

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2005 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 17, 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: Ryan Brooks, EGF City Planner; Mike Kamnikar, MNDOT-Bemidji; Dean Wieland, EGF City Engineer; Nancy Ellis, Polk County Planner; Cindy Voigt, GF City Engineer; Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck; Mark Johnson, FHWA-Bismarck; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Dennis Potter, GF City Planner; and Lane Magnuson, GF County Planner.

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

Guests present were: Craig Rasmussen, HDR Engineering; John Seyer, HDR Engineering; Sarah Koepke, FHWA-Minnesota; Lynne Bly, MNDOT-St. Paul; and Dave Leftwich, NDDOT-Bismarck.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairman Haugen declared a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE JULY 13, 2005, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WIELAND, TO APPROVE THE JULY 13, 2005, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE FY 2006-2008 T.I.P.

a. Public Hearing

Haugen reported that, as noted on the agenda, a public hearing has been scheduled to take place at this meeting. He pointed out that included in the packets were copies of the draft T.I.P. document. He added that the public hearing notice did state that this also serves as the program of projects for the Transit Operators, and identifies that it could be considered as the final document unless significant changes are required during the adoption, otherwise, according to FTA, it will not need to be advertised again.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2005**

Haugen commented that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, drafts of the tables were submitted for approval. He reminded the committee that there were a few changes required, with the most significant being the East Grand Forks Project #10. He explained that this project involves the extension of 13th Street S.E., and was programmed in the past to occur in 2007, using HES funds, but that as part of the Re-authorization, this project was included as a high-priority earmarked project, and since high priority funded projects are now showing up in the 2007 project year, this project has been removed from the illustrative project list to the programmed project list, still retaining the HES funds.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY POTTER, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

There was no one present for discussion. Haugen added that no written comments were received from the public at this time as well.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FOSTER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

Foster referred to Page 25, Grand Forks Project #3, and commented that discussion had been held about changing this to replacement of rolling stock. Haugen agreed, adding that Grand Forks Project #3, which is a 5309 Statewide Request, will reflect the change from purchasing a dispatch system for senior rider and one replacement vehicle to purchase rolling stock.

Noehre referred to Page 26, Grand Forks Project #8, and stated that it should be Primary Regional System instead of Secondary Regional System. He added that this should also be reflected in the Table on Page 15 as well.

Voigt referred to Page 25, Grand Forks Project #5, and commented that it had been determined that under the remarks section, the statement "\$1.852M – how is it split?" was to be removed, however it is still being shown there. She asked that this be removed. Haugen referred to Page 35, East Grand Forks Project #4, and pointed out that the same statement is shown here as well, and will also be removed.

Noehre referred to Page 15, Table 2, and asked what the asterisks were referencing. McNelis responded that they were on the previous table, but there was no key indicating what they were referencing. Noehre suggested that unless a key can be determined, the asterisks should be removed.

Wieland referred to Page 37, East Grand Forks Project #10, and asked what the acronym "HES" stands for. Haugen responded that it stands for "Hazard Elimination Safety", which is a federal funding source, that is awarded by the ATP.

Haugen referred to Page 53, the Project States Summary, and pointed out that they have identified what was programmed this year, and the status of those projects. He said that they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2005**

were able to get a lot of that information, however he is still missing information concerning the Southend Pedestrian Bridge that East Grand Forks put some T.E. monies into. Wieland responded that he would get that information from Greg Boppre.

Haugen referred to Page V, and explained that there was a meeting held this morning, at which it was determined that MNDOT's approval page be removed from the document, and that in future T.I.P.'s, Page IV also be omitted as well.

b. Committee Action

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FOSTER, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 2006-2008 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES IDENTIFIED ABOVE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SAFETEA-LU

Haugen commented that, as most of you know, we do have a new transportation reauthorization, and Mark Johnson has copies of a power point presentation that summarizes the impact this will have on the MPO's he would like to share with everyone today. He added that Lynne Bly has some information pertaining to this new bill as well, and asked if copies were available. Copies of this information was distributed, and is available upon request.

Johnson stated that the first handout basically came out of their Intergovernmental Affairs Office on Monday, and talks about some of the provisions of SAFETEA-LU. He said that he has not had time to look at it yet, so he can't give an in-depth overview on what it contains, but it appears to be a good synopsis of the changes, and what we may see occur. He added that they will continue, over the next few months, to get additional information from their headquarters, and asks that everyone bear with them as they digest all the information.

Johnson said that the second handout includes a brief overview of only the planning portion. He stated that it is informal, and they will be getting guidance and direction from their headquarters, so don't take this information as gospel, as it is certainly subject to change as interpretations are made and changed as they go through all the information. He referred to the power point document, and went over it briefly.

Johnson reported that in regards to the T.I.P., the MPO is still going to be asked to provide an opportunity for participation by interested parties in the development of the T.I.P., and the T.I.P. will need to be updated once every four years, and approved by the MPO and the Governor. He said that because of this change, on the federal side, they will not require the MPO to update their T.I.P. any more than every four years. He stated, however, that there will still be a need for an annual listing of projects, including pedestrian walkways, simple transportation, etc., and it will need to be published by the State, the Transit Operators, and the MPO for public review to inform them what you have done over the past year, what projects were delayed, projects that were advanced, etc..

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2005**

Haugen commented that it does appear that the MPO will be working on a proposed 2007-2010 T.I.P., and as they begin solicitations this fall, and work until July or August of next year, they will be considering a four year T.I.P. instead of a three year as we currently do.

Bly reported that the Minnesota Department of Transportation is working with FHWA in Minnesota to basically go section by section through the bill to come up with a sort of tabular form that tells us how things have changed from TEA-21 to SAFETEA-LU. She said that the handout she has provided discusses only those changes to Title 6 that affect the language related to the Metropolitan Statewide Planning, and covers many of the same points that Mr. Johnson just spoke on.

Benning stated that the NDDOT will be sending out letters in early September asking for four years of Urban Roads projects, which is a change from prior years.

Haugen commented that there are some new programs for which the applications forms, and the programs themselves have not been fully identified, so throughout the early part of the coming year, those programs will get off their feet, and solicitations will be distributed.

Benning reported that Ben Kubishta told him that Transportation Enhancement Program Application packets will be sent out soon, and the applications are due on November 10th.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON EGF GATEWAY DRIVE ACCESS STUDY

Brooks reported that John Seyer and Craig Rasmussen, from HDR Engineering, are here to give a brief update on the EGF Gateway Drive Access Study. He added that they are really only in the beginning stages of the study, and are on track at this time. He said that they will be holding a public meeting this evening at 5:00 p.m. in the East Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room.

Rasmussen thanked the committee for allowing Mr. Seyer and himself to attend today. He then distributed copies of information pertaining to the study, and explained that it is a combination of two things; one being information for this evening's meeting, and the other is information concerning existing traffic information for the corridor. He referred to the document, and pointed out that the first page is the agenda for this evening's public meeting; the second page is a sign-in sheet they will be using at the meeting; and the third page is a comment sheet for those attending to submit any comments or questions they might have about the study. He asked that everyone review this information, and let him know of any changes they might like to see made.

Rasmussen commented that, because everyone here is already familiar with the scope of work for this study, he would not go over it again now, but will do so at the public meeting. He reminded everyone that the study limits are from the southern line of the Kennedy Bridge, east to the corporate limits of East Grand Forks, which is almost two-miles. He referred to the fourth page of the document, and explained that it illustrates the timeline they will be following for the duration of the study, and is current as of today. He pointed out that the tasks completed to date involve data collection, and that they are on track for the public meeting this afternoon.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2005**

Seyer referred to the last three pages of the document, explaining that the background they used to develop these figures is simply a working copy, and they are currently working on refining the aerial portion to develop a cleaner presentation for later use. He pointed out that the first of the last three pages of the document shows the intersection geometrics for the corridor; the second shows the existing levels of service; and the third shows critical crash rates and crash costs per location.

Rasmussen stated that updates will be available for both the September and October Technical Advisory Committee meetings, a draft document will be ready for review at the November meeting, and a final document will be ready for approval at the December meeting.

Brooks asked if anyone had any comments or questions concerning this study. Kamnikar asked what crash information was used, and whether or not they had received 2004 information. Rasmussen responded that they had received the 2004 information, and that they actually used five years of information. He added that all of the crashes at the Central Avenue intersection had occurred prior to the signal installation, so that intersection was analyzed purely as a through-stop condition. He stated that the geometrics changed as well, so most of the crash information can be thrown out. He pointed out, however, that one unusual thing they noticed was that a large number of crashes are shown to have occurred on the Kennedy Bridge, which may have been a coding issue, and they will look into this further, and may toss that information out as well.

Kamnikar suggested that it might be advisable to include the study area limits on the comment sheet in order to remind people which area to focus on when submitting their comments.

Information only.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON 2006 ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that in August or September of 2004, this body identified, as part of the MPO's two year work program process, activities that the MPO would undertake in 2006, and now that we are approaching the Year 2006, he is reminding everyone what activities were identified, and offer the chance to check to see if these are still the activities you want the MPO to undertake, or if there are other's you would like to see done instead.

Haugen stated that one thing he needs to clarify, and, referring to copies of the summary sheet from the work program, he pointed out that in the middle of the page it lists, under 300.21, Corridor Study, which is the generic title, but in the work program itself it shows that we are undertaking the study of unsignalized intersections in Grand Forks. He added that this was originally programmed to be done in 2005, but the MPO Executive Policy Board flip-flopped it with the 32nd Avenue Corridor Study, which is currently underway.

Haugen pointed out that the other item, as mentioned in the staff report, is the possibility that we may be receiving additional funds that can be used to program additional activities, but we are still working with our agencies to determine which funds can be programmed, so he would ask that this body continue to submit projects that they would like to see funded if the funds are made available.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2005**

Haugen commented that staff would like to make any modifications this body might want made to the work program by September in order to submit them to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their September meeting.

Brooks reported that the MPO did a Safe Route to School document two years ago, and that might be something we want to update.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **POINTE BRIDGE PUBLIC HEARING**

Voigt reported that there will be a public hearing on the Pointe Bridge project on Monday, September 22nd, at 5:00 p.m..

2. **NHI ACCESS MANAGEMENT COURSE**

Noehre stated that he would just like to thank the MPO for sponsoring the NHI Access Management Course on August 9-11. He said that he thought it was a very good course.

3. **42ND STREET UNDERPASS PROJECT**

Benning commented that he participated in a conference call yesterday, along with Wayne Lembke and KLJ personnel, to discuss the 42nd Street Underpass Project. He said that they also asked Federal Highway to participate in order to get some direction on how to proceed with the project. He stated that Federal Highway agreed that we can proceed with the environmental document; but that the good/bad news is that the purpose of need, which they are in the process of drafting, needs to be done in such a way that it will compel Federal Highway to agree to our using federal funds to build it.

ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FOSTER, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 17TH, 2005, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:20 P.M.. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Executive Assistant