

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 11th, 2006, 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: Wayde Swenson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Brad Gengler, Interim Grand Forks City Planner; Nancy Ellis, Polk County Planner; Craig Collison (Proxy for J.T. Anderson), MNDOT-Bemidji; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck; Wayne Lembke, Grand Forks Civil Engineer; Roger Foster, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit Superintendent; Ryan Brooks, East Grand Forks City Planner; and Richard Onstad, Grand Forks County Engineer.

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

Guests present were: Brad Bail, Floan-Sanders; and John Sayer, HDR Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 14TH, 2005, MINUTES

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FOSTER, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 14TH, 2005, MINUTES FOR THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FY 2007-2010 T.I.P. APPLICATIONS

- a. North Dakota Projects
- b. Minnesota Projects

Haugen reminded everyone that at the December 14th meeting, the Committee approved extending the timeline for T.I.P. project submittal to today's meeting. He pointed out that copies of applications for projects submitted for our review and consideration were included in the packets. He referred to the staff report, also included in the packets, and explained that only projects that are different than what is currently in our T.I.P. will be discussed today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

Haugen reported that there are some changes to the 2006 North Dakota project list, but added that the public hearing to approve them won't be held until February, however, once acted upon, it will also be necessary, then, to make changes to the ND S.T.I.P.. He said that the remaining projects listed, then, are 2007 to 2010 projects. He added that North Dakota is approving a S.T.I.P. to include 2010 projects, but Minnesota is not, although they will be listing them as more or less illustrative projects. He then referred to the project lists, and went over the new 2007 through 2010 projects listed.

Haugen stated that, again, East Grand Forks rotates with three other cities of similar population, and 2006 is the year they got funding, therefore, 2010 will be the next year they will be eligible for these funds, so they have tentatively identified 5th Avenue N.W./Gateway Drive Intersection as the project for these funds. He added that some additional information he received from MNDOT, after the T.I.P. was mailed, is that they informed the ATP that there is more federal funds available for programming in 2007 and 2008 than we currently show. He referred to the copies of some spreadsheets that MNDOT provided, which were included in the packets, and pointed that they show how things are currently programmed, and where these additional new funds could be programmed. He stated that because he was unable to attend the last ATP meeting, he would defer to Mr. Collison to explain this in more detail.

Collison responded that ATP had said that they would be distributing these additional funds using a percentage method in 2008, and that they currently list partnership projects at 80% of what is shown in the S.T.I.P. in 2007, and then distribute the remaining funds on a percentage basis. He stated that the only exception is that more research is being done to determine whether or not more funds should be set aside for rail-safety projects. He added, however, that this all may have changed as of last Thursday, as they were just informed that the obligation authority of SAFETEA-LU is only at 85%, not the 90% we were assuming, so this all seems to be a moving target, but OIM has said that we should know more in a couple of weeks. Haugen commented that there was roughly \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000 that we are trying to program, and the first spreadsheet does illustrate pretty much what OIM did, but it may change a little.

Haugen reported that no projects were submitted by either MNDOT or Polk County, nor did East Grand Forks submit any enhancement projects either.

Haugen stated that there were, as noted, some significant changes proposed to the North Dakota 2007 through 2010 project list. He said that the major reason for these changes was the dropping of the 42nd Street Grade Separation project, which essentially frees up about \$7,000,000 of federal funds. He commented that Grand Forks has tried to reprogram those monies, but have not been quite able to reprogram the entire \$7,000,000, so there is still some monies left that they are not asking be programmed for urban roads projects during this cycle.

Haugen reported that, as shown on the project submittal list, instead of the 42nd Street project, new projects Grand Forks is bringing in, along with North Dakota include:

2008 – Lift station at 32nd/Columbia Road

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

2008 and 2009 – Gateway Drive Maintenance Project with the western segment from I-29 to Columbia Road being done in 2008 and the eastern segment from Columbia Road to the Kennedy bridge in 2009.

2008 – Grand Forks will be constructing a new segment of 40th Avenue South, between Washington and 20th Street. He added that in 2006 the segment of 40th Avenue South, between 20th Street and 34th Street will be done, so this new 2008 project fills in the gap between Washington to the Super Target area.

2009 – North 51st Street and a segment of Cherry Street will be reconstructed.

2010 – Both NDDOT and Grand Forks are looking at improvements to the Washington Street Underpass, at a cost of about \$15,000,00.

Haugen stated that North Dakota has also requested that an additional year, a 5th year, of regional projects be included in the T.I.P., which is why projects are also shown for 2011, including improvements to Gateway Drive/Columbia Road, and to the Downtown DeMers Avenue Skyway Bridge.

Haugen referred to the list of transit projects, and explained that they are basically a continuation from past T.I.P.'s. He added that, as noted in the staff report, there are still some programs that are being developed for which we will also need to solicit projects for. He pointed out that these include: Highway Safety Improvement Program; Safe Routes to School; New Freedom; and Job Access/Reverse Commute. He added that there could be a couple more that have yet to be identified as well.

Haugen stated, and this is really a question for NDDOT, but he is assuming, even though there are some differences between our current MPO T.I.P., and the State's S.T.I.P., and, even though we haven't received any information on these projects, that the I-29 reconstruction, north-bound, with crossovers will still occur in 2008 and 2009, and that in 2007 the I-29/DeMers Avenue Interchange and Gateway Drive Interchange projects will still occur as well. He explained that these projects are not included in the MPO's T.I.P., but are included in North Dakota's S.T.I.P., and he doesn't think there is a need for us to amend our current T.I.P., but can, instead take care of this with the development of the new S.T.I.P.. Benning responded that Mr. Haugen is correct, and that he will be getting new Urban Program sheets to the MPO in about March. He added that they have a category called "Other", and these projects can be appropriated to it. Haugen asked if there were any 2010 projects that they aren't aware of. Swenson responded that he did not see any. Benning commented that the difficulty with all of this right now is the fact that, as Mr. Collison stated, we don't know what our funding will be for 2006 yet, and they have at least a dozen different scenarios for projects based on funding, so when we finally know what our funding will be, those projects are programmed to go.

Collison stated that in terms of the S.T.I.P., one thing MNDOT is concerned with is their bituminous costs, as, around the State they are letting them come in about 25% higher than they were this time last year, and if things get delayed, how are those two S.T.I.P.'s matched, do you have to do an amendment to the MPO's S.T.I.P., or can it happen the next year. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

responded that next year they have an obligation to correct, and you will see in the T.I.P. document an appendix that states that current year's obligated projects, or an annual listing of what should have taken place, and they will just note there that if it carried on that it was delayed for the next year, and then when the new T.I.P. is done it will need to be included as a new project for that year. He added that if the project only affects the North Dakota side, there will not be a corresponding Minnesota S.T.I.P. amendment needed, only a local MPO amendment.

Haugen reported that, as noted in the staff report, they are recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve that all of these projects are consistent with the MPO's Long Range Plan, and that they be given a high priority ranking.

Ehrenstrom asked if it was an oversight, or if Mr. Brooks intended to ask for less funding for bus shelters in 2007. Brooks responded that it was correct, that because they were also purchasing a vehicle that year, less funding was being asked for for shelters.

Collison stated that he would to note that MNDOT has not yet completely worked out all of the details on the 5th Avenue Interchange Project. Brooks commented that it is only an illustrative project at this time. Collison said that he doesn't have a problem with it being included as an illustrative project, but he just wanted everyone to be aware that they still have some work to do with it.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LEMBKE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2007-2010 T.I.P. PROJECT APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT A HIGH PRIORITY RANKING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FINAL E.G.F. GATEWAY DRIVE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Brooks reported that John Sayer, with HDR Engineering; and Brad Bail, Floan-Sanders, are here today for a brief presentation on the E.G.F. Gateway Drive Access Management Plan. He added that they did have a public meeting on this project last evening, and they will be asking that comments on the final be submitted to them by next week. He stated that Mr. Sayer will now go over some of the changes that occurred within the project since our last meeting.

Sayer stated that he would like to briefly go over some of the changes made to the plan since the last meeting, and also discuss some of the comments they received at last evening's public meeting.

Sayer referred to a drawing, or map of the recommended access plan, and went over it briefly.

Sayer stated that the comments they received from the public at last evening's meeting were very similar to what they received at the first public meeting, in terms of what alternatives they would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

like to see. He added that people were happy to see the connection at 5th Avenue N.W. with a signal, but there really wasn't much discussion on the other two alternatives. He added that they did send those in attendance home with some comment sheets, and encouraged them to give copies to their neighbors as well, asking that they return their comments by the end of next week in order to allow for them to be addressed, and incorporated into the plan if necessary.

Sayer reported that the comments they received since the draft report was distributed at the December meeting included some from MNDOT.

Sayer said that the first comment he would like to discuss has to do with the dynamic between the existing access versus the Category 2B Guidelines, and the proposed access versus the Category 2B Guidelines. He explained that the Category 2B has some pretty well defined spacing requirements, and for the most part this corridor meets those requirements, with the exception of that portion to the west of 5th Avenue N.E.. He stated that this alternative does not propose any new access to the corridor with the exception of additional connections at the existing accesses at 2nd and 5th.

Sayer stated that another comment made was to suggest that we take a look at the corridor functionality as a whole, rather than looking at individual intersections. He said that this issue was actually discussed at the December meeting, and, in-fact if you turn to page 42 of the report, you will find a table and some text that describes exactly what we found when we developed our model, and ran the analysis of the corridor as a whole.

Sayer then reported that another comment suggested that we need to put together an implementation strategy for their recommended access plan, so that was added to the report. He referred to the report, and pointed out that this comment was actually addressed on pages 52 through 54, and Table 8.1, however, based on some of the comments they received last evening, as well as any they may receive in the next few days, they will certainly refine the implementation strategy as needed.

Sayer said that another comment spoke to garnering more public input, however they believe that they satisfied that with the second public open house last evening.

Sayer pointed out that truck traffic is another significant issue, and this was discussed briefly at the December meeting, and was incorporated into their analyses and report, so you will find this information peppered throughout the document.

Sayer stated that they were given more refined numbers for the monitorization of crash impacts on the corridor, so when you go through this document in January, you will see that those numbers will be somewhat different.

Sayer said that the last comment was a question concerning whether or not the Technical Advisory Committee was supportive of this plan, and it certainly has been their understanding that it is.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

Sayer commented that the report you have before you is kind of a “final” draft report, so they are certainly looking to refine some of the details on how these alternatives can be feasible, particularly Alternatives 1 and 3, and will incorporate their findings in the “final” report.

Brooks stated that he only has a couple of comments to add, specifically from discussion with MNDOT representatives at last evening’s meeting, and he would like to thank Mr. Kamnikar and Mr. Collison for coming all the way from Bemidji to attend, but one issue that was discussed involved Alternative 3, the ¾ access at 2nd Avenue N.E., in that MNDOT would like to see us off-set the accesses so that they aren’t directly lined-up across from each other in order to ease their concerns that a full access would be asked for in the future. He said that another item that was brought up involves the area east of 5th Avenue N.E., where the last traffic light is located on U.S. Highway 2, in that MNDOT, who is always looking for more definitive answers as to what the future may hold, would like to know where we thought the last traffic light might be located, and, after discussion, it was determined that the it would most likely be located at 11th Avenue N.E., and that wording would be added to the document to addresses this. Haugen asked, then, if in the report, on Page 39, a different graphic for Alternative 3 would be included to clarify what Mr. Brooks just explained, and if verbiage would also be added to explain this, and a new Figure 8 would be included to show a future traffic light at 11th Avenue S.E. as well. Brooks responded that a different graphic, and verbiage would be added to the report, but that he didn’t think that a new figure showing a light at 11th Avenue S.E. would be included, possibly just a reference in the text.

Haugen asked if anything would be added to address the 7th Avenue modifications discussed. Brooks responded they would address this issue in the text. Collison pointed out, however, that it needs to be made clear that if and when this would become an issue, there wouldn’t be a full intersection at this location. Sayer commented that he thought this issue would be tied to the signal at 11th, but he is hearing that this may not be the case. Collison responded that, let’s just say that prior to doing signalization at 7th, something developed in that location, and we started to see accidents, etc., at that location, something would then need to be done at that time, but it is pretty hard to speculate what may or may not occur in the future. Brooks added that, from a Planner’s perspective, this helps them as they start to get development on the north side of 7th as well. He said that they can then alert perspective developers that the access they enjoy today may not be there in the future.

Benning asked if the area by 7th was zoned commercially. Brooks responded that that area is actually outside of City Limits at this time, however it is zoned industrial on the south side of 7th. Ellis added that the area on the north side is zoned commercial by the County. Benning asked how many acres this included. Ellis responded that she isn’t sure, that this was done in the 1970’s, and is shown as a box on their maps, which were done in the 1970’s. She added that they haven’t had the opportunity to amend their maps, but are working on getting this done. Benning suggested that it may be pro-active to look at the acreage and zoning here, and putting the number of acreage down. Ellis responded that this would be nice, but she is the only planner right now, so until they get their GIS fully developed, and can do some GPS work to get it up and running, and hire some additional help, it probably won’t get done right now.

Discussion on acreage issues, etc., ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

Collison stated that Mr. Kamnikar did send some comments with him that he would like to address:

1. MNDOT really hasn't had a chance to look at the Draft Final Plan thoroughly yet, so they have quite a few questions/concerns from their central office that need to be reviewed.
2. Clarification is needed that addresses the fact that even though this is now a Category 7, and MNDOT has agreed to additional access points, they will still be controlling access along this corridor in the future.
3. The CO will be the one who will approve the Category 7 change because they are the one's who put it in their plan.
4. Because 5th is going to require a lot of work, in terms of what is being proposed, so discussion needs to occur with Lynne Bly to determine whether or not State Planning funds can be used or not.
5. MNDOT doesn't want to sound mean or callous, but currently within MNDOT's fiscal ability, and with the priorities St. Paul is directing to them, they would look at the costs of implementing this plan as a local issue. He added that this does not fit into MNDOT's current program, nor does it fit into the planning recommendations they have been given statewide, and this would need to be reflected in the document in order to be consistent. Brooks responded that he understands this, however, they didn't actually want to say that MNDOT wasn't going to participate in any of the costs at this time, as they were hoping to answer all of MNDOT's comments first to allow them to get a better understanding of what we are looking at doing, and possibly convince MNDOT to find some way to help, but they can do so if necessary. Collison commented, unfortunately, that right now that is where they are at with this, but they do need to go through all the comments, but that is the direction, that within the statewide requirements, they have been given, as their priorities right now are preservation and safety, which requires a lot more funding then they have available. Haugen asked if Mr. Collison would provide something to that effect in writing. Collison responded he would.

Sayer stated that the text in the document alluding to the potential for a signal at 11th Avenue will also state that no other access will be permitted on U.S. Highway 2 west of the substation access. Haugen added that if there were ever a need to modify that statement, that would require a plan amendment.

Brooks commented that staff was requesting final approval on this plan, but because we are a little behind with the study, and are waiting for comments from the public and MNDOT, we are now looking at asking for final approval at the February meeting.

Haugen asked what the final date for comments from the public is. Brooks responded that comments need to be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 17th.

Haugen asked if the method staff has employed to get information out to the committee, by identifying downloading documents from the MPO's web site, is acceptable. Consensus was that this method was acceptable.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

Haugen stated that this item would then be tabled for final action at the February Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

MATTER OF AMENDMENTS TO FY2006 MPO UPWP

Haugen reported that, per discussion with Mr. Benning at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, we have a better understanding of what is going with our program funding. He referred to the staff report in the packets, and pointed out that it states that we have about \$200,000 of unprogrammed monies available. He stated that he also identified that with SAFETEA-LU, we, as an MPO have some requirements we have to fulfill, and because we did not have the \$200,000 programmed in the 2006 program, we are now going to use some of those funds to meet SAFETEA-LU's requirements, therefore he is estimating that about \$125,000 is available for additional activities that our agencies can request be considered.

Haugen commented that this request was first made to this group back in August or September, however we did not have the actual dollar amounts available, and we are aware that there were some potential activities identified, but no formal action was taken, so we now need to take care of this by February, thus an amendment will be submitted for approval at the February Technical Advisory Committee that will indicate what those activities are, and how we will distribute the available funds to accomplish those activities.

Haugen explained that any additional projects anyone might have will need to be approved by their respective City Council's before being submitted to the MPO for consideration. He added that there is a February 1st deadline for project submittal in order that they can be acted on at the February 8th Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board for action at their February meeting as well.

**MATTER OF REQUEST TO AMEND ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODE
PLAN – BIKE SECTION**

Haugen reminded the committee that this item was discussed at the December 2005, Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Romig reported that MPO Staff is recommending denying the request to amend the MPO Alternative Transportation Mode Plan to allow for a change in bike facility along 47th Avenue South, between Belmont Road and Cherry Street. She pointed out that public input actually shows that the residents in this area want an 8-foot wide bikepath, not a bike lane, as is being suggested. She commented that an 8-foot wide bikepath is an acceptable alternative and would not require an amendment be made to the plan.

Lembke stated that he has some concerns with denying this request at this time. He explained that, while public input did indicate that residents favored an 8-foot wide bikepath, the City Council hasn't given the plan final approval, so he would think there may still be an opportunity for additional public comment until action is actually taken on the request.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

MOVED BY LEMBKE, SECONDED BY GENGER, TO DENY THE REQUEST TO AMEND THE ALTERNATIVE MODE PLAN, BIKE SECTION, CONTINGENT ON THE GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL'S APPROVAL OF A MULTI-USE PATH FROM CHERRY STREET TO BELMONT ROAD.

Brooks commented that it is a little odd that we are going to allow the City Council to make this decision. He added that, as the technical staff, aren't we supposed to be the ones that recommend to the City Council how we want them to vote rather than asking them how they want us to vote, wouldn't the City Council want to know what the Technical Advisory Committee's opinion is on this. Lembke responded that, from his perspective, from the amount of input from the public, if anything new is going to come up on this project, it will be submitted to the City Council, so they would have the most current information from the public in that area as to whether or not they want a bikepath or bike lane. Brooks stated, however, that he still feels that, while it is good to get input from the public, and there will always be a few that want something done a certain way, staff still needs to give their recommendation on how they feel this project should be constructed, and let the politicians make their decision from that recommendation, therefore he would support the denial.

Haugen stated that right now we have a motion, and a second, not an amendment to a motion, so he would ask if there was any further discussion on this motion.

Romig said that she would agree with Mr. Brooks' comments, adding that staff should send out the best choices available, and in this case it seems that a 10-foot bikepath, or an 8-foot bikepath are the best choices, however because the 10-foot bikepath had some controversy, it would seem that the 8-foot bikepath would make the most sense, so maybe we should take the bikelane option out of the set of choices. Lembke stated that this is actually what his concern is, that because the bikelane was presented to the public and the City Council as a choice, we need to keep it as an option even though they will probably end up approving an 8-foot bikepath in the end anyway, therefore he doesn't want to cut it at this time. Brooks said that he doesn't think that the Technical Advisory Committee recommending denial would kill it, it would still go up the ladder with that recommendation, but they could still consider it as an option.

Haugen asked if it was still hoped that this item would appear on the MPO Executive Policy Board agenda, or will it be pulled prior to their meeting. He explained that he asks this because at the December Technical Advisory Committee meeting that this issue would not be coming forward in January if the residents approved a bikepath. Lembke responded that this agenda item will be forwarded to the City Council separately from the PCR approval, so if it dies based on the staff report it wouldn't need to be forwarded on to the MPO Executive Policy Board. Gengler explained that it is his understanding that the way the agenda was being structured was that the PCR report would be dealt with first, and then based on what happens this report would be acted on next, and if the City Council approves the bikepath option, no action would be necessary by the MPO Executive Policy Board. Haugen stated, however, that the unfortunate thing is that if we show it on the MPO Executive Policy Board agenda a staff report would still need to be submitted with the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation to the Executive Policy Board. He added that this is why it would be nice to know if it will be pulled

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

from the agenda so we don't have to iron it all out at the Executive Policy Board meeting next week.

Swensen asked if they were only dealing with this for the 47th Avenue South project, or will it affect all future projects as well. Haugen responded that this is what we call a "slippery slope" issue, because if we accommodate one neighborhood, how do we say no to other similar requests in the future. He explained that the plan was set up to follow through, on a city-wide perspective, that bikepaths are preferred for our trail system, and together with the City's good access control, we don't have issues with paths and driveways and accesses as some do across the nation, so paths are by far the preferred choice. He added that in reading through the minutes of all the meetings, the majority of the people along 47th Avenue South have preferred a bikepath all along, and the lane came up as a compromise to keep the project going in order to meet its bid deadline, so, again, there is a "slippery slope" issue here, and politicians might tell you that this is a case-by-case basis, and based on the uniqueness of this case we won't see this happen in other areas in the future, but there really isn't enough of a uniqueness to this area to really prevent it from happening again.

Benning asked if the PCR could be structured in such a way that the question, "What width of bikepath should be presented for this project: a) 10-foot wide bikepath; b) 8-foot wide bikepath; or c) bikelane," could be asked. Lembke responded that a statement similar to that is included in the PCR. Benning asked if they could follow up on this by maybe adding the statement that if a bikelane is chosen, you agree to amend the bike section of the transportation mode plan to reflect this. Haugen responded that they are following the local process for plan amendments, which is to set this up with two separate agenda items. He added that there are two separate public input processes.

Haugen commented that if this gets to the MPO Executive Policy Board, and we are indeed going to amend the bike plan, we have to, as staff, have to write up the public involvement process piece that tells us what the public input was, and that input was to put in bikepath, so if we decide to put in a bikelane we will need to justify why we are going against that input, so it does create a little bit of an obstacle for us.

MOTION FAILED WITH GENGLER AND LEMBKE VOTING AYE.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FOSTER, TO APPROVE DENYING THE REQUEST TO AMEND THE ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODE PLAN – BIKE SECTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that the MPO Unified Planning Work Program identifies doing an update to our Street and Highway Plan in 2006. He referred to a copy of the Draft RFP for the Street/Highway Plan Update that was included in the packets, and explained that we originally showed this item being completed in 2006, however with the passage of SAFETEA-LU, and its new

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

requirements, we are now suggesting that we extend the work into 2007. He added that SAFETEA-LU provides us until July 1, 2007 to meet their new requirements, and because we aren't sure at this time what all those requirements are, we have determined that we won't try to meet them by the end of 2006, therefore we are suggesting a completion date of May 31, 2007.

Haugen referred to the Scope of Work, and pointed out that he does provide background information as to what our current plan contains, and what he feels the primary issues are that need to be addressed with this update. He said that he also identifies that, as part of SAFETEA-LU, we will need to do more extensive public participation that involves consultation with some additional groups than those we have traditionally involved; such as economic development, historic preservation, natural resources, etc., so we will have the consultant be prepared to add to their scope-of-work to meet these new requirements.

Haugen stated that the selection committee will include representatives from both City's Planning and Engineering staff, and the MPO Executive Director, who will accept and review submittals, and who will then forward on to the MPO Executive Policy Board a recommendation as to which firm to select to perform the update. He added that the deadline for submittals is March 6, 2006 at 3:00 p.m.. He commented that they will also be scheduling an informational meeting for February 10, 2006, at which perspective consultants can obtain additional information as to what we are seeking.

Haugen reported that Mr. Benning, Mr. Johnson, and himself had a discussion yesterday on how this fits with the SAFETEA-LU requirements. He stated that as they discussed, and as he tried to convey in the work program, in-house staff will be updating the Alternative Transportation Mode Plan to reflect the requirements of SAFETEA-LU for bike/transit/pedestrian modes. He added that staff will also be preparing the updated Public Participation Plan, which will be the first document we will do as it is required for us to get the plan into place properly to meet SAFETEA-LU requirements by July 1, 2007.

Benning referred to the anticipated completion date of May 31, 2007, and said that he would recommend that be moved back to about February 28, 2007, as that would allow you a little more breathing room in the event any problems should arise that might require an extension. Haugen responded that July 1st is July 1st, and he did wrestle with the possibility of setting an earlier completion date to try to get the consultants to speed up their schedule, but then he determined that the July 1st deadline is the more harsh one, so instead of possibly having to deal with time extensions to the contract, he chose May 31st as the deadline. He added, however, that if the Technical Advisory Committee would rather see a February deadline, he could do that as well. He pointed out that one thing a February deadline may do would be to increase the cost of the update because of the time constraints involved. Benning agreed that this could be a problem. He suggested that under the selection criteria, past performance, staff may want to consider increasing the amount of points earned. Haugen reported that his main concern is about the flushing out of SAFETEA-LU, so they are asking consultants to get something to them by March 6, 2006, so he hopes we know more about SAFETEA-LU by then.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LEMBKE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 11, 2006**

***REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE UPDATE TO THE STREET/HIGHWAY
ELEMENT OF THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **UPDATE ON METROPOLITAN-WIDE TRAFFIC COUNT RESULTS**

Haugen referred to a map he had displayed, explaining that it was completed just yesterday, and pointed out that it shows where the traffic counts locations are, and whether or not there was an increase or decrease in traffic between the 2000 counts and the counts taken in 2005. He stated that decreased counts are shown in green, and the increased counts are shown in red.

Haugen explained that overall two things occurred, one is that the counts were done in September and October, and, if you are like him, you were paying around \$3.00 a gallon for gas, so we saw that particularly in the residential and collector areas, and around the University area, a decrease in the traffic volume. He said that the other thing was, because of an increase in growth in both communities, there was an increase in traffic volume on our arterial road system, as well as on our bridges. He pointed out that the only decrease in volumes on our arterial road system was on Columbia Road, which may have been due to the completion of construction of 42nd Street, which was under construction in 2000.

Haugen stated that staff would be doing some additional analysis, but he just wanted to give everyone an idea of the overall picture of traffic volumes throughout the community. He added that these numbers will be used in our traffic model to develop the regional base model that will show how traffic is flowing, and will allow us to project out to 2035 what the traffic might be like, and also to help us determine what traffic network alternatives might be necessary to keep traffic flowing smoothly.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FOSTER, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 11, 2006,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:45 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Executive Assistant