

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 9th, 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); Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineering; Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit, Denny Johnson, NDDOT/Transit Division-Bismarck; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Aaron Nelson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; 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.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, because there are some new faces present today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 12TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE THE MAY 12TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2010-2013 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the staff report, included in the packets, identifies the amendments that need to be made to the 2010-2013 T.I.P.. He added that a copy of the public hearing notice was also included, and indicated that the public had until noon today to submit comments as well, however none were received.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion. Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen then referred to slides of the T.I.P. project tables, and went briefly over the proposed amendments as follows:

Grand Forks Project #11: This amendment involves 5309 Grant Monies for FY 2009 that the City of Grand Forks will be using to purchase automatic vehicle locators (AVL) for its fixed route and dial-a-ride vehicles that are out in service; for the filling in of a service pit in the bus barn; and for the purchase of some non-revenue service vehicles. The total cost of this project is \$286,000, with \$229,000 being covered by the FTA 5309 Grant, and the remaining \$57,000 being covered with local monies.

Grand Forks Project #16: This amendment involves a modification to the current project, to update our traffic signals in order to be able to install coordination timing plans, and also get a transit signal priority system installed as well. The modification involves the addition of two more signal locations to the roughly 20 locations already identified. The staff report notes that this modification will increase the cost of the project by \$93,000, with \$78,000 of that being paid with federal dollars, and \$15,000 with local dollars.

Haugen commented that these are funds that have already been awarded to CAT, and the projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and are fiscally constrained, therefore, staff is recommending that we forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the amendments to the 2010-2013 T.I.P. as presented.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY2010-2013 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Williams asked if amendments would be necessary to the T.I.P. should additional funding be made available for Safe Routes To School projects. Haugen suggested that this question should be addressed when discussing Agenda Item VII.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

MATTER OF MODIFICATION TO DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. – MINNESOTA

Ellis reported that the City of East Grand Forks has received transportation enhancement funding from the State for two, well actually three projects that are currently included in the T.I.P.. She stated that one of those projects, a 2011 T.I.P. project, involves the construction of a bikepath from 5th Street N.W. to connect with the bikepath at 8th Street N.W.. She explained, however, that a problem arose when another T.I.P. project, a full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W., which was being funded using City Sub-Target funds, was pushed back to 2014, thereby causing a problem with the installation of the proposed bikepath until that project is completed. She stated that because of this they are asking for approval to submit a request to the ATP to move the 2012 T.I.P. project, which is a continuation of sidewalks along Central Avenue, and across 2nd improving the pedestrian islands up to 14th, to 2011, and the 2011 T.I.P. project back to 2012.

Ellis commented that in terms of the cost of making this change, there would be a difference of about \$10,000 to the City's share. Haugen added that they discussed this with MNDOT staff, and they seemed okay with the change.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO THE DRAFT 2011-2014 MINNESOTA T.I.P.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2011-2014 T.I.P. – NORTH DAKOTA

Haugen reported that he did include a copy of the Draft 2011-2014 T.I.P., which was available both on the MPO website, as well as a hard copy in both the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks offices for public input; however, because some changes were required, and an updated version has just been distributed.

Sanders reported present.

Haugen referred to the updated document, and went over the changes as follows:

- 1) Page 3 – Changed “Minnesota Department of Transportation” to “North Dakota Department of Transportation”.
- 2) Page 4 – Changed “Minnesota Side” to “North Dakota Side”.
- 3) Grand Forks Project #5 – Transit project seeking New Freedom Funds. The project description has been changed to identify that one demand response vehicle will be purchased instead of “some” vehicles.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

- 4) Grand Forks Project #9 – There used to be some operational improvements on I-29 listed, but that has been completely eliminated and in its place it indicates that two Dynamic Message signs will be installed along I-29, essentially near 32nd Avenue and Gateway Drive. The cost of each sign is \$175,000, for a total project cost of \$350,000, and it will be funded with an 80/20 match, with the 20% being funded by the State of North Dakota.
- 5) Grand Forks Project #14 – Previously there was no Project #14, it was intentionally left blank, but now a project has been programmed, to install a Dynamic Message sign on U.S. #2 west of I-29. The cost for this sign is \$112,000, with 80% being funded with federal dollars, and 20% being funded with state dollars.
- 6) Grand Forks Project #19 – Downtown Traffic Signal Upgrades. Change involves a more descriptive project description, with no change to the cost of the project.
- 7) Grand Forks Project #27 – This project was previously Grand Forks Project #35, but it has been identified that this project's funding will occur in 2013 rather than in 2014, so it was moved up. The project is being funded through the safety program, and involves new pedestrian countdowns at a couple of intersections in Grand Forks.

Haugen asked for clarification on whether the Draft S.T.I.P. is correct in that the local match for this project is being funded by the State of North Dakota, or should it be the City of Grand Forks. Hanson responded that she would double check on this, but that it is her belief that Washington would have a State and City match, and Columbia a State match. Lang stated that he would agree with this.

Williams stated that she has a question on one of the e-mails she received yesterday, in that it reported that some of the other jurisdictions were taking their money and buying as many pedestrian heads as they could and then installing them themselves, is that correct. Hanson responded that that is correct. Williams said, then, that it appears that Grand Forks may be able to use these on Columbia, Washington, 32nd, and Gateway, as they are all State Highways, correct. Hanson responded that you will need to go through traffic operations with the safety program and they would have to approve that. Williams asked, however, if it would be a possibility if approved, and if so, how would they amend it in. Hanson responded that they would have to work with traffic operations on this.

Haugen clarified that this is an HSIP request that the City of Grand Forks sent directly to the State, with a request for \$198,000, to do pedestrian count downs. He stated that they are being awarded \$30,000 of the requested amount, so there is still the issue of who pays for the local match, otherwise everything else has been identified sufficiently. Hanson responded that the City and the MPO should see

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

more information concerning this project soon. She explained that technically, as of right now the HSIP is still in draft form, and has not yet received approval, so the projects going into their Draft S.T.I.P., and your Draft T.I.P., are based on the Draft HSIP, however, everything being proposed does meet all the requirements, so they don't foresee any issues with getting them approved, but she believes the Final HSIP will be completed within the next couple of months.

- 8) Grand Forks Projects 31 and 32 – Rehabilitation of US #2. Project descriptions expanded to include more information on what rehabilitation will encompass for each project. Lang pointed out that the word “Gateway” was misspelled for each project.

Durrenberger asked if there was a reason there was no Project 27. Williams stated that there is a Project 27, but there isn't a Project 28.

- 9) Grand Forks Project 34 – In remark section the candidate for the intersection improvement has been identified – Washington and 40th Avenue South.

Haugen referred to the Illustrative Project section, and pointed out that there are no longer any illustrative projects identified. He explained that when the draft document was sent out they had conflicting information regarding the previously shown illustrative project, DeMers Avenue, between Washington and 5th Street, whereby it was listed as “pending”, which means that if there are any funds left over they would be used to complete this project, however it has now been programmed, and is shown as Project 13.

Haugen reported that the last series of changes were necessary due to a request that we provide information on the status of our 2010 projects, or the current year projects, that are more reflective of how they are shown in our T.I.P. document. He explained that he took the annual element of the T.I.P. document, all the North Dakota projects, and provided, under the status section, the status of each project. He went over each project as follows:

- 1) 5309 Funds – Waiting for these funds to be awarded. Johnson reported that, as of yesterday afternoon, they were supposed to hear back from FTA on the draw-down, which was awarded \$1.4 million for the entire State, but that did not occur. He added that there is also a possibility that the 5309 program could change, and he doesn't know how if or when that may occur, but if it does it could conceivably make the process more competitive. Haugen said that once the monies are awarded, we may have to do an amendment to our T.I.P. to include the amount awarded us.
- 2) JARC/New Freedom - Route 12/13, is in operation. Bergman responded it was in operation. Haugen asked if the vehicle has been purchased. Bergman responded it has not. He explained that they have been awarded the money, but they have not yet purchased the vehicle.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

- 3) Advanced construction payback on the I-29 reconstruction project done last year.
- 4) South 48th Street Project - City Council awarded the bids for this project at their meeting this past Monday. Williams added there is still some issues with the engineering portion of this project. Haugen commented that he does know that the bid came in about 25% lower than the estimate given.
- 5) Cherry Street – Under construction at this time.
- 6) US #2 to Arvilla – Up for bids. Lang explained that bids were supposed to let in April, but then everything got slashed, so he isn't sure what the status is on this project at this time.
- 7) PCR For the Sorlie Bridge Project – Agreements are still being worked out between the two states as to who will be the lead agent on the project. He asked if Ms. Hanson received his e-mail concerning this project. Hanson responded that she had received the e-mail, and after checking on it, found that they are still working on the agreement.
- 8) Kennedy Bridge Pier Replacement Project - Haugen reported that this project has been eliminated.
- 9) Safe Routes To School For Safe Kids Coalition – This is an on-going operation, with this past year being the third.
- 10) South 42nd Street Side Path – Bids are being awarded for this project.
- 11) Sign Project – Bids will be awarded in October.
- 12) Traffic Signals and Transit Priority – Transit equipment has been purchased with the exception of the two just added. Haugen asked if the bids would be going out soon for the 2070's. Williams responded that that is what she wanted to ask Ms. Hanson. She explained that she can't find any reference, that they have the sole source letter now, but she cannot find a previous project that was equipment purchase only because their city employees will be doing all of the installation of the equipment, so there will be no contractor involved, so how do they sole source the equipment purchase only, on bids, or how. Hanson responded that she would check with their procurement people to see if there is a state process that might govern, but as far as Federal Highway, if they don't have the federal funds she doesn't know if there is an FTA process that would govern or a DOE process that would govern sole sourcing a project. Johnson added that he could also check on this as there have been instances when they have sole sourced equipment on FTA side that just requires justification as to why it is being sole sourced. Williams

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

explained that the reason they are sole sourcing this project is because there is only one vendor that is allowed to sell this equipment in this area. Johnson asked what is meant by one vendor allowed. Williams responded that the makers of the equipment being purchased has divided up their sales areas within the United States, and only one vendor is allowed to sell it in this area. Johnson asked if this equipment was the only equipment that will work with the system. Williams responded it was. Johnson stated, then, that that is the justification, that you are adding additional equipment to the existing equipment, and only this equipment will work. Johnson asked that a copy of the sole source letter be given to him for review.

- 13) I-29 Reconstruction – Lang stated that the reconstruction is already underway.

Haugen stated that those were all the changes incorporated into the document, however there was one request that was not reflected in the document, and that is a request from the State that PCN numbers be assigned to each of the projects listed in the document, so between now and the final document, this will occur.

Williams referred to Item 13, and asked if it also includes the non-infrastructure item for the radar, the \$15,500.00. Haugen responded it is part of the 3510. Williams commented that that is something she isn't sure of, that she doesn't have the final number was on that. Haugen responded that as far as he knows that number hasn't changed, but he will look into it.

Williams asked if we were to receive safe routes to school dollars from our application from last year, which T.I.P. document will need to be amended. Haugen responded that it will depend on when the monies are awarded. He explained that if it is awarded before August, using 2010 funds, most likely the 2010-2013 T.I.P. will need to be amended; however if it is awarded later than that, or if it is using 2011 funds it will show up in the 2011-2014 T.I.P. ; and if it is awarded between now and August using 2011 funds, it will show up in our draft, but if it is awarded later than that using 2011 funds it will have to be amended into the final draft of our 2011-2014 T.I.P..

Williams asked if Ms. Hanson had heard anything on the safe routes to school projects. Hanson responded that she has heard that the infrastructure projects selection should be coming out soon, but that the non-infrastructure selection will be coming out at a later date, so she would anticipate that we should hear about the infrastructure projects in the next couple of weeks.

Haugen commented that we have noted a couple of changes even to the handout distributed today, so any action that the Technical Advisory Committee might recommend will include those changes as well. He stated that the other action this committee should make today, if approval is granted, would be to continue the public comment period until noon on Wednesday, June 16th.

***MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE
FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA 2011-2014 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

***THE CHANGES DISCUSSED, AND TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
UNTIL 12:00 NOON ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 2010.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS
DESIGNATION**

Haugen reported that last month we approved an update to the Functional Classification System on the North Dakota side. He asked if Ms. Hanson would give a brief update on where the approval process is on this. Hanson responded that they have been reviewing it, and have been trying to work with Federal Highways over the last couple of days to get approval, but found out that they were not receiving our e-mail. She stated that this issue has since been rectified, and they should now have the maps and the final copies, so we are hoping for approval soon.

Haugen stated that, assuming the Functional Classification System update will be approved as we submitted, we would then need to update the Urban Roads Map. He referred to a slide presentation, and explained that they show what changes will need to be made to the Urban Roads Map based on the functional classification updates submitted.

Haugen pointed out that we have several areas that need changes:

- 1) 48th Street – Change the dashed line to a solid line as an Urban Road, not part of the Regional System.
- 2) 20th Avenue South – Change it to an Urban Road.
- 3) DeMers/Columbia Ramps – Previously these ramps were not functionally classified, so now that they are we are proposing to give the ramps a Secondary Regional classification.
- 4) DeMers/4th Avenue Ramps – Also give these ramps a Secondary Regional classification.
- 5) 27th Avenue North – Have a segment that is not functionally classified, classify it so that it is not a part of the Urban Road Program.
- 6) South Belmont Road – This should be classified as an Urban Road.

Information only.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED UPDATE TO THE MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**

Kouba referred to the map included in the packets, and reported that, basically there is an agreement, and the last map that MNDOT had sent indicated that there were still a couple of minor changes needed, but this will be the actual agreed upon map.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

Kouba pointed that she also included a table listing the current miles for the City of East Grand Forks, which pretty much follow the national averages, and are definitely below the national average miles so she sees no problem with getting anything new added.

Haugen commented that one difference between the Minnesota and the North Dakota systems is that on the North Dakota side we functionally classify roadways out to the MPO Study area, while on the Minnesota side we only functionally classify out to the flood protection project, so we are not classifying out to the MPO Study area on the Minnesota Side.

Haugen pointed out that the Map Title should be updated to 2010.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP FOR EAST GRAND FORKS, SUBJECT TO THE MAP TITLE BE CHANGED TO 2010.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NEW T.I.P. PROCESS

Haugen reported that staff has been working on the T.I.P. project selection process, with the last several months focusing on the North Dakota side, but it was stated that they would begin working on the Minnesota side as well, so today's discussion will focus on the Minnesota side.

Ellis stated that they have been working with the NDDOT, and the three MPOs, to try to more closely mirror the SAFETEA-LU process when doing our T.I.P. project selection, prioritization and approval as candidate projects in the T.I.P.. She commented that on the Minnesota side they have discussed this with the Fargo/Moorhead MPO, who is in the process of working with MNDOT on their T.I.P. process as well.

Ellis stated that the basic principle is that the MPO should be, and is required to drive project solicitation and prioritization, so it should be developed cooperatively with MNDOT and the ATP so that we are aware of any projects that are being proposed to receive federal monies, or are being submitted as a federally funded project so that we can review it to ensure it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Ellis reported that she went through all the projects, or funding programs right now that would mirror the North Dakota T.I.P. programs. She said that what the current process is, and what it should be, right now for cities we have a four year cycle subtarget, and there are four cities within the ATP that provide a project that would receive federal aid dollars, and then if one city has a project they would like to have done sooner, while another does not have one ready, they can swap funding for that year, but typically it runs on a four year cycle so we know that every fourth year the City has to have a project ready.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 9th, 2010**

Ellis referred to the Minnesota Programs document, included in the packet, and went over the current and proposed processes for each T.I.P. funding program. She concluded by saying that we are simply trying to be more a part of the process.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update On Secretary LaHood's Visit

Johnson reported that it was interesting, and was quite a feather in North Dakota's cap. He said that they listed the cities that Secretary LaHood went to with his tour, and they included cities such as Los Angeles, New Orleans, Minneapolis, and Bismarck, so it was quite a coup.

Johnson gave a brief overview on what occurred, explaining that there were a couple of panels that were put together to talk about needs and such, basically focusing on the next highway bill, which is what Secretary LaHood was looking for. He stated that their Congressional Delegation has been very active in working with Secretary LaHood in getting the rural state's needs met, so the secretaries and directors of the various DOTs, including Montana, and Wyoming were present on a panel. He added that Idaho would also be included in our region, however they were unable to attend as they had a prior commitment.

Johnson stated that, in a nut-shell, there was a lot of interest expressed, from a lot of different groups, on money needs and how to deal with those needs.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 9TH, 2010,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager