

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 8th, 2007, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: 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; Steve Salwei (Proxy for Paul Benning), NDDOT-Bismarck; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Dean Wieland, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Transportation Superintendent; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Guests present were: Mark Johnson, FHWA-Bismarck (Via Conference Call), and 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.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen introduced Dale Bergman, explaining that he has replaced Roger Foster as the Cities Area Transit Transportation Superintendent. He asked that everyone introduce themselves as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 11TH AND JULY 18TH, 2007 MINUTES

MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY WIELAND, TO APPROVE THE JULY 11TH AND JULY 18TH, 2007, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

**MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 2008-2011 T.I.P. AND SELF
CERTIFICATION**

- a. Public Hearing
- b. Committee Action

Haugen referred to the packets, and pointed out that a copy of the notice of public hearing was attached to the staff report. He stated, as the report indicates, that the T.I.P. document also serves as the Program of Projects for the transit operators. He explained that a program of projects is required, and can be done separately from the T.I.P., but our transit operators choose to include it in the T.I.P.

Haugen commented that another thing you will notice in the T.I.P. is that we also self-certify that we are fulfilling our requirements. He referred to roman numeral page three, the self-certification signature page; and to page forty-three, Appendix II, which includes the self-certification documentation, and explained that this past spring the North Dakota Federal Highway Administration did a review of the North Dakota Department of Transportation's self-certification of the three MPOs and this will probably be the last time you will see a self-certification included in a T.I.P. document. He said that next year they would be working with Mark Johnson, Paul Benning, and the three MPO Directors to draft, or create a new self-certification process and document.

Haugen referred to the T.I.P. document, and explained that he is missing one project. He explained that the missing project is one that Mr. Noehre submitted, and is a Transportation Enhancement project that involves the landscaping of I-29. He stated that this project does show up in North Dakota's Draft S.T.I.P. in FY 2009, at a total cost of \$180,000, with \$146,000 being federally funded, \$34,000 being funded with State dollars, and no local funding. He said that this project will be amended into the T.I.P. as well.

Haugen commented that the only other issue is that the FTA 5307 Table on page 14 needs to be updated, that the 2003 and 2004 funding amounts need to be removed, and 2006 and 2007 funding amounts need to be included. He explained that he has placed a call to Jennifer Stewart to get those amounts, and will update the table as soon as he receives that information.

Williams reported that there is a minor correction needed on the staff report. She explained that the dollar amounts for the Safe Routes to School is incorrect in the staff report. She added, however, that the dollar amount in the table is correct, but should be \$169,500.00 in the staff report as well.

Haugen stated that a notice from the governor identifying the award of some Safe Route To School funds, was included in the packet as well. He explained that he did combine all of those projects in the T.I.P. list, in FY 2008, but that he does show them separately in the project description.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

Wieland referred to East Grand Forks Projects #4 and #13, and asked if the amounts shown are correct. Haugen responded that they were, adding that this is a high priority project, and high priority projects are funded equally within a five-year period.

Haugen commented that there is one high priority project on the North Dakota side as well, and in the Draft S.T.I.P. it is listed as two separate projects, but in the final T.I.P. he tried to list it as one, on Page 25, Project #13, the reconstruction of I-29's northbound lane from 15th Avenue to just south of 32nd Avenue. He said that he noted in the Remarks section which portion of the cost is Interstate Maintenance funds and which portion is High Priority.

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion. Haugen added that the public also had the opportunity to submit written comments by noon today, but none were received.

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY THOMPSON, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL 2008-2011 T.I.P. SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL PROJECT AND CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR SCHOOL RELATED TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Haugen referred to the staff report, and commented that this is a work activity identified in the MPO's Annual Unified Work Program. He explained that the intent is to work with the City of Grand Forks and the School District to come up with a strategy for determining what kind of traffic control devices to use, and where, throughout the area.

Haugen pointed out that the entire RFP was included in the packet, and is our standard RFP with one exception. He referred to page five of the RFP, and reported that we now have to assist the North Dakota Department of Transportation with their FTA DBE/MBE goal, which is done by asking a consultant, when they submit a proposal, to give us a list of DBEs they contacted, their responses, percentage of work done by them, etc.. He added that we then have to report, annually, to the Office of Transit all of the RFPs we have issued out, and all of the information related to each RFP we receive.

Noehre asked what a "Type #3" marking was. Haugen responded that it is "zebra" stripes, which are placed parallel with the travel direction.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

Haugen referred to page eight, and stated that they did use this body as the steering committee, but will also have a sub-committee made up of Grand Forks School District Safe Kids personnel, and staff, to help guide the consultant through the process as well. He added, however, that this body will remain involved at each major milestone as well, and they do have some public meetings identified, and a modest budget with which to hire a consultant.

Durrenberger asked what the anticipated completion date is for this study. Haugen responded that they hope to have it completed by the end of the year. Wieland asked what the budget is for this study. Haugen responded that they have \$30,000.00 programmed.

***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 SCHOOL TRAFFIC CONTROL
DEVICE STRATEGY STUDY.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that he would like to suspend the agenda in order to discuss the Bridge Closure Concept of Operations agenda item before getting Bill Troe and Jason Carbee, URS on the phone.

MATTER OF BRIDGE CLOSURE CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS

Haugen reported that, as everyone is aware, the MPO has been working with A.T.A.C. on traffic incident management for bridge closure events. He stated that at the June Technical Advisory Committee meeting we reviewed the draft study documents, and at that time the Technical Advisory Committee asked that A.T.A.C. meet with more of the implementers of the plan versus coming back to them. He said that a meeting was then held in July, which several of those here today did attend, in order to work out any differences in the draft report document.

Haugen commented that they also spent a lot of time working on the concept of operations document as well. He explained that the original Concept of Operations was a request of MNDOT to try to have a document in which people from the various agencies involved would sign to indicate that they were in general agreement with what this document states. He said that during the special July meeting, this concept of operations was discussed at length, specifically as to whether or not there was still a need to have all the signatures on it, and the feeling then was that if we were able to get the signatures, great, but if we weren't that was okay too, so we identified who should sign, and received approval of the concept from three of the four agencies, but then the City of Grand Forks raised a concern, or question regarding this, and it was determined that in order for them to sign it they would need for their City Attorney and City Council to approve it before it could be signed, so the question was is it still a document that we need to have signed, or do we go back to the statements made in July that we don't really need

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

signatures, and MNDOT responded that they did still want signatures. He stated then, as noted in the staff report, A.T.A.C. felt that they had fulfilled their role by providing the actual plan, and drafting the concept of operations document, but added that they were unwilling to take it through the approval process, therefore he is taking on that duty.

Haugen referred to the Draft Concept of Operations document, and commented that one of Grand Forks' concerns was that when we have to start closing State bridges, who is actually responsible for making the decision to close it, when and where to put up signage, and who pays for the costs involved with the closure process; so under the City of Grand Forks section, the last bullet, we state that when State bridges are closed we are under a state of emergency declaration, which opens the flow of State and Federal resources.

Haugen reported that he still needs to meet with the Grand Forks City Attorney on this as he has a couple of issues concerning the document. He added that, as is the case in most instances, when one attorney gets involved, the other agencies may want their attorneys involved as well, so it may be a while before we are able to get all of the signatures required, but he will continue to try to get that done as soon as possible.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF UPDATE ON LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – STREET AND HIGHWAY SECTION

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 are several memorandums from URS that were included for everyone's review, and that additional information was distributed as well.

ALTERNATIVE 3L – 32ND AVENUE/42ND STREET/I-29 – EXTEND 42ND STREET TO 32ND AVENUE, RECONFIGURE NORTHBOUND ON-RAMP

Carbee referred to the map illustrating Alternative 3L, and went over it briefly. He reported that basically, what they were interested in seeing was what the difference would be if they took Alternative 1I, which is now a base confirmed project in which 42nd Street is widened to four-lanes from 17th Avenue to 32nd Avenue South, and inserted it into this concept, which is to straighten 42nd Street out and tie it in to the existing northbound off-ramp at I-29 and 32nd Avenue.

Carbee commented that as they get into a more detailed analysis of the traffic changes that occur with the base confirmed, they will try to show exactly what the intersection will look like at 42nd Street and 32nd Avenue. He stated that, as you can see, the northbound off-ramp would continue being a northbound only, and because there are two directions of traffic on 42nd Street, the on-ramp would move a few hundred feet to the north, but likely there will be at least one left and one right turn lane at 42nd Street.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

Williams asked then, in this conceptual layout that you are showing here, you don't show any southbound traffic on 42nd Street being able to get onto that northbound on-ramp, correct. Carbee responded that that is not correct, that he assumes you would be able to go southbound on 42nd right onto the northbound on-ramp. Wieland asked if you would be able to take a left turn coming off the on-ramp on 32nd as well. Carbee responded that you can make a left, a right, or go on through.

Haugen commented that the attempt of this concept is to try to eliminate that "U" weave that takes place with traffic coming off the Interstate and wanting to get to 42nd Street, as they currently have to cross traffic on 32nd to get to the left turn lane, and then take an indirect route to get to 42nd by taking 38th Street, so this is trying to better direct access onto 42nd Street. He added that a concept similar to this one is in our current plan, however, now this plan is sort of identifying that widening 32nd Avenue to six lanes, three in each direction, is no longer needed, so our current plan modification for the I-29/32nd Avenue Intersection/Interchange has been modified to this concept now just to create a better connection to the I-29 Interchange. Wieland reported that back some time, when they platted 42nd and 29th, they proposed something very similar to this and at that time the DOT was very much against it. Noehre added that they would have to send it to the Traffic Operations folks as well. He added that his question would be what is the ADT on the ramp compared to the ADT on 42nd.

Wieland asked how the intersection of 42nd and I-29, the ramp, would be controlled, would there be a stop condition there, and who would be going through and who would be stopping. Thompson responded that there is signal there now. Carbee added that the 42nd Street intersection with the northbound on-ramp actually operates pretty well because there are only two directions of traffic entering the intersection, northbound and southbound traffic, so they aren't showing a need to signalize that intersection at this time.

Haugen commented that in the current plan document 42nd Street does come in and connects directly across from the northbound off-ramp, and the on-ramp is separate, and is moved to the west completely off any direct connection with 42nd. He stated that this concept takes 42nd, brings the northbound on-ramp into play with 42nd with the possible intersection at 31st Avenue.

Durrenberger asked if there was a conflict between the southbound traffic on 42nd Street and the northbound traffic trying to access I-29, or would they have to stop. Troe responded that what you would probably do would be to have a stop condition on the southbound 42nd Street. He added that your northbound traffic on the ramp/42nd Street would have the right-of-way, and then you would get rid of, or at least control your conflict.

Haugen commented that under the box that says "for safety consider closing the east leg of 42nd Street", the land under that box the City has received a site plan for a hotel. He said that he also has a follow-up question, is there a particular reason why that on-ramp can't still show up as it does in our current plan, shifted to the west as a separate ramp. Troe responded that the on-ramp shifted to the west is a separate ramp. Haugen stated that in our current plan the modifications to the 32nd Avenue Interchange, besides accommodating six-lanes at 32nd Avenue, we also brought

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

in 42nd Street as shown here, but the on-ramp from northbound I-29 is situated a little to the west of the 42nd Street intersection as its own separate ramp facility. Troe responded that the only issue would be that they would both need to be signalized, and would need to be coordinated. Noehre commented that another issues is that very close to that box, where it is closed off on 42nd, NDDOT owned the right-of-way, and quick-claimed it to the City, and he isn't sure what the City did with it. Troe stated that you would have to ask if you would leave enough development area there to allow something like a hotel. He added that you would also have to ask where that parcel would get its access, possibly with a cul-de-sac off 42nd Street, etc..

Haugen stated that the last thing is that this concept replaces a lot of major modifications that we would have to do otherwise on 38th Street, at the 32nd Avenue Intersection, to deal with capacity issues.

Haugen asked that the consultants take a look at the MPO's current concept to see how it might be integrated with this concept. Troe asked if it met all of the design criteria. Haugen responded that it does.

AUGUST 3RD MEMORANDUM – UPDATED COMPARISON OF COLUMBIA
ROAD 7-LANE EXPANSION SCENARIO IMPACTS

Troe reported that this memorandum discusses some of the assumptions that were used in the boulevard setback and sidewalk combination. He stated that they were requested to look at a situation where they initially had a 20-foot setback, and then added the trail or sidewalk, and the result of that is about a 15-foot increase in the overall right-of-way width along Columbia Road. He added that they then put that information into their analysis, and that is essentially what is summarized in the memorandum.

Troe stated that you will notice that there are a couple more properties that are impacted by this, although there are no noticeable additional building impacts, they are at a very preliminary stage and that could change.

Troe said that they were also asked what would happen if they narrowed up that setback and sidewalk distance to be pushed through the design process, and that resulted in a right-of-way width that was about 15-feet more narrow than they had previously looked at and reviewed with you. He added that the result of this would be that we would have a few less property impacts relative to parking lots or such, and a few less residential impacts, but, again, none of these situations would involve building impacts in any event.

Troe commented that one of the things they did not include in the table were the impacts to the lift station. He explained that they initially they showed it as a residential building, and that the parcel of property it is located on, as well as the building itself, would be impacted under both 7-lane scenarios, and he has no concept as to whether or not that would be a showstopper or not for widening Columbia Road. Wieland responded that he wouldn't know why it would, as it is just a sanitary lift station.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

Troe stated that in his estimation, or in his opinion, there isn't a dramatic difference between one alternative versus another when you are looking at the overall magnitude of the impacts because you aren't in a situation where you have one alternative that creates a lot of impacts and one that doesn't, they both create similar impacts, so he would think we would be much better off simply talking about a seven-lane, or essentially a six-lane with a turn-lane or a six-lane divided alternative as opposed to getting into Alternative 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of the six-lane plus a turn-lane, or six-lane plus the boulevard.

Wieland asked, going back to the lift station site, whether or not they were actually impacting the building. Carbee responded that they were. Wieland stated, then, that if the building is being impacted than it would be a showstopper. He explained that they might be able to move the building slightly, but not the lift station. Troe said that that is why he asked the question, because if it is not a showstopper then you note it and move on, but if it is a showstopper then they want to make sure that it is identified in the alternative analysis of the plan.

Haugen commented that previously we saw two right-of-way widths, but the only one that was carried over was the one identified as having a 20-foot boulevard, and then there are two right-of-way widths provided by the City of Grand Forks Engineering Department which are identified as their preferred and minimum designs. He asked if he was correct that the 10-foot boulevard has been dropped as a concept. Carbee responded that that would be correct, as the 10-foot boulevard shown previously wasn't substantially different from the minimum design that they were showing.

Troe stated that in all likelihood, if the seven-lane concept is carried over he thinks we would all understand that in the design phase that ultimately the concept would be a combination of the 20-foot, the preferred and the minimum, to reduce the level of conflict, and if that requires you to narrow up your setbacks, then you are probably going to do that.

Thompson asked if we would now interject this project with seven-lanes in, and say that as we move forward with the new plan if the projects that were committed in the 2030 plan aren't completed we still need to have the seven-lane option but if they are completed, with the reduction in traffic due to those projects, or the redistribution of traffic, that we can get by with the less costly, and less impacting TSM projects. Haugen commented that the next item for discussion is the base confirmed projects, which is what Mr. Thompson is alluding to with his question.

**PRELIMINARY 2035 BASE CONFIRMED PROJECT LIST TRAFFIC FORECASTS –
REVISED**

Troe reported that when they went through the alternative analysis with the Technical Advisory Committee they did not have a traffic forecast available to them that included those projects, which from the start of the update, were projects that they wanted to confirm were still viable from the 2030 plan. He stated that those projects included the Merrifield Road Interchange, the Merrifield Bridge, the 32nd Avenue Bridge, and the 17th Avenue Interchange. He explained that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

those four primary projects were incorporated into the update, but added that a fifth project, the Washington/DeMers Intersection was determined to have had enough changes occur that it needed to be reassessed. He commented that the result of incorporating those four projects is documented in the ADT forecasts that are attached to the July 23rd memorandum.

Troe referred to Figure 1 of the July 23rd memorandum, and went the information briefly.

Haugen reported that in the next series of memorandums you will see that they took the easier issues first, and that would be Harley Drive and the Highway 220/US#2 connection, and addressed what they see as alternative solutions; then they started working their way west and started focusing on the DeMers/Washington Intersection as that is a critical intersection for the area; and now URS is looking at how the 42nd/Columbia corridors will be affected by these confirmed forecasts. He added that they now have information to share on the southeast side of East Grand Forks, the DeMers/Washington Intersection, and will soon be able to discuss how they think the 42nd/Columbia corridors are affected by all of it.

BASE CONFIRMED SCENARIO TRAFFIC ISSUES IN MINNESOTA – REVISED

Troe commented that with a 32nd Avenue Bridge we would see an increase in traffic on 32nd Avenue, and ultimately on Harley Drive in East Grand Forks. He explained that because there are a lot of angles and curves on some of the routes people would use to get there, and in looking at where the concept for a 32nd Avenue Bridge comes in and connects with Rhinehart Drive, they have come up with five alternatives for this location. He then went over each of the alternatives briefly.

Alternative 22A – Realignment of the Bygland Road – Harley Drive Intersection (including reconstruction of the existing gravel portions of Harley Drive).

Alternative 22B – A new East-West Arterial Connecting the 32nd Avenue bridge to Bygland Road.

Alternative 22C – A new Arterial Connecting the 32nd Avenue Bridge to Harley Drive.

Alternative 22D – Add a Westbound Left-Turn Lane to the Bygland Road – County Road 58 Intersection.

Alternative 22E – Add a Traffic Signal to the TH 220 – US 2 Intersection

Haugen pointed out that Alternative 22B is the concept that East Grand Forks supported in our current plan, and Alternative 22C is, to some extent, an affordable alternative that tries to utilize existing infrastructure as much as possible.

Wieland asked if all of these alternatives are assuming that the Merrifield Bridge is constructed as well. Troe responded they do.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

WASHINGTON STREET – DEMERS AVENUE INTERSECTION ALTERNATIVES
SUMMARY

Haugen reported that discussion was held at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting regarding the question of appropriate level-of-service at this intersection. He stated that this question was forwarded the DOT and Federal Highway as there is a concern that by doing improvements that get us to anything lower than a level of service “C” federal aid might be impacted. He asked if Mr. Solwei was prepared to answer that question today. Solwei responded that they look at these types of situations on a case-by-case basis as there is no real “yes” or “no” answer to that question. He added that if you are improving the operations at the intersection, and you still have a level-of-service “F” federal aid may be impacted, but, again they would need to look at this on a case-by-case basis. Troe asked, if you have to evaluate this on a case-by-case basis, where would that evaluation be completed within the timeline relative to the transportation plan update. He added that they would like to come out of this with a recommendation, and if the DOT says they have to evaluate this on a case-by-case basis, and they aren’t going to do that until the project hits the T.I.P., do we really have a transportation plan that is affordable. Solwei responded, again, that he isn’t able to make that call at this point. Troe asked if that was a call that could be made soon, and by “soon”, he means at this point in the development of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Solwei responded that he would have to visit with Mark Johnson, Federal Highway, on that.

Troe commented that in reality, when you look it, Washington and DeMers, and the recommendations along there are going to be a very critical element of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He added that the concepts they are looking at have a pretty broad breadth of cost and impacts, and he thinks that when you look at the level of impacts, the at-grade alternatives they are looking at have the fewest adjacent impacts, but they have not developed, and he doesn’t think there is an at-grade alternative out there that can provide us with a level-of-service “C”, so if you can’t say that at this particular location you can accept a level-of-service “D”, then you might as well stop looking at any of the at-grade alternatives.

Haugen stated, then, that he thinks we may need to rephrase our question in our transportation plan to ask if a concept that achieves a level-of-service “D” is acceptable. Troe agreed, but added that he also thinks you need to include the phrase “at this particular location” as well.

Haugen said, then, that we need to decide if we are interested in continuing the consideration of the grade separated alternatives, or just going with an at-grade alternative knowing that it doesn’t achieve a level-of-service “C”, but that it does improve the intersection, as well as being more likely to occur as an improvement.

Noehre asked what the costs were for the at-grade improvements. Carbee responded that they range from \$6,000,000 to \$12,000,000, and the \$12,000,000 includes some pretty significant right-of-way associated with the addition of the north and southbound lanes. Noehre asked what the costs were for the interchange. Carbee responded that they would be looking at about \$20,000,000. Troe added that these are all in 2007 dollars, and when you have to start looking at

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

year of expenditure dollars, you will also have to consider how long it will take to amass the low end of the at-grade costs versus how long it will take to amass the grade separated costs, and whether or not that ends up pushing the project further into the future, which in-turn would make the costs increase, and ultimately may make the project unaffordable.

Noehre commented that, while he doesn't know what Federal Highway will say, from a District point of view he would say that pursuing the at-grade alternatives would still be worthwhile. He explained that his reason for saying this is that at some point or another they are going to have to do something with the Washington Street Underpass, whether we like it or not, and whether the City likes it or not, so incorporating \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 for that project, and \$20,000,000 for this project, it would seem pretty unattainable, so the lower cost alternatives may be more attainable and should continue to be pursued.

Troe stated that in reality it all comes back to the DOT because they is the entity that establishes the policy, and the Federal Highway Administration enforces that policy, so if the DOT were to come out and say that they were going to change the level-of-service "C" requirement to a level-of-service "D" the Federal Highway Administration could not, or would not fight that, because if you go to other States, their level-of-service guidelines are substantially lower than an level-of-service "C", and actually even Minnesota is not the same. Solwei said that this is why he has said they need to look at these on a case-by-case basis.

Haugen said that we know what the grade separation alternatives look like, but there are a couple of new at-grade alternatives, and would Mr. Carbee please give a brief overview of those alternatives.

Carbee reported that they essentially combined some of the alternatives that were looked at separately, and knowing what level of traffic had been diverted out of the DeMers corridor with the base confirmed in place, they developed some combinations that would achieve a level-of-service "D".

Carbee referred to Figure 6 and explained that they added an additional east and westbound through lane to the dual north and southbound left-turn lanes. Troe added that previously they had separate alternatives, one adding east and westbound through lanes, and the other adding north and southbound dual left-turn lanes, but Alternative 2H adds them together. Haugen commented that they shifted all of the right-of-way to the north, and tried not to do anything to the south.

Carbee referred to Figure 7 and explained that they added an additional through lane and dual left-turn lanes to the northbound and southbound approaches. He stated that as you add those dual lanes, and carry them through to the most logical location for ending them, in this case they carried them down to 13th Avenue South, and as you do that on the Washington Street corridor the right-of-way is relatively narrow, at about 80-feet, and the businesses are located very close to the property line in many cases, adding that southbound lane would likely create a need to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

acquire several businesses, so comparing Alternative 2I to 2H, you will see a much higher business impact.

Carbee referred to Figure 8 and explained that they added a through lane to the eastbound and southbound approaches, and dual northbound and southbound left-turn lanes. He stated that adding that additional through lane to the eastbound and southbound approaches is the most optimal alternative for dealing with traffic issues, but also has the highest right-of-way impacts as well.

Troe asked if they can assume that a level-of-service “D” operation, at this particular location, would be acceptable for the Long Range Transportation Plan by the DOT, and he would like that answer yesterday. He stated that in terms of the at-grade alternatives, whether or not it is Alternative A-H, that can be determined at the workshop on August 22nd. Noehre responded that he would work on getting the answer to the first question as soon as possible.

Haugen asked how the Technical Advisory Committee feels about Alternatives I & J, which both carry a third lane all the way to 13th Avenue, should they continue to be considered, or should they focus on Alternative H versus Alternative E. Noehre asked if Alternative H didn't have significant impacts to the firestation as well. Troe responded that to maintain the southern curve line the majority, or all of it shifts to the north and significantly impacts the firestation, and most likely would be completely removed and/or relocated. Durrenberger asked if this had been discussed with the Fire Department. Troe responded that they have had discussions with the Fire Chief, and he doesn't think they would really be adverse to having the firestation moved as it is difficult for them to get in and out during peak traffic events, and they are moving more towards having neighborhood type firestations, so if this were to be relocated it would probably be relocated to two separate buildings, one locating near this location, and another further to the south.

Haugen commented that the only other differences between Alternative E & H is that under H we probably don't have as many access issues with the Xcel facility, and we have no real access modifications to the properties to the south, whereas under E, which is the single-point option, we have right-of-way access issues with Xcel and properties to the south. Troe agreed, adding that we would most likely be acquiring Xcel with Alternative E.

Haugen referred to page 8 of the memorandum, and pointed out that it does give the costs of each alternative, however there are two Alternative Hs, and no Alternative J shown. Carbee responded that he would make that change.

Noehre reiterated that he would look into the level-of-service issue and get back to URS as soon as possible with an answer

Haugen referred to pages 11, 12, and 13, and explained that the originals were 14 x 17, and didn't print correctly, but the estimated cost of the single-point alternative is \$18,700,000, and \$8,000,000 for Alternative H.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR ADDRESSING FUTURE YEAR OF
EXPENDITURE AND FUTURE FUNDING FINAL ESTIMATES

Haugen commented that the last memorandum discusses how we are going to address year of expenditure and year of revenue.

Troe explained that the purpose of this memorandum is to address both how much money we might have, and how much money everything will cost. He stated that when they started this process they had assumed that they would put everything together in 2007 dollars, then determine how much money we might have, and how much everything will cost then factor everything out the twenty-odd years we have in the planning period, and put all of the projects into a base using 2007 dollars. He said that earlier this year Federal Highway came out with a requirement that by December of this year we have to look at the cost of the projects and adjust them to the year of expenditure dollar amounts, so if we don't think we are going to put an improvement in in 15-years, we have to inflate the cost of that project to 15-years into the future. He stated that they did provide some direction as to what inflation rate should be used, and it is 4% per year for project costs.

Troe reported that he isn't a real believer in being able to reasonably determine if you are going to build a project in 2020, 2022 or 2024, so he is suggesting breaking the transportation planning future period into three phases: 1) short-term phase which goes out about zero to five years; 2) mid-term phase which goes out six to fifteen years; and 3) long-term phase which goes out sixteen to the end of our 2035 planning horizon, which is about twenty-eight years. He said that we would then place projects within each of these projects, so we might have some TSM projects in the short-term period, and some of the larger projects that are dollar intensive in the mid-term or long-term periods. He stated that after placing the project in the correct phase, the way we would then come up with the inflated cost of that project would be to look at the number of years to get to the mid-point of that phase; thus for the short-term period they would look at about 2.5 years, for the mid-term period they would look at about 10 years, and for the long-term period they would look at about 22 years, and use those as the number of years of inflation they would need to take into account. He commented that the result of this would be that we would take those 2007 estimates, or cost estimates, inflate them at the 4% per year rate for the number of years identified in the memorandum so that our short term projects would all be our 2007 cost estimates plus 10% for inflation; our mid-term projects would all be our 2007 cost estimates plus 51% for inflation; and our long-term projects would all be our 2007 cost estimates plus 135% for inflation. He stated that by using this formula we are addressing the spirit of future year of expenditure, but are basically admitting that we have no way of knowing if a project will be done in 2021 or 2025, but at least we are taking inflation into account the best way we can.

Troe commented that the other issue is funding. He said that initially they developed a methodology to come up with the 2007 typical year of funding level, where they used 2007 dollars and take that times 28 to come up with a reasonable expectation of funds that would be available for the region. He stated that they did modify that a bit to take into account anticipated changes in funding, and, when looking at the S.T.I.P., found that there is approximately a 5.4%

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

annual increase in funding shown, which is what they then decided to use to extrapolate their funding dollars for North Dakota out into the future.

Troe stated that they do need concurrence from the Departments of Transportation on the use of these percentages. Haugen responded that Minnesota has already provided them with their concurrence that the percentage used for inflation is reasonable. Troe asked if North Dakota concurs with the use of 5.4% for inflation, which was taken from their S.T.I.P.. Solwei responded that he is not able to answer that today, but will discuss it with Paul Benning.

Troe requested that a special meeting be scheduled for Wednesday, August 22nd, to run from mid-morning to mid-afternoon. He explained that the purpose of this workshop will be to try to come up with a preliminary set of projects to include in the Long Range Transportation Plan's Recommended Projects List. He stated that they will put together a series of packages that address the issue, and get that information out to everyone prior to the meeting on the 22nd.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Open House For Central Avenue Corridor Study

Haugen reported that an open house is scheduled for the Central Avenue Corridor Study on Thursday, August 16th, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Northwest Technical College Room 315.

2. Proposals on the Strategies for the Collector Intersections Due

Haugen commented that the proposal on the strategies for the collector intersections are due at the end of August.

3. North Dakota T.E. Applications Due

Haugen stated that we just finished the T.I.P., and are already starting the process for the next one. He said that the North Dakota T.E. Applications were sent out this morning, and are due to the MPO on November 7th, so if anyone has a project they would like to submit for T.E. funds, you need to have it go through your respective Cities and Counties for approval and get it to the MPO by the 7th of November, after which it will be submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee on November 14th, and by the Executive Policy Board on November 16th.

Solwei reported that the Safe Route to School Applications will be due at approximately the same time. Haugen asked if the Safe Route to Schools would be approving projects out three years or two years. Solwei responded that it would only be for one year.

Haugen commented that the T.E. funds will be for FY 2009 and the Safe Route to School funds will be for FY 2009, as they awarded FY 2008 funds this year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 8th, 2007**

4. Thank-You and Good-Bye To MPO Intern

Haugen commented that we need to thank Lucas Rengstorf, MPO Intern, for his help the past several months. He stated that Lucas is leaving us to attend graduate school at Missouri State.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO ADJOURN THE
AUGUST 8TH, 2007, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:32
P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Executive Assistant