

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 11th, 2007, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: James Bittman, MNDOT-Bemidji; John Thompson, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planner; Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planner, Senior; Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Richard Onstad, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Guests present were: Bill Troe and Jason Carbee, URS (Via Conference Call).

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director; Lucas Rengstorf, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, MPO Executive Assistant.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Haugen reported that, as everyone knows, Roger Foster is no longer with the City, and Carol Diamond-Gierszewski has been hired to replace him, and should attending these meetings in the future as the Public Transportation Representative.

Haugen stated that Mr. Johnson, with Federal Highway in Bismarck, has asked that he be removed as a voting member of the Technical Advisory Committee. He explained that Mr. Johnson has stated that he believes it is an inherent conflict for him to remain as a voting member, as he ultimately has to review and approve some of the things we discuss and vote on as a committee.

Haugen commented that Nancy Ellis' position with Polk County has been filled, however he has does not know who that person is at this time, but hopes to have a name soon.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 13TH AND JUNE 20TH, 2007 MINUTES

MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 13TH AND JUNE 20TH, 2007, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION ON STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that Bill Troe and Jason Carbee, from URS, will be participating today via conference call. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that there were two memorandums from URS included for everyone's review, and added that some additional information was just distributed as well.

Troe commented that they just have a few things they would like to discuss relative to the alternative analyses, specifically to put them into categories, and clean them up per the discussion at the workshop last month.

Troe stated that the first issue he would like to discuss is the Columbia Road Corridor. He explained that during the presentation given last month, as well as at the workshop, a lot of discussion occurred about the impacts of the TSM versus the six plus turn lane alternative, or the seven-lane alternative along Columbia Road. He said that a lot of information was given, but to him it still all comes down to the bottom line, and when you look at it from an operation standpoint you get a tremendous improvement with the seven-lane alternative versus just some intersection turn improvements. He added, however that what they weren't really showing was the quantification of, well from a land-use and adjacent impact standpoint, how the seven-lane alternative compares to the TSM improvements, and how they stack up against each other.

Troe referred to the memorandum distributed that covers the Columbia Road Corridor Improvements, and explained that it goes through and provides some of the assumptions that were used to come up with the area of impact for each of the concepts discussed. He added that there is a table provided at the end of that memo that summarizes potential impacts by alternative improvement scenario as well. He then gave a brief overview of the information provided in the memo.

Haugen commented that the committee just received this memorandum so they haven't had an opportunity to really look it over, therefore, he would ask that Mr. Troe go over it a little more in-depth, particularly their assumed pavement widths. He added that he also handed out a drawing that shows the right-of-way impacts as well. Troe responded that he would briefly go through the assumptions they used for each of the alternatives.

Troe reported that when looking at a seven-lane Columbia Road, you need to take into account that some of the lanes need to be a little bit wider than others in order to either accommodate the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

turn or to accommodate the curb and gutter, so what they are assuming with the seven-lane cross-section is that the outside lanes in the northbound and southbound directions would be 14-feet, and then the through travel lane through the interior travel lane would be 12-feet, and the center median, which would either be a painted median, or a raised median, would be 16-feet. He stated that when you put all of this together you come up with a pavement width of about 92-feet, and then outside of that they need to get into the issue of maintaining the pedestrian/bicycle facilities along the east side of that roadway, so the question arises as to whether or not there is a setback between the roadway and the sidewalk or bikepath, and based on the type of facility, a free-flow operating speed on that facility, and the need to accommodate snow storage, most people would think we need a setback, and it should be consistent with what we have there today, which then pushes us out 20-feet on either side of the corridor, and gives us a corridor width of about 130-feet. He added that this is shown on the drawing.

Troe pointed out that on each of the figures shown, you can see the general level of potential impacts we have. He added, however, that you have to remember that this is not a preliminarily engineered drawing, but is only a concept drawing that can be laid over the existing GIS mapping from the centerline of the existing corridor, so it is close, but he wouldn't be pouring concrete by it.

Troe stated that they have done this same thing for the TSM alternatives, and have tried to show the potential area of affects each would have, and went over each TSM alternative briefly: 1) add additional southbound lane between the DeMers Avenue on-ramp and 13th Avenue South; 2) add southbound dual left-turn lanes at the 13th Avenue South intersection; 3) add dual left-turn lanes to all approaches of the 17th Avenue South intersection.; and 4) add southbound dual left-turn lanes at the 24th Avenue South intersection.

Haugen referred to the second handout, and explained that it illustrates the accumulative impact of right-of-way for the TSM projects down the corridor, specifically the boundaries of where they begin and end at each of the critical intersections.

Haugen stated that with the seven lane option, it is his understanding that there is still a recommendation to a TSM at 17th Avenue or any one of the other intersections as well. Carbee responded that basically we are a level of service "C" at 17th Avenue South, with a single left turn lane, but they recommend going to the dual left.

Durrenberger commented that he didn't see anything in the memos that addresses the ramps on the Columbia Road overpass, particularly the west access. Haugen asked if he was referring to the continuous right turn lane from the on-ramp. Durrenberger responded he was. Troe pointed out that Figure 6 does address that issue, that it shows the continuous right turn lane to 13th, as well as impacts at 13th that are an accumulation of the impacts associated with that continuous right turn lane and the dual left turn lane in the southbound direction. Haugen added that for the overpass impact, it is basically a continuation of a right turn lane that backs up to the ramp.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

Durrenberger pointed out that one of the residential units identified as being impacted by the seven lane, 20-foot setback is really a lift station. Carbee asked if he was referring to the unit directly north of 11th Avenue South. Durrenberger responded it was. Carbee stated that he actually wondered about that, and would address it.

Haugen referred to the second memo from URS addressing the updated or revised alternatives following the June 20th workshop discussion, and asked that either Jason or Bill go over it. Carbee gave a brief overview on the adjustments/changes made to each alternative, as listed in the memo (included in the file). He also pointed out that an additional alternative was added - 3L: Extend 42nd Street to 32nd Avenue South and reconfigure the northbound I-29 on-ramp. He explained that the purpose of this concept was to provide a continuous 42nd Street corridor with a direct connection to 32nd Avenue South.

Williams asked, with the exception of Alternative 3L, were all these assumptions based on keeping the existing centerline of the street. Carbee responded that actually he believes that they did shift the centerline north a bit on 13th Avenue to reduce the level of impact. He added that he also believes that they did a little shifting for the TSMs as well.

Haugen referred to Alternative 2G, and commented that in the staff report that was included in the packet, they had some communication with Mr. Benning, and one of their biggest hurdles with this intersection is to bring it back up to a level of service "C", which is the desired level of service, and they do now have the ability to accept a lower level of service at this intersection, in fact, a level of service "D" is acceptable. He asked if Jason and Bill had had the chance to look at this with the new model run that was done. Carbee responded that they are actually in the process of doing that now, and are very close to having the forecasts reworked based on that model run. He added that once this is done, they will look at what level of diversion they might have at that intersection, and how it might affect their alternatives. He stated that once that is done, they will then start building packages of improvements.

Haugen referred to the third memorandum, which covers the Crystal Sugar truck traffic issues/alternatives, and asked for a brief overview of it as well.

Troe reported that following the workshop last month, they met with Dan Gowan from American Crystal Sugar to get a better understanding of how the truck traffic comes in and out of their property so that they could try to develop some reasonable alternatives to deal with that traffic. He added, however, that if American Crystal can't really dictate to the drivers, and require them to follow an alternative, then that may lead us to another set of potential alternatives that might of might not work. He said that they also wanted to gather some information about where on the site are the trucks that come in and go out really destined, and how does the site operate, because that, again is going to control, along with the ability of American Crystal to dictate a route, what that universe of alternatives might be.

Troe stated that they actually spent a good hour meeting with Mr. Gowan about how the site operates, what control they do and do not have, and also what the level of truck traffic is, which

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

is considerable for many months of the year, with 4,000 trucks a day during peak season. He said that they used this as an opportunity as well to talk to Mr. Gowan about some of the potential alternatives they had already started looking at, to determine how reasonable he felt they were to help with the truck traffic issue. He referred to the memorandum, and commented that it is really a summary of the meeting with Mr. Gowan, as well as a review of the alternative they had previously come up with in order to document what they might and might not be able to accomplish to help control the truck traffic concerns. He said that the bottom line is that there is probably only a limited number of ideas that are viable, and that will make an appreciable difference in how the vehicles get in and out of the parcel, specifically the 2,000 trucks a day that come in during the peak season from the west.

Haugen referred to the memorandum, pointing out that they referenced a potential reliever access down the middle, which could cost a \$1,000,000 or more, and the fact that they were going to try get further information on this alternative. He asked if they had been able to revise their cost estimate to reflect this. Carbee responded that he had not been able to do so at this time. He suggested that it might be a good idea for them to discuss it further.

Benning referred to the memorandum concerning DeMers/Washington improvements, and commented that on the issue of whether or not they can accept a lesser level of service, they did have a project where they had a principal arterial line up with a collector, and FHWA granted them the ability to use federal aid to rebuild it to a level of service "D". He stated, however, that in the case of DeMers and Washington, he thinks they are both arterials, although he isn't sure if they are principal or minor arterials, but he isn't sure they would be able to rebuild using federal aid to anything less than a level of service "C". Haugen responded that they are both principal arterials. Benning said, then, that they will probably have to get a special design exception from FHWA to do this. Troe added that he thinks they need to go through and make sure that they document that they looked at a broad range of alternatives, and that those alternatives that met the level of service threshold were not feasible.

Bittman asked if there was a huge gain from the east entrance over to the southbound county road. Haugen responded that it is actually north of County Road 17. Bittman asked if there was enough of a gain to justify building a road across there, and would it be at the cost of American Crystal. Haugen responded that it would actually be a cost of a co-op, which includes both their members who are driving in, plus TranSystems, who operates for a longer period of time than just during the harvest, and who are all getting paid on a mileage basis, so if they can shorten the miles traveled, it would help cut costs, which is why they are looking at this alternative. Haugen asked if the million dollars shown is only for the north/south roadway, or does it include the east/west roadway as well. Troe responded that there is a problem with the soil for both, and the million dollars is really just a number, and Mr. Gowan actually said it would be closer to three or four million dollars. Bittman asked what the problem is with the soil that it makes this so expensive. Durrenberger suggested it may be a problem because of seepage from the lagoons. Ehrenstrom added that he thought they used to just pump over the sides of the lagoons. Haugen commented that this may be, but he doesn't know enough about their operations to say for sure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

Haugen referred to a drawing illustrating a portion of American Crystal's operation, and stated that the key to their operation are the two scales, which allows them to basically split their October traffic in half. He said that they say that every twenty-seconds or so there is a truck being weighed on both sides, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, and that after harvest TranSystems continues to haul from the north in both Minnesota and North Dakota onto the US2 corridor to 5th Avenue, to where they unload, separate from the scales. He pointed out that the parking lot by Stauss Park is part of a community assistance program that American Crystal has going that includes this property, which they had no immediate plans for so they allowed the City to use it as a parking lot to service Stauss Park. He added, however, that they now have plans for this area, so the parking lot may not be there forever.

Durrenberger asked how trucks going down 5th Avenue and turning west exit after they have been weighed. Troe responded that they exit the same way they came in.

Haugen commented that their existing lagoon system does create a problem with restructuring. He pointed out that with the current layout of their plant there isn't much that can be done except diverting traffic more from the east, which would cause additional mileage and time, or somehow maneuvering down the middle of the plant. Troe stated that they did talk to Mr. Gowan about the fact that it all comes down to the two scales, and whether or not we want to spend a lot of money on a new roadway system to get everyone back to them, or would it be reasonable to suggest that we move the scales and dumping area elsewhere, and it was determined that there really isn't another area that is large enough to do both those things. Bittman asked if it wouldn't be possible to leave the storage where it is, but move the scales elsewhere. Troe responded that you would still need to have the facility to get the vehicles through there, so someone would still be investing the dollars to do so. He added that the biggest issue here is the storage, as you could probably move the scales easily, but finding a large enough area for storage is the key, and those opportunities on this site are limited.

Troe reported that when they were last in Grand Forks they had not yet received the baseline 2035 assignments from ATAC, which would include those transportation system improvements that were confirmed during the last round of the transportation plan update; such as the Merrifield Road Interchange, the Merrifield Road Bridge Crossing, the 32nd Avenue South River Crossing, and the 17th Avenue Overpass. He stated that they have now received that information and are working on developing reasonable TSM improvement packages, which he is guessing at this point will not expend all of the dollars available, so they will then look at the balances and add other potential projects, based on need, that scored well, and can be afforded within the balance, or if that improvement project exceeds the balance then they would go through and say that this TSM project needs to go, and this one needs to go, until they work their package back down to what their budget is, and will present this at the August meeting. He said that once they have presented the packages, with any luck, we will be able to make a selection of one, or a combination of one or two preliminarily approved improvement packages.

Haugen stated that, regarding the budget, there are a couple of things we need to get in agreement on, one is the fact that there were some big ticket projects that were being viewed as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

maintenance, or outside of the budget, that we heard should be looked at, and possibly included, such as the Washington Street Underpass, the potential replacement of the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges, etc., as these projects substantially impact the budget. He said that the other issue is the year of expenditure revenues and cost, which will actually be addressed through the next agenda item, and involves adjustments to our current T.I.P. projects to year of expenditure, so he will provide up-to-date year of expenditure cost estimates for those projects.

Haugen asked how we resolve the question of maintenance versus expansion for our big ticket projects. Troe asked if he was referring to the T.I.P. or the Street and Highway Plan. Haugen responded that, take the Washington Street Underpass project, which isn't included in the T.I.P., and isn't part of our Transportation Plan because it is viewed as a maintenance project, and the dollar amount is huge, but he heard Mr. Noehre say that he didn't think it would be funded with just maintenance dollars, but would bite into those expansion dollars as well, and he doesn't know if that means 100% expansion or what. Benning responded that he would see this as, on the state side they have investment strategies for their rural areas, and have fixes that are considered at 7 to 10 years, 10 to 12 years, 12 to 15 years, and reconstruction or new construction, and this underpass project would be a total re-build, or reconstruction, and would be in the minimum 30 to 35 year design frame, and wouldn't be considered a maintenance project. Noehre agreed, adding that it would be in the same category as new construction. Benning stated that you need to identify maintenance projects, reconstruction projects, and new construction projects. Troe commented that that is essentially what they did, that when they went back and looked at historical spending, they tried to divide the projects into categories, although he didn't divide maintenance and reconstruction, but instead combined them under the assumption that reconstruction meant that if you have two through lanes, and a turn lane today, and you went in and tore out all of the pavement and rebuilt it to two through lanes, and a turn lane, that would fall into the whole category of maintenance, and when they looked at historical spending, and then divided it into expansion, which would be the new construction, and which would they would argue would be covered under the transportation plan. Haugen commented that he would redistribute the memorandum that deals with this issue, and perhaps a special meeting could be held to discuss this further.

After some discussion it was determined that a meeting/conference call would be held on Wednesday, July 18, 2007, at 1:30 p.m..

MATTER OF 2008-2011 T.I.P. YEAR OF EXPENDITURE REVENUES AND COST

Haugen reported that the reason this item was placed on the agenda was due to a telephone conversation he had with Mr. Benning and Mr. Johnson regarding SAFETEA-LU compliance. He explained that the main discussion involved year of expenditure costs, and whether or not our T.I.P., which we are about to approve within the next month or so, should reflect year of expenditure. He stated that the actual date of compliance for this issue is December 11th, 2007, so in reality we could approve a T.I.P. without including year of expenditure in August, but we would then have to revisit it by December 11th. He said that Mr. Johnson and Mr. Benning's advice at that time was that we should probably just address the issue now, since you will have to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

revisit it later in any event, so that is what precipitated the memorandum that was distributed a couple of weeks ago, in which he applied the year of expenditure to the current T.I.P. projects, accomplished by using the base year the cost estimates were done, and adjusting the year of expenditure to current costs.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that attached were copies of information pertaining to each of the projects in our draft T.I.P., for which he tried to identify in the remarks section how much this adjusted the revenue stream. He explained that as part of his discussion with Mr. Benning and Mr. Johnson, was, and he alluded to this earlier, that four percent seems reasonable for a cost estimate, but Mr. Johnson was not comfortable with adjusting all of the revenues across the board by 4% as well, which was included in the e-mail he sent, and also in the staff report. He pointed out that in the past the MPO has used an annual adjustment of 4% per year, but now we need to reach an agreement as to how we should be covering the cost differences now that this adjustment created. He commented that Minnesota is a little different because they have already done the cost adjustments in their estimates, so this is not really an issue on the Minnesota side. He added that the revenues were also adjusted, and transit, historically, has always adjusted their numbers for operations and year of expenditure, so it is more of a discussion on the North Dakota side, because as he talked to various staff members, the cost estimates seem to be based more on 2006 dollars, so if you do a 4% adjustment and your going out to the year 2011, it does have an impact, which he showed to be about a \$6,000,000 gap in his e-mail.

Noehre commented that they were going through a similar process for adjusting the cost estimates for their S.T.I.P., even though they request them, the system automatically adjusts them, but this hasn't been completed yet, so all the estimates he did for the regional stuff wasn't adjusted. Haugen asked if this means that somewhere in Bismarck someone is adjusting the State cost estimates. Benning responded that they did a priority rewrite of their software, and then they factor 4% into their rural and urban projects, so when they are entered in they are entered as today's dollars, and if they amend the S.T.I.P. for a 2010 project, it inflates it 4% each year to 2010, so that is the number they use, 4% as a whole for everything. Thompson asked if that was done to the City of Grand Forks' submittal as well. Benning responded that it was. He added that they assume that when the City's submittals are based on today's dollars. He commented that this is just the first cut at it anyway, and when they get the concept reports they look at the cost estimates and check to see how they measure up to what is in the S.T.I.P., and if it is a lot, say 10% to 15% more, they will make the adjustments.

Haugen asked if their March letter already shows the increase for each year, because it is the March letter that, for the draft T.I.P. this is the cost estimates that were submitted in December, and this is the federal amount that we are assigning to that cost estimate, committing to, and that cost estimate hasn't been adjusted yet. Noehre responded that the regional projects haven't been adjusted because they are still the same as when they were submitted last time. Haugen said that that is the case for the City projects as well, so that is what he has done here, he increased them using a 4% annual increase, but then he hears that maybe during the S.T.I.P. development process adjustments are being made. He asked what they were doing, then, for the revenue side

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

of things, which brings this back to the fact that Mr. Johnson said that he wouldn't accept an across the board revenue adjustment of 4%.

Haugen referred to Grand Forks Project 13, which is the Interstate Reconstruction project, that, with a 4% annual adjustment is just under \$2,000,000 short now with the revenue that was identified back in December, listed in the March letter. He then referred to Grand Forks Project 12, Cherry Street project, which is now \$200,000 short. He stated that the easiest way to do this would be to use a straight calculation of 4% annually up to the year it is going to spent, but the hard part is, and he asked about his because he currently uses a straight 4% adjustment for the revenue side as well, and Mr. Johnson said he wasn't comfortable with that, so he would like to know the best way to make these adjustments. He asked if they should adjust everything on the local side and leave the federal dollars capped, or should they assume that the federal dollars will increase by something other than 4%, say 3%, which would mean that the local dollars would need to be increased to capture that remaining 1%.

Bittman asked if Mr. Haugen shouldn't be concerned, as an MPO, about just the dollars that are given for project costs, by MNDOT, NDDOT, the City of East Grand Forks and the City of Grand Forks, as those entities should be doing the inflating themselves, and should be dealing with the revenue, which is something the MPO shouldn't have to be working with. Haugen responded that, again, we get back to the issue of having to have a fiscally constrained plan. He added that have to identify how many dollars are coming in during the four-year T.I.P. cycle, so that when we have projects coming in we can show that we have the resources and revenue available to cover the expenditures. He commented that this is the first year in which the federal government required the adjustment be made to the year of expenditure, although this has been done on the Minnesota side for some time, but it will be the first time for North Dakota.

Noehre commented that he would assume that the MPO essentially knows what it is going to get for the next four years, and the only alternative would be to start moving projects back. Haugen responded that that is the problem, nobody really knows what we are going to get. Benning agreed, adding that we don't know how much federal aid we are going to get, and while he doesn't know how they do this on the Minnesota side, and he doesn't know if they really put the pencil to these projects on the urban side either, but they do have historical data sheets that they use that give them cost per mile or cost per foot. Noehre said, though, that you have those projections, so then you just have to use those projections against what we have requested in the program, and when it gets closer you have to make hard choices.

Benning stated that, basically, for a four-year T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., at least on the urban side he can pretty much tell you what's a go this year and next year, but the fourth year he can't, although it will go eventually, whether it will happen exactly in the third year or the fourth year is a tough call. Bittman said, then, that that makes it hard to forecast. Haugen agreed, adding that, again, to get back to why we have this commission at the federal level, we need to try to identify how we are going to finance things. He pointed out that in 2009 they are already showing that there isn't enough money coming into the trust fund to expend out our current levels of expenditures.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

Williams asked if she was correct, then, that the federal dollars in 2009 are actually shown in 2007 dollars. Haugen responded that that was correct. He added, again, that the problem is how do we adjust them, and what should we adjust them to. Williams asked Mr. Benning what they are using in 2009, are they using 2007 dollars or something else. Benning responded that they aren't really doing a detailed concept, so they are looking at what their previous costs were on projects, and increasing that factor a little bit, just going by feeling to some extent, but basically increasing it by about 4%. He stated that he wouldn't put a 2009 project in there with 2007 dollars because that will just create problems in 2009, but when he tries to figure out his urban program over a four year period, specifically how much the City is going to get, he straight-lines because the only thing he knows for sure is how much money he is getting today.

Williams asked if the projects in the T.I.P. are prioritized, if they were numerically prioritized. Haugen responded that these are the outcome of our prioritization process, but they are not necessarily prioritized as they are listed in the T.I.P. anymore.

Discussion ensued on whether or not the federal revenues are shown in adjusted dollars or not, and if it isn't how to adjust it so that the T.I.P. remains fiscally constrained.

Thompson commented that when they program their projects they look at per foot, per mile, etc. costs in addition to the aggregate costs of the project, not just at the design aspect and adding up a tabular quantity, so in their estimates from way ahead, the 30% is already included.

Haugen stated, then, that what he is hearing is that the year of expenditure has already been adjusted in all of these numbers so he doesn't need to worry about this, and, back to the phone conversation with Mr. Benning and Mr. Johnson a couple of weeks ago, it isn't an issue. Bittman summarized, stating that his understanding is that they are saying that their cost estimates aren't close enough to worry about a 4% inflation rate. Benning agreed that this was correct. Haugen asked if this was the case for the years 2010 and 2011 as well. Bittman responded it was, explaining that they are taking away that inflation earning when they do the cost estimate. Benning added that they will have to look at what their draft S.T.I.P. looks like, as he hasn't seen it yet, and they just hired someone last year to start developing, on the rural side, a scope and study of these costs.

Haugen said that his conclusion from this discussion would be that the figures he gets are already inflated, and as long as we do the best we can to show fiscal constraint for year of expenditure and year of revenue, he doesn't have to worry about it.

Ehrenstrom referred to the tables, and pointed out that East Grand Forks Project #7's totals don't match. Haugen responded that he would revisit that project.

Benning stated that right now, what got approved in January this year, for projects through 2011, the dollars in 2009, 2010, and 2011 are dollars that they basically think they will be getting so they were factored in, but they may change those figures next year. He said that what he gave the MPO in March, the dollars shown should be incorporated into this year's T.I.P.. He added,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

then, that he would suggest not making the 4% adjustments at this time, explaining that he was basically told that for his urban program for 2011, here is how much money you will get, and it is about the same every year as they pretty much flat-line it, so that is what they did for their cost. He commented that he would suggest Earl go through this and make any changes to the dollar values, and he would hold to the philosophy that you are still working with Federal Highway, and he would wait until we see what the draft S.T.I.P. looks like before shifting any projects around because we are getting pretty close to getting the T.I.P. wrapped up.

Haugen commented, again, that December 11th is our federal deadline to do the year of expenditure adjustments. He said that after December 11th, all the documents from that point forward have to have those adjustments factored into them, but we can approve a T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. this go-around, prior to December 11th, but when December 11th rolls around we have to make it compliant. Noehre asked how he was going to make it compliant. Haugen responded that he just heard his answer, he is just going to leave it as it is now, forget the draft tables he distributed in today's packet, and go back to his April draft. He added that he will discuss this further with Mr. Johnson to determine if this was his understanding as well.

Ellis referred to the project list, Grand Forks Project #13, Reconstruction of I-29, and pointed out that we are short \$2,000,000.00, and there are no local funds shown, so when you say we need to prioritize which projects we need to do because we are short on funding, can we prioritize when there is only federal and state dollars shown for a project. Noehre responded that you do still have to look at the funding sources involved, and you don't just do the prioritization blindly. Ellis agreed, but then asked if that is something that you adjust then because there is no way that local match can increase because there is no local decision attached to it, which is what is confusing to her because you are saying you can't adjust it because we can just pick and choose what we want to redline, but in a T.I.P. situation like this for the MPO we don't have a say or not as to whether your going to rehab I-29. Noehre responded that his comments were geared more towards regional projects. Benning agreed, adding that in Grand Forks regional roadways are the State's responsibility and the urban roadways are the City's responsibility, and it has always been in the past that if something is going to be cut, we cut the regional stuff first. Bittman commented that the same thing is done on the Minnesota side as well.

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR UNSIGNALIZED CLASSIFIED ROADWAY
INTERSECTIONS STUDY**

Haugen reported that in the MPO's Work Program, we have programmed an activity to look at the intersections on classified roadways that are unsignalized to help Grand Forks develop a standard of operations, or a policy of traffic control for these intersections. He referred to the RFP that was included in the packet, and explained that it is a pretty standard RFP.

Haugen commented that the last page in the packet is a map identifying the intersections scheduled to be studied. He stated that there are some intersections that aren't identified but that are located on functionally classified roadways, for example 47th Avenue and Washington Street, which was not identified because it is a recent project; 40th and Washington is another that was a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

recent project as well. He asked if anyone knew of any other intersections that may need to be added to the study. Thompson suggested that Belmont and 5th be added. Williams suggested that 6th Street and University Avenue, and Columbia and 47th be added as well.

Haugen stated that the deadline for submitting proposals is August 29th. He said that the MPO Executive Policy Board meets on Friday, July 20th, and, assuming they approve the scope-of-work, that is when the RFP will be sent out. He added that the selection committee will then meet on September 20th to select a firm.

MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION STUDY OF FUNCTIONALLY CLASSIFIED ROADS IN GRAND FORKS SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF THE INTERSECTIONS OF BELMONT AND 5TH, 6TH STREET AND UNIVERSITY AVENUE, AND COLUMBIA AND 47TH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. T.I.P./S.T.I.P.

Benning stated, for clarification on the previously discussed item, for the urban items, the numbers they have thrown in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. were for that year, they did not put any placement factor on them, for the urban items. He added, however, that the ones he had for the regional and urban road items, the numbers that are in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. they did not add the 4%, because, at least for the urban projects there are so many different variances, those are the numbers they use, but the numbers for the rural projects there is that 4% placement factor included, so maybe you want to have your T.I.P. reflect that. Haugen asked if that was what the draft does. Benning responded that he thinks it shows a 4% increase in urban projects as well, and, at least for the regional and urban road projects you don't need to factor in any additional percentages. Haugen commented that there aren't any rural projects shown. Benning responded that the interstate projects would be considered rural. Noehre stated that he doesn't think that project should be inflated either, as it is still listed as \$14,000,000 plus.

Williams asked if the funding amounts were increased as well. Benning responded that they did increase is slightly, but, again, their projections, basically on the urban side in North Dakota is that he gives out 16.5% of whatever the total amount of funding is. Williams stated, then, that for the planning numbers for the cost estimates you are using 4%, but then you are also, in your anticipated funding numbers, increasing that as well. Benning responded that he doesn't know if it is 4%, but yes it is increased. Williams stated that that is what she thinks is the problem, that Earl is increasing the cost estimates, but is being told not to increase the estimates for the funding. Haugen responded that that was what he was told ten days ago, but now he thinks he is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2007**

hearing that he doesn't even need to increase the cost estimates either, so he doesn't have to worry about this at all.

Benning reported that when they look at their costs on the urban side, they figured that this is how much our projects will cost that year. Williams asked, then, if Earl uses the March figures, that will be sufficient. Benning responded it would.

Haugen stated, then, that he will just go back to his draft T.I.P., and hope that Federal Highway is happy with this explanation of how the year of expenditure and year of revenue are addressed. Williams added that if anyone wants to put a percentage on it... Haugen said that per the phone conversation with Mr. Benning and Mr. Johnson, he knows that it was adjusted 4% annually and Mr. Johnson would not accept an across the board 4% increase of all the revenues. Williams stated that based on this she doesn't see how you would adjust your costs.

2. Safe Routes To School Application Update

Haugen reported that Grand Forks was awarded three of the five Safe Routes To School projects they applied for. He stated that the award letters were received just the other day.

Haugen stated that this fall we will have another opportunity in Grand Forks to apply for more such projects. Thompson asked if the application process for this begins next month. Benning responded that he did talk to their Safe Routes To School Coordinator, and was told that she was going to try to coordinate this with the T.E. process to simplify things.

3. Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Haugen reminded the committee that a special Technical Advisory Committee meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, July 18, 2007, at 1:30 p.m., to discuss financial forecasting; budget impacts by year of expenditure; and, with the new model run of our base confirmed projects, and their impacts to the TSM projects at Columbia and DeMers/Washington, an analysis of what the different concept alternatives might provide in terms of level of service.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 11TH, 2007, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:25 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Executive Assistant