

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 9th, 2008, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planner; Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planner; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck; Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit Superintendent; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Graig Gilbertson, MNDOT-Bemidji; 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: Dave Leftwich, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); Roger Hjelle, MNDOT-St. Paul; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that, because there are new people here today, he would like for everyone to introduce themselves.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 11TH, 2008 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY NOEHRE, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 11TH, 2008, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

MATTER OF 2008-2011 T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR 23RD STREET N.W.

Haugen explained that back in April the City of East Grand Forks submitted an application to the Minnesota Transportation Revolving Loan Fund to do the 23rd Street N.W. project, which involves urbanizing a rural section of the roadway, and that application was awarded funds. He stated that because the City would like to do a portion of that project this year we now have to do an amendment to our existing 2008-2011 T.I.P. even though this is a 2009 project.

Haugen reported that they did publish the fact that a public hearing on this issue would be held at today's meeting, therefore, he would now like to open the public hearing.

Opened the public hearing.

No one was present for discussion.

Closed the public hearing.

Haugen commented that in addition to the public hearing at this meeting, the notice indicated that the public could submit comments to MPO staff until noon today. He said that there were no comments submitted.

Haugen reminded the committee that back in April it was stated that if funds were awarded for this project, they would be amended into the T.I.P. document, so, because funds were awarded we now have to follow the process of amending the T.I.P. He said that the only question he has regarding this is which dollar amount he should be using as the application shows an amount of \$3.11 million while the Draft S.T.I.P. shows an amount of \$3.467 million. Gilbertson responded that the project also includes some right-of-way so he would think that the \$3.467 million figure is what should be used in the T.I.P..

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY2008-2011 T.I.P. TO INCLUDE THE EAST GRAND FORKS AWARD OF MNDOT TRANSPORTATION REVOLVING LOAN FUND MONIES TO BRING THE TOTAL PROJECT COST TO \$3.467 MILLION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF MNDOT DRAFT BRIDGE PROGRAM
MATTER OF DRAFT T.I.P./S.T.I.P. RECONCILIATION**

Haugen stated that he would like to cover both the Draft Bridge Program and the Draft T.I.P./S.T.I.P. Reconciliation items as one.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

Haugen referred to the packet and explained that it includes a lot of information concerning the new bridge program that MNDOT has put together as a result of a legislative action. He pointed out that the MNDOT program identifies the Kennedy Bridge as one of eleven major bridges needing to be replaced, while NDDOT is still in the “convince us it needs to be replaced” mode. He added that it also appears that MNDOT is programming only a rehab of the Sorlie, while NDDOT has indicated that they may be more likely to agree that there may be a need to replace the Sorlie, and not the Kennedy.

Haugen stated that the reason he asked to include the Draft S.T.I.P./T.I.P. Reconciliation item with the Draft Bridge Program item is because the NDOT S.T.I.P. includes a bridge project that the MNDOT S.T.I.P. does not, and at some point in time during the next 45-days we need to come to an agreement on this project so that final T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P.s can be produced. He commented that this would all normally be done no later than August, but because August 13th is the next regular Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and because we need to publish the fact that we would be holding a public hearing on the Draft T.I.P. ten day in advance, that would mean we would have to come to an agreement on this issue by August 1st.

Haugen reported that back in April the MNDOT District Engineer held discussions with East Grand Forks officials regarding the issue of replacing the Kennedy Bridge, after which he did bring the issue to this body for discussion as well, and Roger Hjelle, MNDOT and Les Noehre, NDDOT did lead that discussion. He pointed out that there is information in the packet that we can go over, but ultimately the big question is: “What are we going to do with the Kennedy Bridge, and how, if there are differences, do we reconcile the two Draft S.T.I.P.s?” He stated North Dakota shows a \$1,000,000 pier replacement project that Minnesota does not.

Noehre referred to the Draft Bridge staff report and pointed out that the last sentence in the first paragraph: “NDDOT is still in the convince us this bridge needs replacement”; and the second paragraph: “The flip maybe the opinion for the Sorlie. It appears MNDOT is programming just rehab type work while NDDOT is more able to see the necessity/possibility of replacing the Sorlie” aren’t entirely correct, but they are questions that need to be asked. He added that there have been no statements, that he knows of, by anyone, to the effect that either bridge definitely does or doesn’t need to be replaced. He said that NDDOT’s position is still that what we have is a draft document, and it is still being looked at as a draft document, and when it is a final document then we will have to go through the process of evaluating everything to get to a solution.

Hjelle commented that there isn’t anything in Minnesota’s S.T.I.P. regarding North Dakota’s pier project, but there isn’t anything in North Dakota’s S.T.I.P. regarding Minnesota’s pier project either. He said that it needs to be clarified that MNDOT is still in the process of inspection and analysis on one bridge and inspection on the other. He stated that neither agency is going to say right now whether there is a need for replacement or rehab of either bridge. He added, however, that Minnesota has a plan in place that says that if their partners in the joint jurisdiction of a bridge can fund the replacement of a bridge, they can fund it as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

Haugen reported that the problem is that because there is a difference between the two S.T.I.P.s, that difference needs to be reconciled if we are going to do something in August because he can't show a Kennedy pier replacement on the North Dakota side without a corresponding project on the Minnesota side as well. Hjelle asked what the amount of the project in question is in the North Dakota S.T.I.P.. Haugen responded that if North Dakota agrees that the project is 100% funded with North Dakota funds, then it is fiscally constrained and nothing needs to be done with the Minnesota S.T.I.P., but, because this bridge is jointly owned, any project done is typically split 50/50 between Minnesota and North Dakota, so half of the cost of the project should be shown in the Minnesota S.T.I.P. as well. He pointed out that the total cost of the project is \$1.40 million, with \$832,000 being federally funded, so if the entire \$832,000 is North Dakota's, then the S.T.I.P. is fiscally constrained, but that isn't typically how these bridge projects are funded. He explained that we would normally show the project as costing \$1.04 million in both S.T.I.P.s, and the \$832,000 being split 50/50 in each. Hjelle commented that he isn't ready to amend the Minnesota S.T.I.P. based on what he knows right now.

Haugen suggested that we could consider including the North Dakota pier project as an illustrative project in the S.T.I.P.s.. He explained that that would show that the project is not programmed in Minnesota, but it is still a desired project on one side of the river, and then should funding become available, an amendment can be made to the T.I.P. at that time. He explained that an illustrative project does not need to meet the fiscally constrained criteria.

After further discussion it was determined that the Kennedy Bridge Structure Repair Project would be included as an Illustrative Project in both S.T.I.P.s.

Haugen commented, however, that while making the pier project an illustrative project solves our immediate T.I.P. issue, there is still the issue that when Minnesota finalizes its bridge program document, at that time we will have to address a potential amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan to include it, so North Dakota will need to be on board with Minnesota's document or we will have the same issue as we have discussed today because a project that large cannot be left out of the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan, but we can't include it if one state isn't fully behind it because, once again, there would be the issue of it not being fiscally constrained.

Hjelle stated that the replacement of the Kennedy Bridge is not any of their Long Range Plans, however MNDOT has a funding mechanism in place to do so provided their adjacent jurisdiction can come up with their half of the funds. He added that their best guess is that it will be replaced in 2018. Boppre asked when a report on the bridge review will be available. Hjelle responded that it probably won't be released for at least two or three months.

Haugen asked if there were any decision changes regarding the Sorlie since there are some local dollars that would typically be involved, and do the local people want to be involved in those discussions. Hjelle responded that this organization, and the public, would have major involvement once they determine the scope of that project, whether it is a rehab or a replacement project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

Haugen referred to the table illustrating the differences between the North Dakota S.T.I.P. and the MPO T.I.P., and went over them briefly as follows:

- 1) I-29 Northbound Reconstruction South of #15 to near 32nd

Haugen pointed out that the NDDOT S.T.I.P. shows the cost of this project as being \$10,669,000 and the M.P.O. T.I.P. shows the cost as being \$13,536,000. He asked if he should use the S.T.I.P. amount. He also asked that Ms. Hanson double check to make sure his totals are correct and get back to him.

- 2) US #2 Hot Bit Pave Between Arvilla to near I-29

Haugen stated that he isn't sure the description for this project is correct, if it is near Arvilla to the west, but it does state in the text that it is near I-29, and the map shows it going to the west past Larimore to Niagra. Noehre responded that the text is correct, and suggested that they not pay attention to the map included as that is incorrect.

Haugen commented that the last project they did like this they had to split the project because of the urban limits, and he is wondering if that same thing will need to be done with this project as well. Noehre responded that that is something that Ms. Hanson will need to check into.

- 3) I-29 Northbound CPR, Grinding Between 32nd to North Washington
- 4) I-29 Southbound CPR Between 32nd and North Washington

Haugen reported that these are two new projects that came in after the Draft T.I.P. was done in April, so they need to be added into the T.I.P.. Noehre reported that the reason for these two projects is because of the rebuilding of 9 and 11 south of Grand Forks through the urban portion of the interstate, for traffic control and continuity.

- 5) I-29 Southbound Reconstruct South of #15 to near 32nd

Haugen commented that it appears that the cost estimate for this project increased by about \$300,000, therefore a cost adjustment is needed.

- 6) South 48th Street Construction between 17th Avenue to 32nd Avenue

Haugen stated that we would like to see the S.T.I.P. reflect what the T.I.P. shows, which is \$8,750,000 instead of the \$4,942,000 it currently shows for the project cost since it was stated that if the project is delivered the \$7,000,000 is available. Leftwich responded that that can't be done. He explained that he has serious doubts that this project will be done, but if it is done then he would like to modify the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

at that time as they need to make sure their S.T.I.P. is financially constrained and if they left the \$7,000,000 in there it wouldn't be at this time. He asked if the City is still planning on doing this project or not so he would like to leave the \$4,000,000 figure for now, and if the project is to be done add the \$5,000,000 at that time.

Grasser asked how we would document that intent because someone will look at this recommendation and will see that \$4,000,000 have been programmed for the project and that's it. Leftwich responded that they can send a letter explaining what has been discussed, but he is assuming the City is taking a look at their C.I.P. to see if this project is in the cards or if they want to use the funds for other projects. Haugen responded that the MPO is not aware of any other project that is out there seeking funds, but the City needs to tell the MPO if this is a \$5,000,000 project or a \$9,000,000 project, and if it is the higher amount then we can just show a lower federal amount. Leftwich said that that would work as well. He asked if the City was still serious about doing this project. Grasser responded that as of today the project is still on and they are spending money on the PCR to get it done. He stated that the PCR identified the need for \$7,000,000 of federal funds to get the project done. He added that they have run into some issues with this, including the fact they this is the first project that they have to deal with storm water quality issues and bonding, and that has thrown a little kink in their time process, and has increased some of the costs, but they don't have any substitute projects for these funds.

Leftwich commented that it is fine if the City wants to continue on with this project, but as far as getting anything delivered in time, in terms of water quality NDDOT and the City are still negotiating on where to dump the water and there are a few other environmental issues that need to be addressed, so it will be a very tight schedule to pull this one off in time, but if it is then NDDOT will provide the funding necessary to get it done. He added that right now, however, in order to get their S.T.I.P. financially constrained they need to move some monies around, and this project seemed to have the slimmest chance of making it in time, so they moved the money to another project in the S.T.I.P.. He stated that he apologizes for not discussing this before, and will be in touch to discuss it further, but if they can show the \$8,700,000 cost, with \$4,000,000 being federally funded that would help them balance their S.T.I.P., and if the project does come to fruition, they will put the monies back in at that time and amend the S.T.I.P. and T.I.P. then. Grasser responded that he doesn't think he is in a position to agree to this, but if the State is going to do it they are going to do it, but he isn't in a position to say that the City concurs with that decision. He said that he doesn't know what other competing projects there are out there, or what their chances are of being done, but the City is working pretty hard on this now.

Haugen asked if the project the \$3,000,000 is going towards was in the PCR stage. Leftwich responded that it is. Haugen asked if was in the beginning stages or the 90% percentile. Leftwich responded that it is just starting, but there aren't any environmental issues to contend with so it should go quickly. Haugen asked where the \$3,000,000 would come from when the project is ready to be done. Leftwich responded that it would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

come from the state. He added that with the new highway bill coming up we may not be doing any of these projects if congress doesn't do something pretty quick, but assuming we get a fair level of funding we will juggle the money to get it back in there. Haugen asked if NDDOT would send a letter to the city requesting them to consider the proposed changes discussed so that it gets someone higher up on the chain than Mr. Grasser to make that decision. Leftwich responded that he would do that.

Haugen reported that he did not include any transit projects, but he knows that the Draft S.T.I.P., at least, was done before the City submitted JARC/New Freedom applications, and he was wondering if he should use what the City actually submitted instead of what is shown in the S.T.I.P. Leftwich responded that they can either be included or not, and if not they can be amended in at a later time. He added that he would look into it further and get back to him.

Haugen distributed copies of the Minnesota table illustrating the differences between the MNDOT S.T.I.P. and the MPOs T.I.P., and went over it as follows:

- 1) 23rd Street N.W. from River Road to Trunk Highway 220 Reconstruction

Haugen stated that this item has already been resolved.

- 2) Repair Blowup – Trunk Highway 220 from Climax to East Grand Forks, Trunk Highway 220 0.14 Miles north of CSAH 19

Haugen commented that it appears that a portion of this project is in the MPOs study area so it will probably have to be brought in to the T.I.P.. Haugen asked if the last project shown on the table, Trunk Highway 75 from Climax to East Junction Trunk Highway 3 Resurfacing was eliminated in the S.T.I.P. because of this project. Gilbertson responded that the last project was dropped because it will be done in 2012, but with 2013 funds.

- 3) Trunk Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W. Intersection Upgrade

Haugen pointed out that the federal dollar amount in the S.T.I.P. is lower than what is shown in the T.I.P.. He explained that the additional total project cost shown in the T.I.P. is higher due to some additional right-of-way costs, but he is wondering why the federal amount is less in the S.T.I.P. than the T.I.P.. Gilbertson responded that he would look into this issue and get back to him as soon as possible.

- 4) Section 5307 – EGF Fix Transit Operating Assistance
- 5) Section 5307 – EGF Transit Shelter/Coach Replacement

Haugen reported that the next two projects are scheduled for 2012 transit funding. Ehrenstrom pointed out that there may be a typo here as the Draft A.T.I.P. is built

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

off the T.I.P., so it could just be a typo for that year. Haugen agreed, adding that it appears that you just carried over the 2011 dollar amount for the fixed route. Ehrenstrom stated that he would look into this further. He added that the transit shelter and the coach replacement are typically two different projects. Haugen responded that the Draft T.I.P. doesn't show any shelter project, just the coach replacement because it follows the replacement schedule. Ehrenstrom said that he would look into this project further as well.

6) Sidewalk Connection Across US Trunk Highway 2 for Ped/Bike Trail

Haugen stated that this is most likely just a difference between the cost estimate, as the federal amount shown is the same for both the S.T.I.P. and the T.I.P.. He asked which amount he should be using, the \$195,000 or the \$147,000. Ellis commented that they applied for \$195,000, but were given \$147,000. Boppre stated that he thinks he should be using the \$147,000 figure, but will check into further.

7) Trunk Highway 75 from Climax to East Junction Trunk Highway 2 Resurfacing

Haugen stated that this project would be put back in.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON 32ND AVENUE SIGNAL COORDINATION STUDY

Haugen pointed out that copies of the first Technical Memorandum reporting the existing conditions on 32nd Avenue were included in the packets. He stated that it shows that we do have some level of services issues, as well as some traffic signal timing issues and a camera issue that have been resolved. He said that this information is now being used in the Synchro Traffic Model to produce some different coordination plans along the corridor.

Haugen commented that in two weeks Alliant Engineering will be here to work with City and District personnel to finalize which coordination plan they will input on all signals along 32nd Avenue except the interstate signals. He added that the City can implement, inform, and coordinate the plan with the State, but prior to the interstate signals having work done the State needs to review and approve the plan. Williams reported that she already sent that information to the State so it can be done before that time.

Haugen stated that Alliant will have their coordination alternatives to us by July 17th, so he sent an e-mail to Shawn Kuntz to see if they could have them reviewed prior to Wednesday, July 23rd, as Alliant plans on uploading them into the signals on Thursday, July 24th, and then review and tweak them over the next couple of days.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

Grasser commented that staff is planning on talking to the City's Public Information Center personnel, the City Council, and the public about this in order to make them aware that changes are going to be occurring along that corridor as well. Haugen suggested that the information could be taken to the Service Safety meeting on Tuesday. Grasser responded that right now his thought is that they will just take care of this through e-mail or memorandum, just so that the council and public is informed.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY

Ellis reported that she would like to just briefly go through the presentation that was given at the June 25th Steering Committee meeting and the open house in order to update you on where they are with the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor Study.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Ellis stated that KLJ, consultants, presented potential alternative design solutions for pavement, granitoid mitigation, intersection and access design, lighting and signage, landscape enhancements, and preservation. She reminded everyone that there are four project goals that they keep redefining: 1) to maintain and enhance the historic quality of the corridor; 2) to improve the ride quality; 3) to improve pedestrian safety (which she stated should actually state to improve safety, not just pedestrian safety); and 4) to look specifically at the intersection of Minnesota Avenue and 4th Avenue.

Ellis referred to the document in the packet, beginning on Page 113, and explained that once the goals were reviewed the consultants presented some draft design solutions. She went over them as follows:

- 1) Restore pavement ride and
Recognize characteristics of granitoid as it contributes to neighborhood aesthetics.
- 2) Extents of concrete stamping for removed granitoid. She explained that this would involve the removal of concrete and granitoid along the corridor, replacing it with stamped concrete that has been turned longitudinal so that it would be easier to maintain for the Public Works department as it doesn't chip as much, putting in new curb and gutter, and removing the sandstone. She stated that this would help improve the ride along the corridor considerably.
- 3) Examples of concrete stamping in corridor. She reported that this is all very preliminary at this time because they don't have any specific direction yet from the State Historical Preservation Society nor the Grand Forks Historical Preservation Society on this concept.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

- 4) Recognize safety issues for bicyclists, wheel chairs, and non-motorists and Ensure ADA accessibility throughout corridor. She explained that this is one of the concepts looked at to deal with pedestrian safety, as well as to preserve some of the historic qualities of the corridor, and it involves the possibility of putting in some bulb-outs, which would minimize the area that a pedestrian has to walk. She stated that they would also use some of the stamped concrete as well as some of the salvaged sandstone curbs in those bulb-outs. She said that this concept would not be used at all of the intersections, including those at Cherry and 4th and Belmont and 4th because there are turns and traffic lights at those intersections and we don't want to decrease the roadway at those points, but would be used at all others. Grasser stated that he was going to ask what the design vehicle will be and will it be applied to all intersections. Ellis responded that they could request that the same design vehicle be used at all intersections. Grasser said that that might be a problem with the bulb-outs, particularly when you get larger vehicles that need a wider turning radius.
- 5) Align skewed crosswalks. She explained that this is not necessarily something that will get done. She said that, while it would be nice to get them aligned, it can be confusing to some so this will need to be looked at further.

Ellis commented that they also talked about traffic calming, reducing speeds, and safety issues. She stated that one thing that helps with traffic calming, as well as presents both a nice entrance and lets people know they are in a historic neighborhood, is a median at corridor entries. She explained that while this option is desirable, it still needs to be looked into more thoroughly as there are issues such as private drives, etc., that need to be taken into consideration.

Grasser stated that something that needs to be considered is the fact that there are quite a number of large trees located close to the road, and someone should look at the aspect of road widths as they relate today, and in particular how they relate to those existing trees, as they have found that building roads in proximity to trees of that age can be very problematic in trying to save the tree. Ellis responded that that has been considered, and is, in-fact, a major issue for the Grand Forks Historical Preservation Society because some of those trees are included in the historical register for the neighborhood, so that will certainly be addressed if any intersections are changed. She added, however, that there aren't any plans on widening the corridor at this time, but the trees will be considered in any future plans.

Ellis commented that one of the main goals is to try to come up with a solution to the problem with the Minnesota Avenue/4th Avenue intersection. She explained that that intersection can be quite confusing, and people who aren't from the area might not follow the curve, and will continue forward instead, and there is also an issue with speed at that intersection, so the consultants came up with four intersection design recommendations, with the first two being mini-roundabouts. She referred to drawings of the four designs, and went over each briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

Ellis reported that the consultants also came up with some streetscape enhancement options, including period style lighting, street markers made out of salvaged sandstone curb, and street signs.

Ellis stated that the final recommendation involves the historic granitoid preservation. She explained that it has been noted that the side streets have the best granitoid at this point in time, and if an agreement can be reached between the City of Grand Forks and SHPO to preserve those and allow us to change the actual corridor pavement, that would be the best solution for all.

Durrenberger reported that the section of granitoid between 5th Steet and 6th Street is not granitoid, but instead is stamped concrete. Ellis stated that she would think that has already been noted, but she will relay that information in the event it hasn't.

Ellis said that they will now continue working on refining these recommendations, and hopefully get both historical societies to tell what they will and won't accept concerning the granitoid issue. She stated that the Steering Committee will be meeting in August, and then again in September along with another open house at that time.

Williams asked if the issue of maintenance will be addressed in the study, particularly whether or not there will be more maintenance required, and will the cost of maintenance be more or less than other areas of the city. Ellis responded that she doesn't know if that issue was included in the RFP or not, but agrees that that is an issue that probably should be looked at.

Grasser stated that he is trying to figure out how, when we are obtaining public input, particularly with these roundabouts, do we really relay to people how something like that will work. He said that he is wondering if it would be worthwhile to go out and literally put paint out in the field to show where the back of the curb will be, and where the sidewalk will be located, etc. He explained that he thinks when most people are shown a drawing, they still can't actually visualize how it will look in the field. Williams commented that that intersection has enough concrete that she would think it could actually be painted on the ground right where it would be located if done.

Further discussion ensued.

Grasser commented that he would like to reiterate that we need to make sure people are aware that, while we will try our best to do so, we may not be able to save all the trees along the corridor. He explained that from a practical standpoint, when you redo those streets, even if you keep the same alignment, by the time the contractor takes a foot out behind the curb to get the pull-arms and string lines set, and he has no idea where we are at with paving grades, but we now we try to use a minimum of .4% grade, and those old street may or may not be at that so we may have to adjust the existing grade as well, which, again creates a lot of issues when we are trying to get that transition from the curb to the tree and you only have three feet to work with, so some of the trees may need to be removed. Williams added that a lot of the roots are under the pavement so we are going to be disturbing some of the trees no matter what we do.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

Haugen referred to the newsletter, included in the packet, and pointed out that it refers to a Steering Committee meeting on July 30th, but that will now be held on August 6th instead.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON DIGITAL RIGHT-OF-WAY R.F.P.

Nelson referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it explains that an RFP was mailed out requesting proposals for an update to our Right-Of-Way Imagery File. She stated that we received one proposal from GoodPointe Technology. She said that the selection committee will meet to review their proposal, and its decision will be presented to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their July 24th, meeting.

Haugen added that there are two key points; that GoodPointe's bid proposal was about \$6,000 over the budgeted amount, and the fact that they have another project in Fargo in two weeks so they would be able to start our project once that project is done, which would mean that they would be able to begin in early August.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FREIGHT STUDY

Rood reported that back in May the Technical Advisory Committee was presented with the scope-of-work for the freight study, and at that time it was discussed that a large part of the study would involve communicating with the private sector and the freight community to try to solicit ideas an input from them. She referred to the packet and pointed out that there are three memorandums included that discuss some of the information we have been able to gather to-date, which will be included in the study.

Rood referred to the memorandums and went over each briefly. She explained that the first one documents a meeting that Earl and she attended with Brent Massmann, who represents the North Dakota State Mill, to discuss information regarding truck and train traffic to and from the Mill. She stated that the second one documents a meeting that she had with Peiter Hjerstedt, who represents BNSF, to discuss their train operations, infrastructure, and other freight related issues. She said that the last one documents issues and alternatives that have been raised by local trucking industry representatives.

Rood stated that all of the information discussed in all three memos will be included in the MPOs Freight Study. She said that her next step is to try to set up a meeting with various organizations such as Simplot, Crystal Sugar, etc., to get input from them regarding freight issues as well.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 9th, 2008**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. New Freedom Small Urban Transit Project

Ehrenstrom reported that MNDOT has re-released the New Freedom Small Urban Transit Project. He stated that the amount is small, \$275,000, but is available for regional mobility management projects, new services, and has a deadline of August 31st for applications.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 9TH, 2008, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:12 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Executive Assistant