

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

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 12th, 2008, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planner; Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planner; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); Dale Bergman, Superintendent for Cities Area Transit; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Ali Rood, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call).

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 10TH AND OCTOBER 8TH, 2008, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 10TH AND OCTOBER 8TH, 2008, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE STUDY REPORT

Ellis reported that they basically have a preliminary/final document which is based on all of the final recommendations received from the public and the Grand Forks Historical Society. She pointed out that the cover page from the document, and the recommendations are included in the

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

packet, and a full copy of the report is available on the MPO's website. She stated that she would like to go over the recommendations and cost estimates briefly today.

Ellis commented that basically the recommendations are divided into historical mitigation recommendations and context sensitive solutions. She stated that for the actual corridor itself the historic mitigation recommendations are as follows:

- 1) Granitoid on the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor itself would be removed and replaced with stamped concrete. It would not be colored, and would begin at the approximate location of the Senior Citizen Center and would continue to 4th Avenue. The stamped concrete would be laid in the same direction as the current granitoid is now.
- 2) Salvage any in-tact sandstone curbing that is four-feet or greater in size, and place it at the ends of the corridor where you enter rather than back in it's original location. Anything smaller than four-feet would be salvaged for park displays or any other area that may need some sandstone curb replacement.
- 3) There needs to be an agreement on preservation of those granitoid streets that are still in good condition, and it does list four streets that are candidate for that. This will also be further defined by the study that the State Historical Preservation group is currently doing at this time.
- 4) All alley entrances will remain in place, though, that have existing granitoid, provided that they are compatible with future street grades.
- 5) They will reuse a portion of the salvaged granitoid in a public green space. Kannowski Park was suggested as one area in which this could be accomplished. The Grand Forks Historical Preservation Society is currently looking at how much granitoid they have available for such uses, and if they have quite a bit, and if the cost of removing the granitoid along the corridor, they may use what they have instead.

Ellis stated that there are also some context sensitive solutions that were also included in the recommendations. She added that because this is a historic neighborhood these things will need to be done to keep it historical, and they are:

- 1) Get pedestrian lighting to look similar to that in the Grand Forks Downtown area.
- 2) Either replace or paint traffic signal poles black to look more historical. This would also include all signage poles except stop signs as well.
- 3) Medians – one will now be located further east of the Senior Citizen Center in order to not block any driveway or alley entrances, and the other will be located past 3rd Street. These entry monuments will do two things: provide traffic calming and landscaping.
- 4) Include possible monuments on each side of the road so it will look more like an actual entrance rather than a monument in the center of the medians.
- 5) Improve the safety of the intersection of Minnesota/4th Avenue. The preferred method would be to construct a two-way roundabout with landscaping in the center.

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

Ellis reported that they also recommend following the recommendations made by A.T.A.C. earlier in the year; including replacing sidewalks that need to be replaced, salvaging any pavers along there, landscape enhancements should be completed, and all project contracts should include provisions to protect the trees. She explained that the trees are a great portion of that historic district, and was one of the distinguishing items for it being made a historic district and placed on the historic register, so they want to make sure there is extreme caution used regarding the displacement of any trees before replacing sidewalks or roads.

Ellis referred to Page 28, and pointed out that it lists the cost estimates for the entire project, with a final cost of \$4,100,000. She stated that this estimate is split into base project costs, historic mitigation costs, and context sensitive solution costs, however in order to be able to use federal funding, or to even replace the granitoid on that corridor we will have to do both the historic mitigation and context sensitive solutions, so the base project cost is really just the kind of the entire corridor as a whole, and includes contingency and engineering costs for a total of \$3,029,900.

Williams referred to the fifth context sensitive solution, the roundabout, and commented that they had made the comment that that solution was based on further engineering studies being done to make sure that it was even possible, and she didn't see that comment included, so she would like it included in the record.

Noehre commented that he doesn't know that everything in here would be eligible for federal aid either, that some may be 100% City cost including stamped concrete, light pole upgrades, etc.. Haugen responded that all of it would be eligible because it would be historic property that is being displaced, and it is required that in order to use federal funds that we do these items, to mitigate or recompensate the neighborhood. Noehre said that you are saying, "absolutely", and he is saying that, while you may be right, he is saying that he doesn't think it is "absolutely", and, in-fact is sure that it isn't for some of them.

Rau stated that that was one of the questions he brought up earlier. He said that it is hard to say what is going to be eligible and what isn't, and Les may have a little better idea than he does, but he just wasn't sure so that's why he brought it up earlier.

Ellis commented that what was explained to her was that it would have to be looked at nationally, in terms of replacement of that granitoid, from a historical standpoint, and the feds would decide what qualifies and what doesn't. She added, however, that they do know that the stamped concrete itself is integral to the removal of the existing granitoid, and in order for us to apply for federal funding we do have to do some historic mitigation.

Ellis reported that in terms of funding, and whether or not it would be federally funded, or whether some of it would need to be special assessed, etc., we need to remember that this is just a document that we hope will replace the 1994 mitigation and preservation plan, and the City and State Historical Society will need to meet to go over it and further refine the recommendations it includes in order to get the project approved.

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

Noehre stated that, again, he isn't commenting on each individual item, but he is saying that some items may not be federally funded. He said that just because it says "you will do this", even if it is approved doesn't mean the funds will every be available to get it done.

Boppre asked what is next. Ellis responded that it now goes to the Service Safety Committee for their consideration, then to the Council of the Whole, the City Council, back to the Technical Advisory Committee, and finally to the MPO Executive Policy Board for final approval.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE STUDY REPORT SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF T.E. AND SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATIONS FOR THE 2010-2013 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that information was included in the packets pertaining to the Safe Routes to School applications, and that information pertaining to the Transportation Enhancement applications was just distributed to everyone.

Haugen asked if there were any updates or changes required to the Safe Routes to School applications that were included in the packets. Williams responded that after their staff gave information to Nancy, they went through and did some refining to the cost estimates, so they will be working with Nancy prior to the final submittal to include those changes. Ellis commented that the estimates included in the packet are not correct as they include engineering costs, which will be removed from the estimate, but include as a City, in-kind contribution instead.

Williams stated that the other change is to remove the Safe Routes To School application that requests a sidewalk on South Washington as that is really a Transportation Enhancement project and should be included in the T.E. applications instead. She added that she believes this is listed as Project #4 in the Safe Routes To School application.

Haugen said, then, that in the staff report on Page 31, under Infrastructure Projects for Grand Forks, number four should be removed, and the cost estimates for the remaining projects will be revised to remove engineering costs, but the project descriptions will remain the same.

Haugen referred to Page 29, and pointed out that there are two East Grand Forks infrastructure projects: 1) to essentially take what was completed as a Safe Routes To School sidewalk along Bygland Road to 13th down to the Middle School; and 2) to put a sidewalk on the west side of Bygland Road.

Haugen stated that they also have one non-infrastructure project for Grand Forks. He explained that for the past two cycles Safe Kids, through the Grand Forks School District, has applied for funds and we are applying once again this year.

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

Haugen reported that this means we have four infrastructure projects and one non-infrastructure project for Grand Forks; and two infrastructure projects for East Grand Forks. He asked if the Grand Forks projects listed are done so in priority order. Ellis responded they were. Ellis stated that on the Minnesota side we can include an additional \$5,000 for non-infrastructure activities so we will be including that to help with the Safe Kids programs on the East Grand Forks side that we recently got started.

Haugen said that he would like a motion on the Safe Routes to School applications first.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE AND PRIORITIZE THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENTS AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen reported that Grand Forks has submitted a Transportation Enhancement application to construct a shared use path on South 42nd Street. He referred to a map illustrating the location of the proposed path and went over it briefly, explaining that the project would entail continuing that existing shared use path from the Alerus Center to 17th Avenue South.

Haugen stated that the estimated cost of the project is for \$200,000, with \$160,000 coming from federal funding.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY AND SORLIE BRIDGES

Noehre reported that for the Kennedy, and you need to remember that this is all in draft form at this time, the plan is to continue on with the 2010 Pier Repair Project for right around \$1,000,000, and then in 2016 look at a substantial rehab of the bridge that may include a new deck, painting, pigeon abatement, and, should the 2010 Pier Repair Project not be successful, and it continues to slide and rotate, maybe a pier replacement. He stated, then, that this means that right now they are looking at two projects for the Kennedy, the 2010 Pier Project and the 2016, estimated \$10,000,000, rehab project.

Haugen asked if the 2010 project, which is currently shown as an illustrative project in our T.I.P., will require that we amend our T.I.P. now or wait until the 2010 T.I.P. is finalized, which won't happen until next year. Noehre responded that they do have the project in their S.T.I.P., but MNDOT doesn't have it in theirs at this time. Haugen said, then, it appears that we probably wouldn't need to do anything until next August.

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

Williams asked if the 2010 project is a Pier Replacement project. Noehre responded that it was not, that it is a pier repair project. He explained that the reason for the repair is because there is a slip plain that is located diagonally right through the center of one of the piers, which causes it to tip out and rotate, and we are going to try to tie it back to prevent that from continuing to happen. He said that they are obviously hoping that the repair will be successful in stopping the slippage and rotation of that pier. Williams asked what the cost estimate is to do the repair. Noehre responded that the project is estimated to cost \$1,000,000. Williams asked if there was any local share involved with this project. Noehre responded that there isn't. Haugen added that the project is a regional primary project, therefore no local costs are involved.

Noehre stated that for the Sorlie the plan is to replace it in 2018, at an estimated cost of about \$25,000,000. He said that MNDOT District 2 is in the process of putting together more detailed cost estimates, which should be available by December 1st.

Noehre commented that the bridge isn't going to cost too terribly much, somewhere around \$15,000,000, but because of it's historical nature it is probably going to cost an additional \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000.

Durrenberger asked what kind of activities are historical. Noehre responded that it could mean having to move it, take pictures of it, etc..

Williams asked if they were far enough along to know if they were going to change the elevation of the bridge during replacement. Noehre responded that he doesn't think the elevation can be changed much. He stated that there may be some wiggle room on the North Dakota side, but not much on the Minnesota side. He added that it would also depend on what kind of structure they decide to build, what the depth of the beams are, what the load/core height is, if there are any additional piers, low piers, etc..

Haugen commented that a previous e-mail talked about a cost estimate of about \$40,000,000, but this is now \$25,000,000. Noehre responded that he doesn't know about that, but if your asking if it could cost \$40,000,000, he supposes it could be, and are we going to argue over \$25,000,000 or \$40,000,000, no. Benning said that he can respond to that question as he was there at the meeting where it was discussed that it could cost between \$25,000,000 and \$50,000,000.

Noehre stated that the Sorlie was originally estimated to cost between \$10,000,000 and \$15,000,000, but they didn't realize the additional costs involved with it being a historical bridge, which would involve historical mitigation, approaches, etc..

Haugen asked if it is likely that the connection between both downtowns will be gone for months, or can they build the new bridge alongside the existing and then remove the existing once the new one is complete. Noehre responded that they would not be able to build a bridge alongside the old unless you want to buy out Cabelas or an entire city block, but then you might well add another zero to the end of the estimated cost figure. Boppre added that the only way to do this would be to remove the existing and build the new one in the same location,

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

otherwise the costs will be far too great to even consider. Noehre commented that there is always the option of keeping it and spending \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 every ten to fifteen years to maintain it, which isn't feasible from their standpoint, and he wouldn't think it would be feasible from the local standpoint either.

Haugen stated that the previous decision MNDOT gave was the flip to this, to replace the Kennedy and rehab the Sorlie, why the change. He asked if it was the more detailed analysis that caused them to flip-flop the two bridges. Noehre responded that cost was a big factor, that they don't have three billion dollars to spend on structures in the state of North Dakota to 2018. He added that in totaling up what is on the Long Range Transportation Plan, or what is being talked about in terms of a downtown pedestrian bridge at a cost of about \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000, as well as the cost of a total repainting of the Sorlie Bridge, the estimate, which is already about three years old, is for \$4,500,000, so now we are looking at a cost of about \$9,000,000 without even touching any of those things like the deck, rail, etc., so the number continues to climb greatly to just do some band-aids, therefore, it seems to make more sense to just replace the Sorlie instead.

Haugen asked if economics would allow for them to replace both bridges. Noehre responded that they could if they had a big checkbook, which isn't the case. He added that they really don't know that the Kennedy needs to be replaced for some time. He stated that the Sorlie is 80 years old and in 2018 it will be 90 years old and the Kennedy is currently 45 years old, with no significant structural problems other than the pier, so to spend whatever it would cost to replace the Kennedy, including building a bridge beside it, maybe around \$140,000,000 as opposed to around \$1,000,000 to repair the pier, there just isn't any comparison.

Haugen asked if this has been agreed on by both North Dakota and Minnesota officials, if they have agreed, at least in principal to these dates and repairs. Noehre responded that it is just a draft so far, and they are still looking at the notes and making comparisons. He said that this is what they are looking at right now, but is there an inked agreement, absolutely not; will there be a typed and signed agreement, he wouldn't think so either. He added that new information could come up; discussions with East Grand Forks, Grand Forks, the MPO could be held, all of which could have an impact on the final decisions. Haugen stated that you know where he is going with this, that in April the discussion was that the Kennedy was going to be replaced and the Sorlie rehabbed, and the pier project was on the T.I.P. but not on the S.T.I.P., so he would assume that both MNDOT and NDDOT officials have met and discussed all the river crossings up and down the valley and reached the conclusion that was just presented today, so this is all the result of a face-to-face sit down to talk about what to do instead of one side making decisions on their own. Noehre responded that that would be correct. He added that MNDOT had to respond to their legislation, so they were under a very tight tight timeframe, and were considering way more structures than just the Sorlie and the Kennedy so they did the best they could with the time they had and did a super job.

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

Williams asked if all of the dollars discussed today would be shared in some manner with Minnesota. Noehre responded that the Sorlie will be funded using the 80/10/10 formula, which means 5% for each city.

Haugen asked where they were at on the Thompson Bridge. Sanders responded that he doesn't know, adding that it depends on where Bismarck is on it. He asked if they were still planning on replacing it in 2012. Benning responded that he would have to check into whether or not it was still planned for 2012.

Sanders stated that they currently have all the surveying done, all the historic stuff is done, all the permitting is done and they have a preliminary plan approved, so they are just waiting for funds, and once the funds are there they will do a final plan and construct the bridge. He said that if 2012 is still the year North Dakota has the project programmed, that is when they will be looking at getting it constructed. He commented that the cost of the bridge is around \$8,000,000, and another \$1,000,000 to do the approaches on both sides, so we are looking at about a \$9,000,000 project. He added that this construction will bring the bridge out of the flood plain, so the 100 year flood would pass through it and it would remain high and dry.

Benning returned and stated that he did check with Dave Leftwich, and the project is still pending in 2012.

Information only.

MATTER UPDATE ON FREIGHT STUDY

Haugen reported that Ali Rood, MPO Intern, has been working on the Freight Study. He reminded everyone that as part of SAFETEA-LU compliance requirements, the NDDOT asked us to do a high level freight study, and this is that study. He stated that information pertaining to the study was included in the packets, and additional information was just distributed.

Rood commented that since the last update she gave on the study, which was back in July or August, she has been able to gather additional information from LM Glasfiber, Simplot, American Crystal and a number of trucking companies.

Rood referred to the memo on Page 51 and reported that back in late July she met with Bert Gjovik from LM Glasfiber to talk about some of their freight issues, including some of the difficulties they have shipping their wind turbine blades. She referred to a map on Page 55, and pointed out the route most used by LM employees when shipping their blades, and explained what and where their areas of concern are located.

Rood referred to the memo on Page 56 and reported that in September she met with Harley Leake of Simplot. She stated that he did provide her with some information concerning their truck and train operations. She said that they receive one train per day at the Simplot location, and they also store product at Henningsen Cold Storage and they receive one train per day as well.

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

She referred to the map on Page 58, and pointed out the route most used by Simplot trucks and the train route, and explained what and where their areas of concern are located. She commented that one major area of concern is the area in which the train goes between the two buildings, which is very narrow. She stated that, although they haven't had any problems to date, BNSF is in the process of switching to a longer refrigerator car, and that would definitely be a problem. She said that at the time of their meeting, Mr. Leake was having difficulty contacting someone from BNSF to try to resolve that issue.

Rood reported that because American Crystal is still in their busy season she wasn't able to set up a meeting with them, but they did agree to fill out a survey in order to give us some information, and she referenced a meeting that was held with representatives from American Crystal in 2007. She stated that they have a number of issues that they would like to see resolved. She referred to a map on Page 61, and pointed out that the green areas are the main truck routes to the plan. She said that there are two alternatives that Dan Gowan recommended which are shown in red. She explained that one of the alternatives involves a new roadway from Highway 2 east and the other a new road from 10th Street. She commented that another issue, especially during beet hauling season, is Stauss Park, and the two baseball diamonds. She explained that the parking lot across from 5th Avenue N.E. really sees some heavy beet truck traffic, so people crossing between the parking lot and the ballparks have some concerns with safety, so they would like to see 5th Avenue reconfigured, or the parking lot relocated if possible to get rid of that conflict. She reported that another issue is the intersection of Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.E., shown with a yellow circle, where there is some really heavy traffic during the beet harvest season. She said that she will have to ask if they put up a seasonal traffic signal this year. Ellis stated that they have not done that. Boppre commented that they have actually met with American Crystal a couple times, along with the City, and he doesn't think they will do the east/west run as MNDOT does not like it due to the fact that you have to have signalized lights on Highway 2, and they definitely don't want to do that. He added that they are working with American Crystal, with the City, EDHA, County, and other entities to deal with this issue. He stated that they could look at upgrading 10th, and bringing the traffic from 5th, down 10th to American Crystal's property as 10th is a state aide roadway. He said that this is scheduled to occur soon, and they are looking at several different funding agencies for that, and he knows that Councilman Grassel has talked to Collin Peterson's office about a farm to market bill, and Congressman Peterson is very interested in that happening in the next two years.

Sanders asked where American Crystal's scales were located. Boppre referred to the map and pointed out where they were located. Sanders stated that you can see where the piles are located, so when the farmers come in and have to cross the scale and then unload and come back out you want to make it as easy as possible for them to do this so having the scales on the south end would seem to make things harder. He asked if there were any plans to move the scales. Haugen responded that he doesn't think there are any plans to move the scales, but he does think they plan on shifting some of the storage northward. He added that when URS did the 2035 Plan they met with American Crystal representatives, at which time they did go over their plans, and that was when the north access was first discussed as an option for us to pursue as it works well

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

with their current plans as well as their future plans. He stated that that information is in the 2035 Plan if anyone would like to look at it further.

Haugen reported that American Crystal also uses a lot of coal, and having the ability to deliver that from the north rather than from the east would also work better for them. He added that they also felt that this would allow them to keep the coal trucks from having to mix with the beet trucks, and would also allow them to separate their TranSystems trucks from the regular harvest trucks as well.

Sanders asked, going back to the issue of the parking lot and the ball diamonds at Stauss Park, how many ballgames are going on in October. Haugen responded that it references the year round issue of TranSystems trucks using that roadway.

Rood referred to the last memo in the packet and reported that it discusses the results of the survey sent out to local trucking companies. She pointed out that those firms shown in bold were the only ones that responded to the survey. She added that even though they didn't fill out a survey, Mark Christianson from TranSystems has agreed to meet sometime, however she hasn't been able to get that meeting scheduled at this time.

Rood distributed copies of the survey that was sent out to the various trucking firms, and copies of a map illustrating the major routes used by these firms as well.

Rood referred to Page 63, and went over the issues/alternatives listed. She pointed out that there were only two issues/alternatives that were listed more than once: 1) improving the turning radii at DeMers and 48th Street entering the Industrial Park – listed three times; and 2) construct an interchange at I-29 and Merrifield – listed twice.

Haugen pointed out that at the last update Ms. Rood distributed similar information from the State Mill, BNSF and Briton Trucking. Rood responded that prior to the survey being sent out she had received some e-mail comments and attended a meeting of the Northern Valley Transportation Coalition so she summarized the information she received from those two events at the last update.

Rood stated that all of this information will be included in the Freight Study document.

Rood reported that the second part of this update is the issue of an Open House on the Freight Study. She stated that the Open House has been scheduled for Thursday, November 20th from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Holiday Inn. She pointed out that a copy of the power point presentation that will be presented at the open house was included in the packet for review. She added that there will also be some poster exhibits, including maps of the most up-to-date truck route traffic signs, truck accident locations, train routes, etc..

Rood referred to Page 76 and pointed out that it is a summary of the Private Sector concerns and ideas that have been discussed.

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

Noehre commented on the issue of radii, and he isn't saying that the ones that were pointed out are large enough because he doesn't know that, but often what he sees is that even if they are made wider, trucks still seem to have a problem turning and are still going outside of them anyway, sometimes as far as they were going outside of them before they were widened. He gave a couple of examples of radii that have been widened in the past and the continuing issues they have. Williams referred to the comment made about the Washington/32nd radii and stated that she doesn't see how you could make them any bigger as they already have free right-turns and the radiuses are probably at least 55-feet, so she isn't sure how you can make them any bigger.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2009-2010 MPO ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that they are still waiting for the City of Grand Forks to submit any work program activities they would like the MPO to do. He said that he knows that Ms. Hanson, in Bismarck, is pretty anxious to get our completed work program so they can review it.

Haugen referred to the October 8th minutes, Pages 8 and 9, and pointed out that he did discuss some of the ideas he has heard about. He said that there is still about \$250,000 available for outside the required normal MPO activities, most of which is consulted out. He stated that he did have Ms. Hanson and Mr. Benning confirm the estimates he is using for the work program, and would like to get any projects the City wants done in so that the document can be finalized in December.

Boppre asked what projects are currently included for consideration. Haugen responded that we will probably have something included for signal coordination, maybe a study to allow for mass transit to get around easier on some of these corridors, to integrate that; an aerial photos update; have A.T.A.C. look at a couple of schools again; and look at American Crystal access to the north. Williams stated that the Grand Forks Engineering Department is working with the Planning Department and the Public Works Department to come up with a consolidated list of projects to submit. She said that they do have a transit study that they are working with Public Works on to look at Columbia Road and South Washington.

Williams referred to Page 8 of the October 8th minutes, and asked if item eight, the Pavement Management Review, is actually pavement management or does it refer to the pictures. Haugen responded that the pictures are done. Williams said that they are for this year, but she is talking about two years from now. Haugen responded that the last time we did an update we did the photos and purchased the software required to use the photos so we have that. He stated that the third component was to give us some data to fill in the pavement management ratings, and so that third thing is something that could be updated with the new photos, because they basically base it off the photo information, and that is what is being referred to with item eight. He added that as part of the software program there is a budgeting module that allows you to do forecasts to determine what it takes if you don't do needed work, if you delay it.

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

Williams stated, however, that we do need to include photo updates in two years, as we do photo updates every two years don't we. Haugen responded that we don't do photo updates every two years. Williams asked how often photo updates are done then. Haugen responded that they are done every five years. He explained that aerial photos are done every three years and right-of-way every five, at least that has been our past sequence.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. AUWP

Benning said that he would like to talk about the AUWP a little more. He explained that he needs a signed-off AUWP to show their legal staff, who will put a contract number on the agreement once it is executed, and he needs that contract number in order for their finance division set up the funding, and to add the additional funds they just got from FTA a couple of months ago. He stated that in the current contract there is less than \$20,000 remaining, so the MPO is kind of on "empty" which is why they are trying to expedite this so they can put additional dollars in the account so we don't end up having to bill the café because there isn't any money there. He said, then, that this is why it would be good to expedite the AUWP as soon as possible and get it all wrapped up. Haugen responded that he is trying to do that, and it will get done as soon as possible.

2. Urban Roads Projects Due

Hanson reminded everyone that the Urban Roads Projects are due December 15th. Haugen stated that the deadline for submittal of projects to the MPO is December 3rd, to have both the remaining North Dakota projects and all of the Minnesota projects submitted for consideration for the 2010-2013 T.I.P.. He commented that this is the normal timeline for North Dakota, but they did have to move the Minnesota submittal up a month to accommodate the A.T.P. process.

Rau commented that right now the list of North Dakota projects is scheduled to go to the Safety Service Committee on November 19th, to the Council of the Whole on November 24th, and then to the City Council on December 1st, so they should be able to make the December 3rd deadline. Haugen stated that he needs to have both signatures for the regional projects.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY SANDERS, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 12TH, 2008, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:41 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Executive Assistant