin after Labor Day, with NDDOT doing counts for three weeks, and the MPO doing theirs in October, when NDDOT is done.

Haugen asked if this information should be sent to Mr. Benning, or to others in the department. Benning responded that it should be sent to Bob Olzweski, Planning and Programming Division.

Haugen asked if there would be MNDOT resources available as well. Kamnikar responded that there would, and that they should get in touch with Rod Rolfe, for assistance with this.

Haugen commented that Ms. Romig will be getting in touch with everyone soon, asking that they review the map to make sure we are counting in the right spots. He added that this information will be used with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Model to forecast future traffic, so proper locations, and good counts are important.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 13, 2005**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Access Management Course

Haugen reminded everyone that the MPO will be hosting an Access Management Course on August 9<sup>th</sup> through August 11<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the course is full, with thirty people registered, and five NDDOT personnel on a waiting list, so if anyone knows that they may not be able to make it, please let him know as soon as possible in order that someone else can fill that spot.

2. Point Bridge Project

Benning asked for an update on the Point Bridge project. Voigt responded that she dropped off the executive decision summary sign-off document with the East Grand Forks City Engineer, who verbally stated that he felt he can sign it, so she hopes to get it back as soon as possible. She added that she talked to Interstate Engineering about setting up dates for public hearings, as well as to the East Grand Forks City Engineer. She said that she will forward any information she receives from these parties to Mr. Benning.

Benning reported that this project has been programmed for a February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2006 bid opening in order that the plans can be completed by December 9<sup>th</sup>, which means you have five months to complete it. Voigt responded that they do their best to accomplish this.

Kamnikar asked if he was correct in assuming that there would be future discussion on the point bridge replacement issue. Haugen responded that it is his understanding that the desire is to paint it, and have it last another good many years, and that the only issue left is the slip-plain problem on the East Grand Forks side, and how to fix that problem, so future discussions on this issue will be forthcoming. He added that he would think that either Ms. Voigt or Mr. Boppre will be keeping MNDOT informed of this.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WIELAND, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2005, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:15 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Secretary