

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer; Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer; and Teri Kouba (Proxy for Dale Bergman), Cities Area Transit; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT- Bemidji; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; and Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer.

Guest(s) present were: Al Grasser, GF City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen reported that a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE JULY 14TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2010 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT**

Haugen reported that, as part of our T.I.P. process, we are required to self-certify together with our State DOTs that we are following the appropriate regulations. He referred to a copy of the Self-Certification document, included in the packet, and explained that this is something that used to be included as part of the T.I.P., however a couple of years ago Federal Highway asked

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

that we have it as a separate, distinct agenda item. He added, however, that this year it is still included as an appendix in our T.I.P. document, so although we are taking action as a separate item now, when we approve the T.I.P. later on the agenda, it is included as an appendices in that document as well.

Haugen referred to the Self-Certification document, page 3, and pointed out that it identifies all of the CFRs and USCs, etc., that we are required to follow as we go through our annual planning process. He added that that we have provided all of the documentation as to how we fulfill those things in this document.

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2010 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. DOCUMENT**

Haugen reported that back in April we approved a Draft Minnesota T.I.P., and in June we approved a Draft North Dakota T.I.P., and we now need to approve a combined Final T.I.P. document.

Haugen referred to the document, included in the packet, and pointed out that there are a couple of new appendices attached. He explained that we have always included our annual listing of obligations for the prior year, shown in Appendix I; but that this year we also need to include the ARRA projects as well, so we added that information under Appendix II. He added that, again, we have also included, under Appendix IV, the Self-Certification document, otherwise all other appendices are as they have been in the past.

Haugen commented that one other addition/change is to the North Dakota project list, and it involves a new numbering system for the S.T.I.P. projects. He explained that after we have listed our number system, we added a PCN # (a project control number), which is what is used in the S.T.I.P. He stated that there are a few projects for which he still does not have a PCN # for, and he also believes that transit projects do not have PCN #s, so there are still some amendments that need to be made to the project list to include the PCN #s once they are identified.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, they have been identifying the State numbering system for those projects for years, so no changes need to be made to that project list.

Noehre commented that some of the North Dakota projects may not have PCN #s yet, adding that if they aren't in the Draft S.T.I.P., they will not have PCN #s identified yet.

Haugen stated that since we adopted our Draft T.I.P., not many changes have been made, although there was one made to Project 6, the Gateway Drive project. He explained that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

originally the cost of this project was estimated to be about \$3,000,000, and included doing that portion from I-29 to Columbia Road; and then in 2013 or 2014 doing that portion from Columbia to the Red River, again at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000, for a total project cost of \$6,000,000. He said, however, that the NDDOT, along with others, reviewed the scope of work and project estimates, and decided that they would combine the two projects, expand the termini to include that portion from I-29 to the Red River, at an estimated project cost of \$2,000,000. Lang explained that the project involves the rehabilitation of pavement between I-29 and the Red River, with the exception of that portion from the English Coulee to Columbia Road, which should be included as a separate project later on. Haugen agreed, pointing out that the area between the English Coulee and Columbia Road is shown listed as Projects 17 and 18. He asked if he should include this information in the original project description. Consensus was that it should be included.

Noehre referred to Project #10, and asked if the corrections he sent last week were made to this project. Haugen responded that the corrections will show up after today's action. He stated that he did send an e-mail explaining that the document included in today's packet is the public document that went out prior to those corrections being identified, so we will note those corrections now, and will include them in the updated document that will be forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board for final approval.

Haugen referred to Page 49, Project #10 – Signing between 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to Forest River northbound, and explained that he had originally identified this as being just a northbound project, but it is actually both directions. He stated that the other change Mr. Noehre identified was to the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Project, Project #22 on Page 54, and involves a change to the project description, which currently states that this involves rehab and overlay, but Mr. Noehre asked that the word “or” be added to the description as well so that it states that this involves rehab and/or overlay.

Williams referred to Page 35, second paragraph, and pointed out that the third sentence, which states: “This resulted in the loss of several federally assisted projects”, is not a current statement. She added that the next sentence, which states: “The new policy establishes an assessment district ¼ the distance...” should be “The new policy establishes an assessment district ½ the distance...”

Grasser referred to Page 35, first sentence, and commented that it talks about the City Share Fund, and while they have used it in the past it is rarely used in recent times so he was wondering if we should state that somehow as the way it is portrayed it looks like it is a direct combination of those types of funds, but City Share is a mill levy. He suggested that we might want to note that the City is trying to get away from using City Share funds altogether. He then referred to the third paragraph on Page 35, and commented that the sentence that states: “This is intended to provide more equity in the application of the assessments...”, should end after the word assessments, as they aren't reducing the likelihood of protest.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

Noehre referred to Page 25, and pointed out that the first paragraph indicates that this is a three-year T.I.P., that should be four-year T.I.P.

Hanson reported that they are verifying their operations and maintenance numbers in their final T.I.P., so should she find any differences between the two documents she will let the MPO know. Haugen referred to Page 39, Table 5, and commented that last year, after the Final T.I.P. approval, we were asked to prepare an Operations and Maintenance section, however, last year, because the request came after we completed our T.I.P. process we did a separate document, but this year it is incorporated directly into our T.I.P. document. He explained that it is essentially a repeat of what we did last year.

Haugen commented that there was a notice in the paper that a Public Hearing would be held at today's meeting, therefore he would like to open the Public Hearing at this time. He added that the notice also indicated that comments could be submitted until noon today, however no comments were received.

There was no one present for discussion.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Grasser referred to Page 41, the item of Collectors, and pointed out that it states that a collector, by design, is usually a two-lane with parking permitted within the roadway. He said that, although it can be, he knows that on the Grand Forks side, on their newer streets they have been trying to eliminate parking within those systems. Williams added that on their local streets, if they are going to say anything about parking, it would be to say that if parking were permitted it would only be allowed on one side of the roadway. Haugen asked that a more precise wording be suggested. Grasser responded that it might read that the goal for the City of Grand Forks is to not have parking within the right-of-way, although exceptions are made with reconstruction. Williams suggested, instead, that it be written that local parking is permitted as signed.

Noehre commented that he isn't sure the parking description for the interstate is quite accurate either. He said that they actually have to have "No Parking" signs otherwise someone can sit there for up to 72-hours.

Haugen referred to the last table for each side, and explained that they include a summary of all project costs over the four year time period. He pointed out that the total project costs for Grand Forks are just under \$41,000,000, with \$10,000,000 for transit; and just under \$14,000,000 for East Grand Forks.

Grasser referred to Page 120, a copy of the MPO Website Home Page, and pointed out that under the announcements heading it still indicates that the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor Study Final Report is a "New" project. Haugen responded that it is still a "new" project on our website as it has not been replaced with an updated report. Grasser stated that he feels that is misleading as the other items listed are either more current, or are actively being worked on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. DOCUMENT, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CHANGES AS NOTED ABOVE.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE A.T.A.C. SCHOOL STUDY SCOPE-OF-WORK**

Haugen reported that this item is currently in the MPO Annual Unified Planning Work Program, and we have a contract with A.T.A.C. to complete the study. He explained that we held off doing this until school was back in session, and now that school will be starting up soon, Ms. Ellis is working with A.T.A.C. personnel to get things started. He pointed out that a copy of the scope-of-work was included in the packets, and asked that Ms. Ellis give a brief overview on what the study will entail.

Ellis stated that this is the annual A.T.A.C. School Safety Study we have done over the past few years. She explained that these studies look at engineering improvements as well as circulation, signage, operations, parking, etc., in order to ensure that we meet safety requirements for our schools.

Ellis referred to the staff report, and pointed out that they will be looking at Winship, Wilder, and St. Michaels schools this year. She commented that St. Michaels is on a very busy street, and the City of Grand Forks asked that we take a look at some of the issues they have with safety concerns. Noehre stated that they have actually looked into some of the safety concerns at St. Michaels as well, have done a speed study, etc., and ultimately found that one of the problems is simply the amount of mid-block crossings that are made along that street.

Ellis reported that the main objective of the study will be to evaluate pedestrian safety, review roadway and parking characteristics, review traffic control and pavement markings, evaluate traffic circulation and then provide possible short and long-term improvements for each school.

Ellis commented that the study will begin with meetings with school principals, PTO members, GF Engineering staff, Safe Kids staff, GF School District staff, and other representatives from the schools in order to gather information, after which a site visit will then be conducted, a draft report will be prepared, and a final report completed by November for approval in December.

Noehre stated that he would get the data they collected for St. Michaels to Ms. Ellis to provide to A.T.A.C. Grasser suggested that they might also want to invite Mark Aubol to these meetings as well.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE A.T.A.C. SCHOOL STUDIES SCOPE-OF-WORK, AS SUBMITTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2010 UNIFIED PLANNING  
WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that last month the NDDOT notified the MPO that there may be some additional CPG funds available, and just prior to the July MPO Executive Policy Board meeting NDDOT requested that there be an item on the agenda asking the board if they wanted to accept those funds, they agreed they did.

Haugen stated that the next step, then, is to amend our work program to identify the additional work activities decided upon through project solicitation, and through working with local staff. He explained they are essentially corridor studies that take place on the North Dakota side, and in working with North Dakota and Federal Highways, instead of embedding this into the 37 page work program, it was determined that we would just identify where those four studies fit within our typical work program. He pointed out that there is a section titled “Corridor Planning”, that still lists the current activities, and identifies new activities as well.

Haugen referred to page 135, and pointed out that it still lists the street type activities we are doing, however this will change with the addition of these new projects. He pointed out that there are two projects on Washington Street: one on Hammerling to 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, including the underpass structure; and one on 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South where the new Wellness Center is locating. He added that that the other projects involve identifying corridor improvements needed to convert the rural section of roadway on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue to an urban section; and examining the various street network potentials, focusing on the collector street network in southwest Grand Forks.

Haugen asked Mr. Rau if he got any feedback from the Safety Service Committee at their meeting last evening. Rau responded that the only comment was regarding the estimated cost, that it seemed high to them, but he did try to explain that it is a comprehensive study and these are just estimates at this time.

Haugen stated that the MPOs intent is to get a couple of these study’s RFPs completed for approval at our next meeting, and the remaining two will be done in October or November. He said that the intent of our receiving this money is to show that we are able to spend it in a quick manner.

Haugen reported that next month there will be an agenda item discussing work activities for the full two-year 2011-2012 Unified Planning Work Program, and these four studies will automatically be carried over into that work program.

Haugen thanked the Bismarck-Mandan MPO for releasing some funds, which allows us to do some additional, and necessary corridor studies in our MPO area, and also a thank you to North Dakota and Federal Highway for assisting with that process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE 2010 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF NEW T.I.P. PROCESS**

Haugen stated that staff thought they had gotten a draft copy of the T.I.P. Project Selection Process document out soon enough for people to be prepared to recommend final action on it, however, due to some abnormalities with the copying and distribution, some people did not receive everything in time, so we have been asked to just have a review and comment session on this item this month, and carry it over to next month for action.

Haugen explained that several years ago all three MPOs were asked to develop a process for the selection of projects for our T.I.P. documents. He stated that they have been working on that request, and have put together a manual that highlights what the process will be. He said that he hopes that they have captured the critical milestone items needed to assist with the process of project selection.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that they did include a matrix that shows all the federal programs for both North Dakota and Minnesota that are available for funding. He said that the Minnesota matrix was a draft document, and a more up-to-date version was distributed at the beginning of this meeting.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and went over the seven key highlights of the new process.

Noehre referred to 3 and 4 on the highlight list, and asked about the word “distributed” and whether or not that means that the MPO will put the funds in their bank account and then distribute them out. Haugen responded that the MPO doesn’t do anything with the money except prioritize it in our T.I.P., so that is what is meant by distributed. He stated that in our case it is one city one MPO, but in Fargo/Moorhead and Bismarck/Mandan Ms. Hanson could better explain how the monies will be distributed. Hanson responded that both Fargo/Moorhead and Bismarck/Mandan are still working this out, how the money gets sort of consolidated, and then how the projects are solicited and rotated depending on the need so that each jurisdiction gets it fair portion of projects throughout the process. Haugen added that for the five cities, there used to be a letter sent to thirteen cities soliciting projects, with a table attached to it, but now, for the five MPO cities, the State will send a letter to each MPO, and the MPO will then distribute down to its member jurisdictions, so that is the “distribution” he is talking about in the staff report. Noehre said, then, that it is essentially just notification, and distribution means there is money available for projects.

Grasser asked if there was a way to change the wording to make it a little bit clearer. He pointed out that we use the word solicitation a lot elsewhere, but he doesn’t see that word used in Item 3

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

at all, and instead the word “distributed” is used here, and while the noun they both refer to is “funds”, how he reads it is “funds will be distributed to the MPO but they used to be distributed to the City. He stated that there are more words in there than that, but that is how he reads it, so he was wondering if there was a way to reword it to make it clearer, maybe we could say “solicitation of funds” instead. Noehre suggested that both Items 3 and 4 could be removed totally because Items 1 and 2 take care of it by soliciting T.I.P. projects with the funding, that’s what those are saying. Haugen agreed, but added that it is also saying that for those five entities, they are not going to get a direct letter from the DOT saying, that as part of the thirteen cities, here is the amount your city is sub-allocated.

Suggestions on wording ensued as follows:

1. Williams suggested that they could just say that the MPO will notify the appropriate entity of the STP funds.
2. Grasser added that it could state that the NDDOT sub-allocated notification of STP funds will be distributed by the MPO.
3. Williams suggested it could say that notification of the NDDOT sub-allocated STP funds will be distributed by the MPO, or issued by the MPO, or released by the MPO as you are actually releasing the letter.

Grasser asked if it is even funds or is it programming. Haugen responded that for the other MPOs it is funds because they have more than one, so for Fargo and West Fargo, North Dakota is going to provide the COG one number for their MPO area, so Fargo won’t receive a sub-allocation of that sub-allocation, and Bismarck-Mandan is the same way. Grasser said, then, that a letter to Fargo is going to say something like “you are hereby awarded \$2,000,000 to be used as needed”. Haugen responded that Fargo will get a letter from FM-COG stating that they have received a certain amount of funds that North Dakota is sub-allocating to the Fargo-Moorhead area, and COG is asking Fargo-West Fargo for projects, and then they will go through the prioritization process of determining who gets what, and Fargo won’t be allocated a specific amount year in and year out. Hanson stated that, basically, what this means is that it will no longer be Fargo’s money and West Fargo’s money, it will be a combined pot of money for the urban area, and the jurisdictions will need to submit their lists of projects to the MPO, and those projects will be prioritized into the T.I.P. according to the dollar amount available, and what the DOT wants is some form of fairness developed to ensure that one jurisdiction doesn’t get all the projects, and the other doesn’t get any, and that has to do with how voting is set up on their member board and their policy board, but that is an issue they have to deal with.

Grasser asked if Ms. Hanson was referring to the more regional type of monies. Hanson responded that she is referring to the Urban Roads dollars. Grasser asked if each community isn’t garnered a certain amount of dollars based on population. Hanson responded that that is essentially how it was supposed to work, but in the MPO area, for the CFR we have to treat it as an MPO area pot of money for the entire urban area. She added that in the case of Grand Forks, it is much easier because it is just Grand Forks using the money from the pot, whereas Fargo-Moorhead and Bismarck-Mandan, they each have two cities using the money from the pot, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

one year Fargo could be using West Fargo's money, and the next year West Fargo could be using Fargo's money, and the same with Bismarck-Mandan, so their process is a little more difficult to set up than Grand Forks'.

Haugen stated that under the old system there were thirteen sub-allocations, but now there are essentially eleven sub-allocations, but the same basis of the sub-allocations has remained the same – funds divided by population – but combing the allocated amount into one pot for Fargo-Moorhead and for Bismarck-Mandan. Noehre commented that there are still thirteen sub-allocations, but two of them are A and B. Hanson agreed that they still start out with thirteen, but after they go through the funding formulas, then they get combined into one pot of money to address projects in the MPO area. Grasser asked, then, if the MPO is kind of the referee in those communities. Hanson responded that that is somewhat correct. Grasser asked, are they somewhat in control, or are they totally in control, he is just trying to understand the wording of this document. Hanson responded that it depends on the funding program, because for STP dollars, the federal pot of money, we need to go through the project solicitation and prioritization process, but there are other pots of money that we do not need to go through that process. She added that it is up to the MPO to generate the process, and that means that each member jurisdiction needs to be comfortable with the process, and that is why Mr. Haugen has put out these drafts, so everyone needs to take a careful look at this and make sure you understand it, and that it is a process you can work with. She said that if anyone has any questions, please work with Mr. Haugen and his staff, or you can contact the NDDOT as well. She added that, while they will be implementing this with the 2012-2015 T.I.P. process, but since it is a brand new product, they anticipate that there will be some difficulties, and that there may be some things that don't work well that we will need to look at, so they will be working with the MPO to make adjustments throughout the process.

Grasser thanked Ms. Hanson for the explanation, and stated that they will work with Mr. Haugen on drafting some word changes to clarify what he thinks he heard today, but he wants to be a little careful with this as the other two jurisdictions are two communities receiving federal funding through the same state organization, while our MPO is cross-states, so we are not competing for the same funds and yet the MPO organization's membership has four members from Minnesota and four from North Dakota, so we want to be cautious about making sure that the jurisdictions that have to come up with the local funding have the ability to control that project.

Hanson stated that she thinks that everyone has some valid concerns, and it certainly is understandable, but she has been reviewing Mr. Haugen's process, as well as the other two MPO's processes, and she has questions on all three as well, but this is all part of the federal requirements, and is something we need to work out.

Williams stated she knows that the Federal FHWA worked on all of this stuff, but when they developed this ranking policy, and all these other things we went through, was it primarily to handle a situation where you have competing agencies, and did they say anything about this at all when there wasn't a competing agency. Hanson responded that they really haven't said anything

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

about that. She stated that Grand Forks has a unique situation in that the ranking you do on the North Dakota side needs to apply to Grand Forks, and the ranking you do on the Minnesota side needs to apply to East Grand Forks, and therefore you are doing a lot of extra work to basically develop a product similar to what you do now, just a different method of getting there.

Grasser commented that he thinks we have a separate set of problems, and he knows that Mr. Haugen gets caught up in the middle of some of these discussions, wherein some MPO members want to see the money put into projects that will benefit the cross-traffic between the two states, and it is easier for some members to be able to push, if in-fact they haven't been suffering the repercussions of the loss of that money going someplace else; in other words, on the Grand Forks side we have some internal needs as far as transportation expansion, street rehabilitation and reconstruction type things, which half the MPO members do not have a direct connection with that type of project, but are more directly impacted and benefiting as individuals and representatives of the community of the bridges, and yet at the local level, when we come up with funding, and when we bring up some of these things to Service Safety and some of the other committees they say that isn't where our priority is, so we have a bit of a disconnect there that we need to work on, and, of course, there are only two members on the MPO committee that have to directly face the taxpayers on the financial issues of what is going on in Grand Forks, and what money we spend on what roads.

Hanson stated that they think that it would still be best if your engineering department develops your list of priorities, as you have in the past, and submit them to the MPO, and give them the information they need, so what you need to do now is to make sure that the process the MPO is setting up works for you, and your comfortable that it allows your jurisdiction to be able to reflect the type of projects you have historically been submitting, and what you think you will continue to do in the future. She added that she thinks that a real key part of this process still needs to be the engineering department because the engineering department and the public works department are so close to the roads and traffic, and what is going on out there, so you are the ones that really know what needs to be done.

Williams said that there was something in the draft bill that the voting structure was going to be changed for the MPO, that the voting members of the MPO would be represented in proportion to the population. She asked if that was included in the final bill, or did it not go through. Haugen responded that there is no bill to speak of, there was a draft submitted by Obestar that was done fourteen months ago, and it did contain that provision, but those were for large MPOs, and would not apply to MPOs of our size, but it was not formally submitted. Williams said that what she is talking about was actually part of the legislation of the re-authorization. Haugen responded that that is what he is speaking of, but it has not been formally submitted to the House of Representatives. He said that it floated as a draft by Obestar, and that is part of the problem, that there is no draft for either chamber to respond to. Noehre said that it is currently controlled by the two governors, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Grasser referred to Item 7, "Regionally significant projects not funded with federal resources will need to be included in the T.I.P." He asked how you define what a regionally significant project

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

is. Haugen responded that they took a stab at that. He referred to Page 160, and explained that they used the US Code that Federal Highway and FTA updated when SAFETEA-LU came out, straight out of the CFR. He stated that the key thing is “consultation”.

Grasser asked who is going to make the call, the MPO Executive Director. He stated that he has a problem with the word “all”. He commented that using that definition, for every subdivision road that goes in we will invent a process, then, to do a review, submission, and approval process of all these subdivisions. He said that we will have to go through a review and documentation process for every pedestrian crosswalk we put on a collector road. He stated that we have sidewalk work that, for the most part, our technician out in the field determines as to where and when the work should be done, and we have such a short construction season, that if we have to go through this type of process we won’t be able to get all the work done that we need to get done. Williams added that that kind of thing would eventually go through the City Council, wouldn’t it. Grasser responded that just the funding would go to them. Williams asked if Mr. Haugen wouldn’t get a copy of the City Council agendas, and therefore wouldn’t be able to review them to find out what is going on to determine if there is anything the MPO needs to be involved in. Haugen responded he does get a copy of both City Council agendas already.

Ellis asked if the MPO needs to prioritize regionally significant projects if they are not using federal dollars, or do they just need to be listed in the T.I.P. Hanson responded that they just need to be listed in the T.I.P. Grasser asked if we really want to see a T.I.P. that has all these little projects listed. Ellis responded that it is part of the CFR, not the MPO saying that we want to put every regionally significant project down. Grasser stated that he agrees that he doesn’t want to get into the level of detail either, he just wants to make sure that that is clear in this document, so he is wondering if there should be certain dollar limits, or do you want to know about every \$200 project we are going to do just because it happens to touch Washington Street, or are there some limits or exclusions that we can include in this document to alleviate that kind of thing. Hanson responded that she would check to see if there is a definition or example available for regionally significant projects.

Williams referred to that portion of the definition that states: “would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area’s transportation network”, and said that that would mean an extension of a classified road or an additional lane or something that would add capacity, and she can’t imagine them doing anything that wouldn’t involve federal dollars, so that is very very limited for what would be included in your modeling, when you would change your model.

Grasser commented that other than the first two bullet points all the rest of them are clearly major big things that should be included in that planning aspect, but those first two bullets are just a little too general and could be applied to too local of a situation, so we don’t have to worry about the others too much, but we need clarification on those two.

Ellis suggested that the bullet stating that all projects on transportation facilities installing necessary ADA improvement is too vague as well as that could mean a truncated dome or something of that sort, so that would be another one to review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

Grasser said, again, that maybe there is a dollar amount exclusion, as he can't imagine that they want to know about every project that's under \$500, \$1,000, or even \$10,000, as they wouldn't produce much of an impact. Rau added that there are times when you don't even know about a project until a few weeks or months ahead of time so you would be doing amendments all the time.

Haugen referred to the staff report, Item 5, and commented that they had to come up with some specific scoring sheets, copies of which were included in the packet. He explained that there were several meetings held with engineering staff to create these sheets, and these are the result of those meetings.

Haugen referred to Item 6, and commented that it deals with financial planning for the T.I.P., trying to ensure that we get a stronger relationship between the financial plan that is in the T.I.P. document and the financial plan in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Noehre referred to Item 5, and asked if the scoring sheets include a definition for each item so that you get some level of understanding other than a short bullet of what that exactly means. Haugen responded that this is as far as they have gotten.

Williams referred to Item 5, and asked about the statement that says the MPO will prioritize projects, whether that means MPO the staff or MPO the group. Haugen responded that it means MPO the group. Grasser asked if the scoring sheets will go to the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded that the score sheets will be submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee, and then the MPO staff will do the scoring, and then, like most everything else the Technical Advisory Committee reacts to, the document is put forth, it is part of the process that each project has the ability before the Technical Advisory Committee to have its project presented and discussed so we have a great understanding of each project, and it is your recommendation that the Technical Advisory Committee reacts to, and forwards on to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval.

Grasser commented that he is wondering if draft scoring sheets should be created by the initiating agency as part of that, which would then go to the MPO as well. Williams agreed that they should submit those with their list of projects as well.

Grasser stated that the process looks cumbersome because they are developing the scope, and what they think are the details, and then they have to explain it to the MPO who then looks it over and explains it to the Technical Advisory Committee, and so on. Williams said that they found, when they were going through and doing just the initial practice one, they knew exactly where they were going to be putting in a ramp, or they knew where they were adding a sidewalk, and when your trying to write a scoping on a project your not going to write in every little tiny thing, and that affects the score. Grasser added that a lot of those decisions aren't made until you get into the PCR. Williams agreed, adding that that is the thing with the MUTCD right now, is that it left out the engineering judgement clause, and that is where the engineering judgement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

comes into this, to have us do the initial scoring sheets, and then the MPO can go through them again. Ellis stated that it would make sense if engineering submitted your scoring sheets as they aren't going to change, so if there was something that the MPO wasn't aware of in the scope, by putting it in the scoring sheet we would have an explanation if needed.

Noehre asked how many lists there will be, he knows there will be at least two, one for Grand Forks and one for East Grand Forks, but will there also be a priority list for each fund source as well. Haugen responded that for projects that have more than one thing being funded out of that program there will be a priority list for that program. He added that this is already done now, so that isn't anything new.

Haugen commented that the matrix's are trying to identify all of the funding programs, and how they are used in North Dakota and Minnesota.

Noehre asked of the STP regional was going to remain the same as it currently is. Hanson responded that currently for regional projects the district and the city work together and submit them to the DOT, and they get programmed; but now the MPO is going to solicit for projects, so the district and the city will need to work together to get that information to the MPO, however the DOT will still be setting up the program for those regional projects because they have to compare all the regional requests they get statewide, so the MPO can submit their list of regional projects to the DOT so they can set them up in an urban regional program like we currently do.

Haugen commented that that is what has already been going on here, in December you submit your list of projects to the MPO, but that wasn't occurring with some of the other MPOs in the state, so for them that will be a bigger change.

Grasser referred to Page 213, federal funding categories, and said that it seems like there are a lot of programs out there that, from a practical standpoint, don't really have any funding associated with them. He stated that the way the DOT is working the program, he is just wondering which of these programs are really things they should be applying to that don't, in-turn, simply detract from their urban monies. He explained that he asks this because it still comes out of their urban pot, but is earmarked to something else, so on the City side it really doesn't do them much good, they are just giving up their same piece of money under a different title, so it would be helpful to him to know which of these programs actually carry with them additional funding. Hanson responded that they will be holding an MPO Director's Meeting later this month and she will address the issue at that time.

Haugen referred to the Matrix's and went over the information they provide. He stated that there is a lot of information here, but they are just trying to make it so that people understand the T.I.P. process in a document format.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2010,  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:09 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Office Manager