

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 12th, 2008, 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: Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planner; Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planner; Arden Striefel (Proxy for Paul Benning), NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); Brad Bail (proxy for Dean Wieland), East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Teri Nelson (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Public Transportation.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director and Peggy McNelis, MPO Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Steve Grabill and Marie Baker, Ulteig Engineers.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because there are some new faces here today he would ask that everyone please introduce themselves.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 13TH, 2008 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY EHRENSTROM, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 13TH, 2008, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

**MATTER OF PUBLIC HEARING ON LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that it identifies that a public hearing on the Long Range Transportation Plan is required, therefore it was scheduled to take place at this meeting. He explained that this public hearing is the result of the MPO being asked by its lead review agency, the NDDOT, to address some items which need clarification from our SAFETEA-LU compliance efforts we began last year, and the public hearing is one of those main issues needing to be addressed.

Haugen reported that in addition to the staff report copies of the public hearing notice, a portion of the Environmental Coordination and Mitigation document, and the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Executive Summary were also included.

Haugen referred to a power point presentation and went over it briefly.

Presentation/Review ensued.

Haugen commented that the two land use maps are from the Grand Forks 2035 Land Use Plan and the East Grand Forks 2035 Land Use Plan, and are from the Street and Highway sections of those plans, otherwise the remainder of those sections, which include housing, employment and traffic projections remain unchanged.

Haugen stated that NDDOT also asked us to expand the environmental section, including producing a map which identified all the known wetlands and other environmental areas within our study area.

Haugen referred to a power point slide, and explained that it is not included in today's packet, but is a part of the Executive Summary, and consists of a document called "SAFTETA-LU Compliance As It Relates To Our Alternative Transportation Modes Plan". He stated that because this information is included in the Executive Summary he did not include a separate document in the packet. He added that the Executive Summary document has also been available in its entirety on the MPO website for the past ten days as well.

Haugen commented that this document is a summary of our Public Participation Plan, Goals and Objectives, discussion of our Demographics, and ITS information. He added that it also summarizes the Street and Highway Plan, the Alternative Transportation Modes Plan, and the Coordinated Human Services Plan.

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

Ehrenstrom referred to the transit capital page of the document, paragraph three, and questioned whether or not the statement – “In addition to these federal funds, over the capital, after the maximum has been utilized properly” – should say the minimum has been utilized instead. He explained that the reason he asks is because you have to utilize a minimum of the federal share for operation. Haugen responded that that is correct, but added that there is also a 50% maximum as well. Ehrenstrom argued that you can use as much as you want for operating. Haugen responded that that is incorrect, explaining that you are capped at 50%. He added that capital is 80%, but that is referring to the operating side of things. Ehrenstrom said that he is referring to the 5307 section of funding, and said that as far as their contracts are concerned there is a 50% minimum for operating costs. Haugen responded that this statement says the same thing, that 50% is 50% and can be a maximum or a minimum amount. Ehrenstrom reported that there have been times in the past when they actually contracted for more than 50% for operations so in essence their state funding is reduced. Williams asked if the statement could say required 50% instead. Haugen responded that the difference is that in North Dakota there isn't anything left of the 5307 funds after the operating maximum is reached to go towards capital, but this isn't true for East Grand Forks, and that is what he is trying to state with this statement, that there is capital funds available in 5307 for East Grand Forks, which isn't the case for Grand Forks. Ehrenstrom added that this is true after you have reached your contract amount of 50% allotted to operating, which would mean a minimum of 50% has to go toward operation. Haugen agreed, adding that he still feels that is what the statement means, just worded in a different way.

***MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE
FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
THAT THEY APPROVE AND ADOPT THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE MPO
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCHOOL TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE STRATEGY STUDY
REPORT**

Haugen reported that personnel from Ulteig Engineers are here today for a brief presentation.

Steve Grabill, Ulteig Engineers, stated that an e-mail was sent out to the Technical Advisory Committee last week that included a copy of the Draft School Traffic Control Device Strategy Study report. He explained that the document identifies traffic control strategies that would provide a uniform basis for traffic control applications for all the schools located within the City of Grand Forks.

Grabill referred to a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and reported that Ulteig Engineers was brought in back in October to do the study. He stated that the first public meeting was held in December to get some initial input. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

they have been working with MPO staff and the City Engineer on the first review of the draft report, so what you have been given does include the feedback they have received to-date. He said that they also visited with the school principals this morning to garner any additional input they might have as well. He stated that generally only limited feedback was received, however they did get affirmation that this is the direction they wanted the study to go, although there is still some concern out there as to how these standards might affect each of the individual schools. He said that they explained that it really isn't the job of the report to go through and apply the strategies, that that is a future step, and the MPO and the City are already currently active in reviewing the safe route to school maps and are working with A.T.A.C. to look at some of the individual schools.

Grabill reported that A.T.A.C. has been given a copy of the Draft School Traffic Control Device Strategy Study report and they are using the preliminary recommendations in the report in their analysis of the individual school sites and locations.

Grabill commented that the study has completed an analysis of the City's inventory. He explained that their intent is not to look at individual sites and provide individual site recommendations, but rather to look at what is going on on a system-wide level in order to identify inconsistencies with current devices and then to develop a policy guide selecting the preferred control device as well as a strategy to convert the crossing to a more uniform traffic control.

Grabill stated that having prepared the draft report they are now in the process of facilitating input, both with the school district and the Ad-Hoc Committee members, and will hold a public open house in April.

Presentation continued with extensive discussion on various signage alternatives.

Grabill commented that they have prepared a three-step process for making decisions on appropriate traffic control within the school areas (see report for illustrations):

1. Determine the viability of a school crossing
2. Look at vehicle/pedestrian conflict
3. Consider innovative devices if conflicts warrant

Haugen stated that the safe route to school maps are key components to the strategy and we have had safe route to school maps available for the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks communities for the past five or so years. He said that as we are finding with the signs, the manual updates what should be shown on a safe route to school map as well. He referred to a power point slide and pointed out that it represents how we are updating the safe route to school maps to better provide the information the manual requires. He said that the principle issue is to show what traffic control devices there are at intersections, and also to show where our existing crosswalks are located. He commented that Ms. Nelson is in the process of doing this, and he noticed that there is still some signage missing on the maps so staff will go over them and make sure all signage is shown. He said that once this is done, they can meet with Ms. Williams to make sure

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

we are signing and routing people in the best manner, and then we can work with the individual schools to share this information with them to better explain why we are doing things the way we are.

Grabill reported that, assuming they have a public input meeting in early April, the plan is to submit a final report to the MPO by the end of April, per the contract. He stated that the project has been on schedule, and they have been getting good input, so all-in-all it has been a rewarding process.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE 2008 MPO ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that there are three things being addressed in this update:

1. Studies that carried over into 2008
 - a. School Traffic Control Device Strategy Study
 - b. Collector/Collector Intersection Strategy Study
2. Received verification of actual 2008 funding
 - a. Additional \$422,689 from North Dakota and \$41,112 from Minnesota
 - b. \$98,948 in carry-over monies which is an increase of about \$50,000 from what we originally thought
3. Change cost of ITS Regional Architectural Update reduced from \$47,000 to \$8,000.

Haugen stated that the additional monies were distributed as follows: 1) Downtown Plan Update to \$40,000 and 2) MN/4th Avenue Corridor Study to \$50,000.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2008 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2007 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS

Haugen said that this is the second time we have done this since the SAFETEA-LU requirement went into effect. He referred to the information in the packet, and pointed out that the principle part of the document are the tables. He explained that these tables show a comparison of the projected cost and federal funding for individual projects versus the actual cost and federal funding obligated. He stated that the other thing we had to do was to identify whether or not there were any accommodations for bikes/peds, and if so how they were incorporated into the project. He said that part of the SAFETEA-LU requirement is that we try to make these tables

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

resemble the T.I.P. tables, which is what we did by using the same table format, but highlighting in yellow the amount actually obligated for each project.

Haugen referred to the tables and went over them briefly.

Haugen stated that the first East Grand Forks project needs to be changed. He explained that instead of what they have shown for the state contribution, it should be \$107,095 and the local amount should be \$35,205.

Haugen commented that this document, per SAFETEA-LU language, suggests that it should be prepared within three months after the end of the year. He explained that in prior years this was a stand-alone document, but the NDDOT and Federal Highway have asked us to include this in our T.I.P. document, so your next T.I.P. document will also include an appendix that illustrates the annual listing of obligations.

Haugen stated that with the following corrections, staff would recommend the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve the Annual Listing of Obligations, and to request staff continue to work with Grand Forks Transit personnel to get their two line items filled in:

1. Grand Forks 40th Street Project – Include in the remark section that a sidepath, or off-road path, and a sidewalk were included in the project.
2. Change state contribution to the East Grand Forks Fixed-Route to \$35,205.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2007 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS SUBJECT TO NOTED CORRECTIONS AND TO REQUEST STAFF CONTINUE TO WORK WITH GRAND FORKS TRANSIT PERSONNEL TO GET THEIR TWO LINE ITEMS FILLED IN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE REGIONAL ITS
ARCHITECTURAL UPDATE**

Haugen reported that staff has worked out an agreement with A.T.A.C. to update our Regional ITS Architectural Plan. He stated that A.T.A.C. has worked with the three North Dakota MPOs and the State to create the regional architecture for the state, as well as the three MPOs. He added that the other two MPOs have A.T.A.C. under contract to update their Regional ITS Architectural Plans already, so it would be beneficial for us to do so as well.

Haugen referred to the scope of work included in the packet, and explained that it outlines what needs to be done to bring us into compliance with FHWA requirements.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY EHRENSTROM TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY A.T.A.C., AND TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THEM. TO UPDATE OUR REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURAL PLAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF STATUS OF MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY RFP

Ellis reported that she presented the RFP for the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor Study to the Technical Advisory Committee for approval in January. She said that the RFP was sent out and one proposal was received, that being from Kadmaras, Lee, and Jackson (KLJ).

Ellis commented that KLJ's proposal did meet the scope of work in the RFP so the selection committee met and interviewed them, resulting in their recommending staff negotiate with KLJ and enter into a contract to perform the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor Study not to exceed \$50,000.

Information only.

MATTER OF STATUS OF DOWNTOWN PLAN UPDATE RFP

Haugen reported that the RFP for the Downtown Plan Update was sent out and three proposals received – 1) SRF; 2) SEH; and 3) MMM Group. He explained that the selection committee will meet and interview the three firms on Friday, and a recommendation will then be forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board as to which firm the committee is recommending be put under contract to perform the study.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. NDDOT Workshop

Haugen said that he just wanted to remind everyone about the NDDOT Regional Workshop on April 2nd. He explained that the workshop is being put on by Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at the Hilton Garden Inn, beginning at 10:00 a.m. and going until 3:00 p.m.. He stated that they are requesting people register on their website if they plan on attending.

2. Section 5317 Mobility Enhancements RFP

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 12th, 2008**

Ehrenstrom asked if Mr. Haugen had been notified of the Section 5317 Mobility Enhancement RFP. Haugen responded that he did receive an e-mail from Barb regarding that. He added that he did ask that she forward more detailed information on this, but has not yet received it.

Haugen explained that what Mr. Ehrenstrom is referring to is the New Freedom Funds. He said that on the North Dakota side, on April 9th, which is also our regularly scheduled Technical Advisory Committee meeting, a big human service coordination meeting will be held on this in Bismarck. He stated that many members of the Technical Advisory Committee will most likely be attending that meeting, therefore we will be canvassing members prior to the April 9th meeting to determine if a quorum will be available or not, and if not whether or not an alternative meeting date should be scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 12TH, 2008, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:54 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Executive Assistant