

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

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 11th, 2006, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Dean Wieland, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; Wayde Swenson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; James Bittman, MNDOT-Bemidji; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planner; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County Planner; and Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director; David Hampsten, MPO Senior Planner; Marissa Champion, MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, MPO Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Jason Carbee, Consultant with URS Transportation; Pam Wenger, NDDOT (via conference call); Ben Kubishta, NDDOT (via conference call); Steve Solway, NDDOT (via conference call); and Ryan Brooks, GF City Planning.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER/NEW MPO STAFF MEMBER

James Bittman, MNDOT-Bemidji, was present. Haugen welcomed Mr. Bittman, and asked that everyone please introduce themselves.

Haugen then introduced David Hampsten, MPO Senior Planner, to the committee. He reported that Mr. Hampsten will primarily be working on alternative mode transportation issues, and our GIS system.

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 9TH, 2006, MINUTES OF THE MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY WIELAND, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 9TH, 2006, MINUTES OF THE MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL 2006 HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that the MPO's Intern, Marissa Champion, has been working on this project. He pointed out that copies of the staff report, and additional information were included in the packet.

Champion gave a brief background review, and update on what has occurred since the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, reminding everyone that once this plan has been approved, it will make the MPO area eligible for three new funding sources: FTA Section 5310, 5316, and 5317 funds.

Champion reported that the Stakeholders held a total of four meetings, and did approve the plan at their last meeting on September 8th. She stated that the plan was then submitted to both the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks City Councils, and was approved by both bodies. She commented that a public notice was published alerting the public to a public hearing that will be held during the MPO's Executive Policy Board meeting on October 13th.

Champion then went over some of the funding estimates from both North Dakota and Minnesota (a copy of a slide illustrating this information was included in the packets and available upon request).

Champion stated that staff is recommending approval of the plan.

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY MAGNUSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE
2006 HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that Ryan Brooks, City Planning, has been working on this project. He pointed out that copies of the staff report were included in the packets, and reminded everyone that he did send an e-mail earlier alerting them that this item would be on the agenda, and that the entire draft report was available for viewing on the MPO's website.

Brooks stated that, as everyone is aware, a downtown parking study has been in progress since about May, at the direction of the MPO Executive Policy Board. He said that one of the first things they did was to look at how many total parking spaces there currently are in the downtown area, with the result being about 2,750 parking spaces, however, not all of them are located in ideal locations.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

Brooks referred to a slide presentation, and reported that they then took a look at utilization, both during the day and the evening, and explained that the colors indicate where parking was available and where it wasn't. He then went over the information briefly, explaining where, and what type of parking each depicted.

Brooks referred to a copy of the recommendations, included in the packet, and went over each briefly. He pointed out that a downtown parking map will be prepared and put on the City's Web Page, as well as brochures with the same map being made available for distribution.

Brooks referred to a slide illustrating angle parking, and explained that should a decision be made to try to implement angle parking in the downtown we would need to amend the agreement we currently have with NDDOT. He stated that one of the ideas being discussed is to possibly do a pilot project, with the proposed location being Kittson Avenue, although other areas are also being considered as well. He referred to a slide illustrating the various locations, and went over them briefly.

Haugen reported that the purpose of placing this on the agenda today was to bring everyone up-to-date on the status of this study.

Haugen stated that he does think that we have heard two opposing messages, particularly with the angled parking issue, one is to do a pilot site first, and the other would be to install it all over the downtown, so they are trying to get direction, and are looking directly at Mr. Benning and Mr. Swenson, since it is their agreement clause that would need to be amended to allow consideration of angled parking. He asked how they would approach this issue. Benning responded that what would need to be done, for those areas circled on the slide, in order to use federal aid would be to look at the most recent agreement and amend it to allow angled parking. Haugen stated, then, that once the agreement was amended, a decision would need to be made as to where angled parking should be located, if a pilot study area should be done first, or should they put it into effect in various locations right away. Brooks pointed out that they do not plan on putting angled parking on either DeMers or 5th. Haugen said that what he is hearing is that once the agreement has been amended, how and where angled parking should be implemented would be a local decision. Benning responded that that would be correct.

Discussion ensued.

Swenson asked if any thought had been given to safety issues, such as an increase in accidents due to the addition of angled parking, if there is a certain number that we might look at where we would say that maybe this isn't working. Brooks responded that data would be evaluated after six months to determine if there has been an increase in accidents, or other issues, and if we find that there has, then we would need to reevaluate the use of angled parking.

Haugen reported that one key issue that has come out of the study is that the parking ramps have a safety perception problem, therefore there are things that are already in place to start improving these perceptions. He stated that another is the enforcement, or the lack of enforcement, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

identification of one department, Urban Development, to take this on. He reported that Urban Development eagerly accepted this challenge, and the Police Department has eagerly allowed them to accept the challenge.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2007-2008 ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that the MPO is in the process of developing a two-year work program, which would include the years 2007-2008. He stated that normally, by now, we would have received from each of our local governments a list of projects they would like us to consider, but we are currently behind schedule. He added that staff is, however, aware of some projects being considered, but which have not been approved by the respective City Council's so we are not yet listing them in our program.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that he did include copies of, what are his best guess at what our funding sources might be for 2007 and 2008. He commented that he did anticipate a slight decrease in funding in 2008. He explained that he came up with these amounts by looking at our 2006 Consolidated Planning Grant monies from both North Dakota and Minnesota, and using the projection Minnesota uses for their dollar amounts to determine what we might expect from North Dakota as well. He added that due to some staffing issues between both the MPO and the City of Grand Forks' Engineering Department, there will be some carry-over for 2007, however this is not expected to be the case in 2008, which is why there is a decrease shown in 2008.

Haugen referred to the last two tables, and explained that when we fill out the work program, there are three categories of funding: program administration, program support and coordination, and planning and implementation. He stated that most of the additional projects will show up under Corridor Planning, Land Use, and Special Projects as sub-elements, otherwise the 100 and 200 categories are pretty well established.

Haugen reported that in 2007 the MPO is fulfilling the finalization of SAFETEA-LU implementation with it's Street and Highway Plan and it's Long Range Transportation Plan Updates. He pointed out that there is still a nice budget for our Transportation Plan Update in 2007, but that there is considerably less in 2008. He added that we also are carrying over the Traffic Management Incident Plan into 2007 as well.

Haugen stated that what he is saying is that even though there is less money shown in 2008, there is actually more money available for these special studies, or additional corridor studies for the MPO to consider, so if anyone has any projects they would like considered, hopefully they have already started the approval process from their governing bodies.

Benning commented that Bob Bright asked them to hold a meeting in Fargo to discuss a couple of issues that recently came up with the MPO concerning what types of projects are eligible for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

PL Funds, and what the purchasing requirements are for using PL Funds. He gave a brief explanation on what occurred to precipitate this request, specifically that it involved the Quiet Zone Project that Fargo recently did, and the fact that they were told they would not be able to use PL Funds to pay for it.

Haugen stated that one request that might be coming to the MPO, which has been shown in our work program in the past, is the purchase of video detection equipment for various intersections. He asked if that would be an eligible item for the work program. Benning responded that he would need more information before he could answer this, as he would need to determine whether it would be for engineering purposes, or planning. Haugen said that another issue involves quiet zones. He explained that they held a little technical exercise for both communities on what it takes to become a quiet zone, and he knows that Fargo/Moorhead had an RFP for Dilworth to have a quiet zone established, but were told that it is not a PL eligible activity to establish a quiet zone. Benning responded that what they did was to actually develop a quiet zone report, which made it ineligible because it now involved the design of a quiet zone, which is not eligible for PL Funding.

Benning reported that he just distributed the 2006 Federal Allocations for 2006 to each of the MPOs, which they just received themselves from FTA. He stated that they are hoping to get 2007's allocations by April, but there is no guarantee they will.

Haugen stated that he will have a more complete document available for the November meeting, at which time he will ask for a recommendation from this body to forward on to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their action as well.

Benning commented that he also has a draft copy of the agreement for the Unified Work Program for the next two years as well, which he would like reviewed by the MPO's legal staff.

Information only.

**MATTER OF DRAFT TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT PLAN BRIDGE
CLOSURE OPERATION PLAN (VIA ATAC)**

Haugen reported that our current work program includes development of a Traffic Incident Management Plan, and based on what happened during this area's recent flood fight, we found that there is a need, when we have bridge closures, to determine what needs to be done with traffic, so back in May (minutes included in packet), we approved that ATAC be hired to assist us in coming up with a management plan for bridge closure events. He stated that ATAC provided us with a draft concept plan in May, and we have since provided them with feedback on that plan, and they have come up with another basic draft scope-of-work as to what they would do for us.

Haugen explained that they came up with four scenarios: 1) one for when there is no bridge closure; 2) one for when there is one bridge closed; 3) one for when there are two bridges closed;

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

and 4) one for when all three bridges are closed. He stated that the other component of this would be to get the protocol of communication between both communities established so that we have an agreement in place as to when bridges should be closed. He added that they would also be doing some adjustments for signal timing, and perhaps some adjustments with road closures so that areas such as Gateway Drive do not have conflicting turning movements trying to take place when we shift traffic up and down that corridor.

Haugen reported that ATAC is anxious to get this done, but one of the reasons it was delayed until fall was because the Point Bridge has been closed, and we are trying to get baseline traffic data for them, which we are not in the process of doing, so they should be able to get started soon. He said that it is hoped that we would have a final draft of the final scope-of-work available at our November meeting, as well as a cost estimate. He asked that if anyone has any additional things you would like considered, please let him know as soon as possible.

Haugen reminded everyone that this project will carryover into our 2007 Work Program.

Information only.

MATTER OF STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

- a. Goals, Objectives, and Standards
- b. Draft Level Of Service Analysis Report

Jason Carbee, URS, distributed copies of information, including the goals, objectives, and standards, and explained that, basically, what he would like from this body is, based on what has been discussed up to this point, to ensure that the goals and objectives listed reflect what it is you want, then they can begin working on the third level, the actual evaluation criteria.

Carbee referred to the information (copies of which are included in the file, and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

- Goal 1: Provide a Safe Transportation System
Champion commented that the MPO's ITS Architecture Plan would address this as well.
- Goal 2: Provide an Efficient Transportation System
No comments.
- Goal 3: Provide Mobility and Accessibility to the Users of the Transportation System
Hampsten asked if, under mobility, they were only talking about cars. Carbee responded they were only talking about cars and trucks. He explained that this is the street and highway element of the plan. Hampsten stated, then, that sidewalks, pedestrians, and people with

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

disabilities are not included under this goal. Haugen responded that sidewalks, pedestrians, etc., are included under the alternative mode section. He added that when they create the summary for the Long Range Transportation Plan, they will show up under these goals. Carbee added that these goals and objectives are scaled back from the larger picture. Hampsten said that he was just thinking about the intersections where both systems come together, because we are promoting a safe/efficient roadway, but those roadways are also part of the sidewalk/pedestrian/bikeway system as well, and all your standards are orientated towards motorized vehicles, and he is just worried about the intersections.

Goal 4: Provide Compatible Transportation and Land Use Systems
No comments.

Goal 5: Minimize Adverse Impacts from Transportation
Haugen referred to the handout, and pointed out that the last objective was lined out. Carbee responded that it was done so because it was basically redundant. He added, however, that another option would be to make it a standard. Haugen agreed, stating that it should actually come before the first standard under that objective, to compare, then to provide resources.

Goal 6: Finance the Transportation System
Benning referred to the fourth objective, and asked if the standard: “Develop a life-cycle cost analysis of pavement type done for all projects” was a new requirement for SAFETEA-LU. Carbee responded that it is actually a legacy from previous plans. Haugen added that he thinks it is actually from the 1991 plan. Benning stated that the reason he asked is that the way it works now, with Federal Highway, is that they do a cost analysis for projects of \$25,000,000.00, and anything under that they are not required to do so. Carbee asked if they should add that information to the standard. Benning responded they should.

Goal 7: Promote a Balanced, Compact Land Use Growth Pattern
No comments.

Goal 8: Provide a Secure Transportation System
No comments.

Haugen gave a brief recap of all changes made to the goals, objectives, and standards:

Goal 1: Added an objective about the ITS Architecture Plan.
Changed the language from “increase average vehicle speeds” to “reduce vehicle delay”.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

- Goal 3: Modified the note in parenthesis about MNDOT's level of service D threshold from "determining funding priorities" to "efficiencies of trunk highway"
- Goal 5: Took objective that was shown as being struck-out, and made it a standard.
Switch language of fourth standard under first objective from "...optimize vehicle speeds" to "...reduce vehicle delay".
- Goal 6: Added the \$25,000,000.00 threshold for requiring a cost analysis.

Carbee referred to copies of information containing the draft levels of service (copies of which were included in the packet and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Haugen stated that this information provides us with a baseline of what traffic operations are like in the area. He said that the next step will be to finalize this, put on our 2035 socio-economic data, forecast the volumes, and see where any changes might occur.

Carbee reported that over the next couple of months they will complete the next steps; complete documentation of existing conditions, gather more safety and crash information and evaluate it, get ready to look at future traffic projections, tidy-up and finish the future year allocation of development, and get that information to ATAC. He added that they have also discussed getting more information on the website, in terms of finalizing these goals and objectives and getting them on the website.

Haugen commented that they invited all of the area's local shipping, truck, freight people to a meeting this morning to help assist us in gathering additional information. He stated that the 48th/DeMers Interchange was the number one area identified at that meeting. He added that an insert will also be distributed with the local newspaper, and will include a map on which the public will be asked to point out any concerns or comments they may have anywhere in our area, and mail it back to us.

Carbee asked that anyone having any additional comments regarding the goals and objectives get them to him over the next couple of days.

Information only.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS

Haugen reported that Mr. Benning has arranged for us to meet the people working on the Safe Routes to School Program for North Dakota, via conference call. He added that Minnesota already has their Safe Routes to School Program up and running, and solicited applications a month or so ago. He stated that East Grand Forks did submit an application, but, unfortunately it was not one of those chosen.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

Benning introduced North Dakota's new Safe Route to School Coordinator, Pam Wenger; Ben Kubishta, who runs North Dakota's Transportation Enhancement Program; and Steve Solway, Program Manager/Engineer with the Local Government Division.

Benning reported that Ms. Wenger came to the Local Government Division from their Design Division, and has been with NDDOT for many years, so brings a lot of experience with her. He stated that they are in the process of developing a brochure, that will be distributed to the public, concerning the Safe Routes to School Program.

Benning stated that they currently have monies from 2005, 2006, and 2007, and in North Dakota they get about \$1,000,000 per year, so we have about \$3,000,000 available right now. He said that they are looking at programming \$1,000,000 the first year, and then \$1,500,000 the next year, etc., until they catch up.

Wenger commented that she is in the process of working on the brochure, and hopes to have it completed within the next couple of weeks. She stated that they will then get those brochures, and applications out to all of the MPO's, the County Auditor's, and the School Districts in North Dakota within the next five to six weeks.

Benning reported that anywhere from 10% to 30% of the funding available can be used for safety training. He said that they are currently working with their Driver's License and Traffic Safety Divisions on this, however the main person involved has recently left, so things will get going again once the new person is on board. He added that they are working on putting together a mailing list, and are looking at using Public Instruction's mailing list for all the schools.

Haugen asked if there was any kind of identified timetable of when they might want to see the applications returned, and therefore what kind of timetable the MPO needs to reflect. Benning responded that they first need to generate the brochure and applications, within the next four to six weeks. Wenger commented that she was kind of hoping for possibly a December 1st or January 1st date for getting the applications out, and an April deadline for return of those applications.

Champion asked if a selection committee would be formed. Wenger responded that she hasn't verified it, but it is her understanding there would be. Benning commented that there is currently a Director's Task Force in effect, for the Transportation Enhancement Program, which consists of ten different agencies, and they will probably look at a similar make-up for the Safe Routes To School Program Selection Committee as well. Kubishta stated that he has been working on this with Ms. Wenger, and he would foresee a Selection Committee consisting of people in the health field, the education field, cities, and counties.

Benning commented that one thing they will be doing as part of the Safe Routes to School Program is to have either the City be the sponsor for the project, or the County. He said they would be developing agreements between the DOT and either the City or County, and from there

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 11th, 2006**

develop an agreement between either the City or the County and the School regarding participation in a local match, construction issues, etc..

Haugen stated that he gets the sense that if the Grand Forks MPO area is to be successful in securing funding for a project, they would need to amend their 2007-2010 T.I.P. to include that project. He asked if it would need to be shown in Year 2007 or Year 2008. Benning responded that he agrees an amendment would be necessary, however, he isn't certain as to which year it would need to be shown. He added that discussion is ensuing on how they are going to show these projects in their T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. as well.

Haugen asked if there was any consideration being given to splitting the monies into an Urban pot and a Rural pot. Benning responded that that is not being considered at this time. Kubishta asked what Mr. Haugen's opinion was on having Urban and Rural pots of funding, if he had any feelings one way or the other about Grand Forks competing against Larimore or Hatton for funding. Haugen responded that his basic concern is that if the selection is based on normal criteria, some of the real rural communities may not compete well as the benefit would be less than for those communities with higher student populations.

Kubishta asked if anyone had any knowledge of projects that might be submitted for consideration. Haugen responded that Grand Forks did do a Safe Routes to School Study a few years ago, and has had ATAC engaged through a FedEx Grant to look at some specific schools for needed improvements. Kubishta asked if from that study, were there any identified improvements needed. Haugen responded there were. Champion reported that the study is available for review on the MPO's Website. Kubishta stated that because Grand Forks has an identified plan, and an action plan for projects, it will help during the scoring process.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY MAGNUSON, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 11TH, 2006, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:21 P.M..

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Executive Assistant