

2015 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 14, 2015

February 11, 2015

March 11, 2015

April 8, 2015

May 13, 2015

June 10, 2015

July 8, 2015

August 12, 2015

September 9, 2015

October 14 2015

November 10, 2015

December 9, 2015

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 14th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Roger Hille, MNDOT-Bemidji; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Public Transit.

Guests present were: Peg O'Leary, Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner, and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 10TH, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 10TH, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that since our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting the only new information deals with signature features. He stated that both States have provided a budget of \$100,000 each toward those amenities. Noehre interjected that that has changed. He explained that they will be handling the signature features in almost the exact same manner as the Kennedy Bridge.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

Noehre commented that North Dakota is the lead agency, so they are going to look at all of the items on the Sorlie Bridge, and, of course in conjunction with MNDOT, and then just as they do with the rest of the bridge project, will split the costs.

Noehre stated that in terms of enhancements, although it is still project costs; they are looking at replacing existing lighting, using what is currently there but updating it to LED lighting; adding safety lighting for pedestrians and traffic; and, this is where it get a little different, but because they already committed to \$150,000 in enhancement dollars, it is still going to be project dollars, but there will be an additional \$150,000 that the cities could use for changing the lights to colored should that come up in the project development phase and is okay with SHIPO and all those entities, so, again, they are looking at replacing all the lights with LED lighting; adding safety lighting for the pedestrians and roadway, and the addition of colored lighting, if approved, and it would all be part of the project costs that MNDOT and NDDOT would share.

Haugen said, then, that instead of \$200,000 it is \$150,000 that would be identified towards enhancements. Noehre agreed, adding that it would be an additional funding source, but, again, they are allowing \$150,000 above what they would normally spend on the project, it isn't special enhancement dollars, per say.

Haugen stated, then, that when we do the T.I.P. amendment next month, this dollar amount then would be \$5.1 million. Noehre responded that he isn't going to answer any financial questions. Haugen commented that Mike Johnson is in Dickinson today, so he will contact him and get an answer to that question by then.

Haugen reported that a meeting was held on December 16th, and as indicated in the staff report, the format was very similar to the Kennedy Bridge meeting, however there are a lot of things that are eligible on the Kennedy Bridge that aren't on the Sorlie because the Kennedy is a major rehab, while the Sorlie is a preventative maintenance project. He added that he also knows that KLJ gave a presentation to the Historic Preservation Commission last night on some of the lighting features, and that is really all the information he has on the outcome of the December 16th meeting.

O'Leary commented that, basically, KLJ asked the Historic Preservation Commission to let them know if there were parameters that they wanted them to stop at; and the only thing that they really said no to was the imitation historic lighting fixtures that they were looking at for the pathways and the traffic. She said that they didn't close the door on colored lights, but they didn't okay it either as it is too early in the game to make that decision, so KLJ will come with some additional information on the cost, etc. of the lighting, to include the cost of doing colored lights.

O'Leary reported that they also did keep open the possibility of a color wash, and they were more in favor, her sense was that they were more in favor of a white-wash on the bridge.

Williams said, then, that they don't want us to match the rest of their downtown then, with our decorative lighting, or would their decorative lighting be okay. O'Leary responded that it would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

not. She said that they want lighting that will disappear into the structure, similar to what is already there, as it is much more appropriate than trying to imitate historic lighting. Yavarow added that even KLJ themselves, weren't in favor of putting those imitation historical lights on the bridge, the ones that they thought resembled the original lights that were on the bridge. He explained that those lights hung down two or three feet, and KLJ didn't want to put up anything that hung down, or were suspended, so they weren't in favor of the proposed lights either.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that included was the summary of the minutes of the Signature Feature meeting, as well as some graphics that illustrate what that summary document was saying.

Haugen reported that another piece of information was in regard to the low area. He stated that they did receive the analysis from the Corps of Engineers, and they are basically saying that it does not adversely affect the project. Bergman asked if this means that they are saying that that area can be raised. Haugen responded that from their perspective it can be raised, and it wouldn't have an adverse impact on the flood project. He said that they do highlight that FEMA does have a set of requirements that have to be met outside of what the Corps analysis is, but so far what we have been working off of is the premise that if the Corps says that there is no impact, then it would be done as part of the Kennedy Bridge project. Bergman said, then, that so far it is going to be a go to raise it then. Haugen responded that that is the premise that we have been operating under, but if someone wants to change that now is the time, but that is what we were told. Hille commented that he doesn't know that the decision has been made as to whether or not it will be done as a stand-alone project or if it will be included in the Kennedy Bridge project, basically because this is new information, and we all know the process by which we have to get approval from FEMA, so it is pretty early to say that it will or will not be part of the project at this time.

Noehre commented that in terms of the funding for enhancements, the NDDOT has said that there are enhancement dollars, but again they are going to do this the same way that we are on the Sorlie, minus any additional project dollars, meaning, MNDOT is the lead agency so they follow their project process and they send them half the bill.

Hille stated that on the Kennedy Bridge there has been a substantial amount of community involvement, and that will continue through the next phases as they look at possibilities, and the realities of the different types of aesthetic lighting.

Haugen asked if they had a consultant on board yet. Hille responded that they are in the process of selecting a consultant.

Hille said that, as long as we are talking about the Kennedy Bridge, he wants to make one thing clear; in the minutes of the Grand Forks City Council Work Session, they kind of agreed on a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

general cross-section of the bridge in terms of allocation, of width for the multi-use path, and to maintain 12-foot lanes; on that particular graphic, and they just used North Dakota's graphic, it depicted your typical "J" rails, but that graphic was intended for allocation of space on the bridge, it was not indicative of the type of rail that would be on that bridge. He said that there are some historic elements there that have to be followed. He added that he wants to make it clear that the graphic that is, or has been distributed, is more indicative of how the space is allocated, not what the configuration of the inside our outside rail is going to be.

Information only.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2015-2016 UPWP

Haugen reported that, as indicated in the staff report, we adopted the work program back in November; however when the Office Manager was setting up the accounting spreadsheets for billing purposes, a calculation error was discovered on the individual activity spreadsheet. He explained how the error occurred, and went over the changes made to the spreadsheet to reflect the correct amounts.

Haugen commented that another change involves a text change. He explained that the text of the document said that we were carrying over and finishing the U.S. #2 Access Study, but the spreadsheet did not include that activity. He stated that funding has been accounted for, but that the spreadsheet didn't include it, so it was added to the spreadsheet.

Haugen reported that originally we were talking about the Land Use Plan being updated, a component of that was to also look at the Land Development Code, as it is called on the North Dakota side; and the Zoning Ordinance, as it is called on the Minnesota side. He stated that East Grand Forks was not interested in doing that part of the update, but Grand Forks was, but because of the above discussed calculation error we didn't think there was any funding available to do it, however now that there is funding available, Grand Forks would still like to have that part of the update done as well.

Haugen stated that two other things that were identified in the staff report were, initially we had more funds coming from 2014 and carrying into 2015, in the original document, but our U.S. #2 Access Study did have a little more work done than anticipated in 2014 so we paid that out of our 2014 budget, therefore we dropped revenue sources for 2015 by \$50,000, so the \$260,000 unprogrammed funds was reduced by the \$50,000, and then we reallocated \$110,000 to the Land Development Code Update. He added that because of MAP-21, and how it is causing us to do two separate T.I.P.s, as well as to do some additional administrative things, we spread out the remaining funds into some of the administrative activities like General Administration, Interagency Coordination, MAP-21 implementation, and Education and Travel.

Haugen said that the amendment we are seeking approval for is to account for a calculation error, for less revenue being carried over, adding the carry-over project into the spreadsheet, and adding the work activity of updating the Grand Forks Land Development Code.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

Williams asked what ATAC would be doing as they are shown to have a \$25,000 budget. Haugen responded that they will be doing some model runs and updates with some of the studies that will be going on, such as the I-29 Traffic Ops, the Bygland Road Study, etc., so there is some modeling work we need to have done in conjunction with those studies. Kuharenko asked if the ATAC number is being rolled up into the 300.1 line item of \$40,000. Haugen responded that it is not, that it is a separate item.

Kuharenko commented that he does have a point of concern, and you mentioned it in the staff report, as well as here, regarding increasing the Land Use Plan by \$110,000; but in the original 2015 plan it was only \$150,000 and is now shown at \$277,000, so it isn't being increased by \$110,000, but by \$127,000. Haugen responded that they also increased the actual Land Use Plan Update cost, adding \$10,000 to that and another \$10,000 to the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan, so that is where some of the money was distributed. Kuharenko said, though, that you have Grand Forks and East Grand Forks separated out, and he sees a \$10,000 increase in East Grand Forks as well, but there are a number of other mathematical adding issues in this spreadsheet, and the sheet before it, which leads to some questions.

Kuharenko referred to the table on Page 20 of the document, the CPG 2014, over in the budgeted amounts you have the federal and state at \$300,000, and the state and local at \$75,000, equaling a total of \$356,000, but it should be more like \$375,000. Haugen responded that he did not update those columns, he just focused on the first two columns, so he will take care of that.

Kuharenko said, however, that this ends up leading us to the question of what else is needing to be updated. He added that below, where they have the cost allocation, it is still showing that the total is \$1,269,000, but if you add all those numbers up it only adds up to \$1,219,000, so there is a \$50,000 discrepancy there as well, so if we are showing back and forth different numbers that don't add up, that's a problem, and we see numerous problems as well on the next page, going down to that \$1,219,000 at the bottom, because if you add up the various line items you doing get \$1,219,000.

Discussion ensued.

Williams referred to the staff hours and asked if they are the same as what was reported before. Haugen responded that the hours are the same, but there is a difference between a planner and a senior planner salary, as it was updated to reflect the higher salary. Williams said, then, that the number of hours for the director is 1725 and the planner is 1825. Haugen responded that that is correct. Williams asked if that includes benefits. Haugen responded it does, adding that we don't have line items for things like vacation and sick leave, so they are covered with our inflated rate.

Williams reported that previously we discussed that, under the totals on the funding source spreadsheet, you show state and local shares shown, but it doesn't help them when they are trying to budget, to figure out what dollars they need, so can it be separated into state, and then East Grand Forks and Grand Forks so that we know what they are supposed to be budgeting and what they are actually looking at. Haugen responded it can. He explained that it was set up this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

way at the request of MNDOT years ago, and is how it has been shown since. He added that that reason it is labeled federal, state, and state and local is because we do get state dollars that the locals then don't have to come up with but the reason they still wanted state identified in the local part is because in order for us to access the Minnesota monies there has to be a local match to it, and they wanted a reminder that part of the local match is to match the state dollars, but they can separate it out. Williams commented that you could keep those two column, but then add two columns for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks that shows that this is what is needed, and who is going to pay for what. Haugen said that, as the staff report indicated, this will be the first time we are showing North Dakota state funds being used on the I-29 project.

Haugen said that he will certainly clean up the errors, and thanked Mr. Kuharenko for his catches. He added that, ultimately, this is the essence of the work program amendment number one; with \$1,219,000 as the total budget; and with the big ticket item being to the addition of the Land Development Code Update in conjunction with the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update, with \$50,000 less revenue than was identified before, and spreading out some of the remaining funds to the administrative items.

Williams referred to the staff portion of the spreadsheet, pointing out that it still lists two planners, and asked if one of them is a senior planner. Haugen responded that it is. Williams asked if that shouldn't be shown as a senior planner. Haugen responded that our expectation is that we will hire a senior planner, so we are budgeting for such. Williams said, though, that it isn't labeled as such. She asked if there was a desk audit or something done to increase that ???. Haugen responded that the qualifications of the past person did not meet those of the senior planner, although it was intended that we would hire a senior planner at that time as well, but that is why it was shown as a planner previously. Williams said, then, that this is actually reinstating something that was there before. She added that she thinks that it is important to show that.

Williams stated that she has one more question. She pointed out that we are still showing 32nd Avenue South as a signal timing project, but their City Council approved it as a corridor study. She asked if it could be noted that if there is any available funding it be used on the 32nd Avenue South study because we still need the corridor study done. Haugen responded that, if he understands correctly, in the write-up, where we have the 32nd Avenue South Signal Timing Project, we include a sentence that discusses that if there is additional funding available we increase this activity to more of a corridor study. Williams responded that that is correct, that is what was approved by their City Council, as a corridor study, because they are struggling with trying to, they have been looking at it intersection by intersection, and they need to pull the whole thing together, and that is why they need a corridor study done for that entire area.

Williams asked if all of the updates and corrections discussed today going to be made to the document before it goes to the Executive Policy Board. Haugen responded that they would.

Williams said that she thinks they have requested this before, but she would still like to see, going back to the previous discussion of when we received the extra monies from Fargo/Moorhead, where exactly did it go, was it just kind of flipped, or did we actually pick up some studies, did we pick up the interstate project. Haugen responded that the interstate study

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

was picked up, and we are also using it to continue the count program. He added that this is the amended document, so he didn't include all 60 pages of the entire document, but in the original work program it was identified in the first few pages of that document what all of the studies were that those monies went towards. Williams asked if that was the one approved in October or November. Haugen responded that it was approved in November. He added that it is available on the website.

Haugen stated that, with all of the corrections discussed, he still hopes to entertain a motion to approve the amendment.

Noehre commented that he just noticed something on the objectives; the U.S. #2 and U.S. 81 Intersection Skewed Intersection Study, he is assuming you mean Business U.S. 81. Haugen responded that that is correct. Noehre said, though, that the way it is described now it would be I-29.

Williams said that, since we are talking about these individual items, she has one other thing to bring up. She stated that on here you have completion dates, which is great, but for the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting could you bring in some other dates as well because you've got like four projects that are all going to be concluding in December, which means, she is assuming, that you will have a final review for us in October or November, and that will be extremely difficult for them with everything else they do on October and November, so could they get a more complete work plan, like some intermediate or drafts or that sort of thing. Haugen responded that some of those project you will see later on the agenda, and the RFPs have some dates identified in them. He stated that the Land Use Plan RFP has dates, the Bygland Road Study has dates, the Aerial Photography has dates; they are identified in the RFP, not so much in the work program. Williams said, though, that even in a separate document if you could give those to them so that they aren't trying to chase down where this is, or that is, we could have all the information assembled into a spreadsheet or something, with some dates so that they can keep track and see when they should be expecting updates at the Technical Advisory Committee meetings, and where we are at with all of these projects. Haugen responded that he could do that.

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2015 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM
SUBJECT TO PARTNER REVIEW, AND TO INCLUSION OF THE CHANGES
DISCUSSED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF EXTENSION OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT CONTRACT WITH
GOODPOINTE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION**

Kouba reported that, as you know, there have been a few hiccups with the pavement management condition ratings, but as it stands right now Goodpointe has done the condition

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

ratings, they just haven't gotten them into our data bases so they are available for everyone to use.

Kouba said that we are also expecting Goodpointe to do give us an overall report of the conditions of the roads in the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks area. She added that they are also going to be adding in a few budgeting scenarios in the report as well.

Kouba commented that we expect that they will be completed before March 31st, but that is the current deadline, therefore we are looking for approval to extend their contract to March 31st.

Haugen reported that there is no cost increase involved, it is just a time amendment, changing the end date to March 31st, 2015.

Kuharenko stated that in regard to pavement management, and with the new federal register that came out for MAP-21, it will be looking more at the International Roughness Index (IRI), so going forward he would like to know how we are going to incorporate that into this program. Haugen responded that for the local road system, or the non-state owned system, we will have to work on that; but for the State system that is something, as he recalls, from the proposed rule making of the States they are already reporting on the State system, so, and he thinks that is a proposed rule making that people will be commenting on and when it comes down to the final rule he guesses we will have to see how it affects our pavement management system, and what changes or augmentations we will need to make to it.

Kuharenko commented that it is his understand that the State has to make a plan as to how they are going to go through it, and what the rate will be a year after the final rule making, which he believes is the language in there.

Noehre stated that they already use IRI, and have been for a long time, but Urban IRI gives an indication, and he is very confident in the rural values, very confident; but, again, the urban values give an indication, and it is due to the speed and the stopping and in the rural we get very good, very accurate numbers because they are a constant speed, and that doesn't happen, obviously, in a urban setting, so the numbers reflect much, much higher than what the actual IRI is, with the system they use.

Haugen commented that he thinks that by the time we update our pavement management system in its regular cycle, that might be when we are finally informed as to what performance measures from a national and state are that we will need to work towards. He asked if Goodpointe did indicate we have the capabilities to do RIDE. Kouba responded they did. Haugen said that if we continue with them, or whoever we have do pavement management, that is an assessment that we are capable of doing and adding to it, to our software. Noehre stated that there are a number of different ways to measure, and IRI is one way.

Kuharenko asked if there is a particular reason they are asking for a time extension. Kouba responded that it is just a delay, when we originally did the imagery, some of it ended up getting lost in the shuffle between the home and the mobile sites. She said that they had to come back in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

and re-shoot some of the areas. She added that we also updated our Shape File, and somehow the data wasn't matching up between the imagery and Shape File numbers so they had to go back in and rework that information so it took a while to do that, thus the delay.

Williams commented that the City was asked to do some input into this, and they found out they needed to do this in late December. She stated that the original contract was supposed to be done in August, so we're still there, but sometimes they can't just drop everything and do some of the stuff these consultants want them to do. She suggested that, just as a general comment, maybe in all of our contracts, if they need something, and they have identified that we need to do something, they need to let us know at least six or eight weeks before they want it done because their schedules aren't like they used to be where they could just push something aside and work on it, so, just as a general comment, if we could include that in all of our contract stuff, she thinks it would make them go through and take a hard look at what it is they are going to be doing, and give us time to do it if we need to give them any information.

Haugen reiterated that we are looking for approval of a time only extension, no monetary changes to have our pavement management completed.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE EXTENSION OF THE PAVEMENT CONDITION ANALYSIS CONTRACT WITH GOODPOINTE TO MARCH 31ST, 2015, WITH NO CHANGE TO THE BUDGET.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2016-2019 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

a. Minnesota Side

Haugen reported that originally the transportation alternative programs were due last week on the Minnesota side. He stated that two potential projects were in the loop, however both projects have been dropped from further consideration, so there are no Minnesota TAP projects for us to consider.

Haugen commented that the rest of the Minnesota projects are due by the end of this month, for February's Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

b. North Dakota Side

Haugen reported that we have candidate projects from several different programs. He pointed out that included in the packet was the start of this power point he will give, but it has been updated a bit.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

Haugen commented that, again, these are what we gauge all of these projects off of, to determine consistency, and to set a priority list. He referred to a slide illustrating the MPO study area, and pointed out that the area shown in light grey is the area that has been identified as the adjusted federal aid urban limits area, so some programs, particularly on the North Dakota side, we split projects that cross over this adjusted urban aid limits into the T.I.P. as two listings instead of one project. He added that any project that is federally funded, or needs federal approval, or is really significant within this area should be included in the T.I.P.

Haugen stated that there are still unknowns with MAP-21. He said that we do know the focus of good repair, and we know the focus of the majority of the funds is on the NHS system. He added that MAP-21 itself expires May of this year, it was extended, but we don't know what its replacement will be, it's funding program will be unknown, so what we do today is subject to change as these things get rolled out.

Haugen reported that we do have to account for inflation, 1.2% is the rate of revenue inflation , and 4% is the basic expenditure inflation rate. He stated that we do have projects that are moving, sometimes they are moved at the State Headquarter level, and they don't make the adjustments for year of expenditure, so we are hoping to get better coordination and understanding that when things are pushed back, there also has to be a recognition that cost most like will need to be adjusted as well.

Haugen pointed out the project programs are: TAP for 2016, HSIP, current 15-17 TIP significantly changed, Urban Local for FY2019 and Urban Regional for FY2019 (plus one non-TIP year of FY2020).

Haugen pointed out that for the alternatives, the basic funding ratio is 80/20. He said that he would remind everyone that this is now a combination of the old separate enhancement, safe routes to school, and scenic highways programs. He stated that both North Dakota and Minnesota, could have included recreation trails, but they have opted to keep them separate. He said, again, that only the City of Grand Forks, on the North Dakota side can submit projects to the MPO, when in the past other agencies were able to submit projects as well.

Williams asked, if the TAP project happens to be on the National Highway System, does that change the funding split, or is it still 80/20. Haugen responded it would still be an 80/20 split. He explained that if it is funded from the TAP program, it is 80/20.

Haugen referred to slides listing the projects coming from the City of Grand Forks, and pointed out the priority order given by the City to those projects:

TAP

1. Shared Use Path along DeMers Avenue between South 48th and 42nd Street at a total cost of \$809,000 with federal request of \$290,000 (max allowed).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

2. Shared Use Path along South Columbia Road between 36th and 40th Avenue South at total cost of \$167,000 with federal request of \$134,000.
3. Solar Powered Speed Minder Radar Signs at total cost of \$23,000 with federal request of \$19,000.

Noehre asked if any of the speed minder signs are located on a state highway. Williams responded that, with the exception of Wilder, she doesn't think they have any that are directly on a state highway. Noehre mentioned that 5th Street is a state highway. Williams stated that if it comes down to that they would check with NDDOT, but she doesn't think it will.

Dame asked if they would be backing these signs up with a power source, other than the solar power. Williams responded that that is something they are working on. Dame said that they have problems with the one they have on Airport Drive, as it doesn't work when it gets too cold. Williams agreed, adding that when it happens they have to change them out, thaw them, and put them back. She stated that they have solved the issue of the radiant gathering part of it, but unless you have something in there to warm the battery, the battery eventually freezes and doesn't work. She explained that the battery works on a chemical reaction, and what eventually happens is it gets to the point where it is so cold that the chemical reaction cannot occur, so it doesn't actually freeze, but it gets too cold to work.

Haugen commented that all of these projects have been applied for in the past, so we have already determined that they are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan. He added that there is a year expenditure update to them all to reflect that even though they were applied for a year ago, the cost has been adjusted to show inflation.

Haugen stated that the number one priority project, the Shared Use Path along DeMers Avenue, because there is a max allowed in North Dakota of \$290,000, that project is asking for the maximum amount allowed.

HSIP

Haugen reported that for the HSIP projects there is an 90/10 split. He said that North Dakota's program is geared towards 50% of the monies going to the Local Roads Safety Program and the other 50% to the High Crash or dark spot locations. He pointed out that Grand Forks is submitting four projects, with the following priority order:

High Crash

1. 32nd Avenue turn lane improvements at 31st Street and 24th Street at a total cost of \$1,790,000 with \$807,000 federal currently programmed seeking additional \$804,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

2. 32nd Avenue turn lane improvements at 20th Street at a total cost of \$1,353,000 with \$1,217,700 in federal funds.
3. Gateway Drive red light running confirmation lights at a total cost of \$120,000 with \$108,000 in federal funds.
4. 32nd Avenue turn lane improvements at 38th Street with a total cost estimate of \$490,000 with \$441,000 in federal funds.

Haugen commented that all but one of these projects is on 32nd Avenue, so to go back to Ms. Williams discussion on a corridor study, they are all lane improvements, and he believes they are all on correcting the left turn offset and extending the left turns capacity.

Haugen stated that the first project in priority order does have federal funds already assigned to it, but the City has reexamined the improvements necessary, and as the costs have increased they are seeking more federal assistance to help with these projects.

Haugen said that the third project is the red light running confirmation lights, which comes from the Local Roads Safety Program, so for the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Executive Policy Board discussions we are trying to mimic the State's 50/50 share, and whether the priority order should identify the three high crash locations, in their order, and the Local Road Safety Program in its order as well, whereas the City put them as one funding program, one order, the actual intent, from the State's perspective, is to fund 50% towards the Local Roads Safety Program and 50% towards the High Crash Program.

Williams commented that it is her understanding that if they don't get enough Local Roads Safety Program projects, those monies will roll back over into the High Crash Program. Haugen agreed that that is what was stated, however, he is aware that both Fargo and Bismarck are submitting Local Roads Safety projects, so the chance that there will be any additional monies rolled over into the Local Roads Safety Program is pretty slim.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating a different priority rating scenario (see below):

High Crash

1. 32nd Avenue turn lane modifications at 34th and 31st Street intersections.
2. 32nd Avenue turn lane modifications at 20th Street intersections.
3. 32nd Avenue turn lane modifications at 38th Street intersections.

Systemic

1. Gateway Drive Red Light Running Confirmation Lights.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

He explained that reason we might endorse this particular effort is so that Gateway Drive is competitive. He said that when you look at the other perspective, at the dollar values of the first two projects, the number three priority isn't really even in play. He stated, then, that staff will be recommending you identify this 50/50 priority order.

Dame asked for clarification on what the Red Light Running Confirmation Light is. Williams responded that it is an additional light that is placed on the top of the signal head. She said that it is a blue light that gives a visual to police that are approaching the intersection, that are on the sidestreets, so that they know when the light is red and someone has run through it, thus giving them confirmation that they can stop the vehicle that ran the red light. Noehre commented that currently in order for the police to enforce red light running now they need two officers, one upstream and one downstream, to allow for them to actually confirm that someone actually ran the light, and this will eliminate the need for two officers as it puts the light on the backside thus allowing an officer located downstream to know that the light was red when the vehicle went through the intersection.

Dame asked if cameras wouldn't be much safer and easier. Noehre responded that cameras are illegal in North Dakota. Williams added that places where they are legal are taking them out because there have been so legal problems with them.

Discussion ensued.

Haugen reported that for the Urban and Regional Programs we have the current T.I.P., which covers FY2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018; and the new T.I.P. will cover FY2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019; which gives us a three-year overlap so we always need to identify any changes to those three years.

Haugen stated that there aren't really any changes on the Urban side; but on the Regional side there are a couple of things to point out. He commented that there was a turn lane project on U.S. #2; partially in the MPO area, however mostly out of the MPO area, and while there still might be a project here, for now it will not be submitted. Noehre added that if there is a project with that project it will not be anywhere near the MPO area, it will be one location rather than 60-miles long.

Kuharenko said that, as for the changes, he knows that they ended putting in a illustrative request for additional funds, and he is wondering if that is located in a different section than what is being discussed now. Haugen responded it was.

Haugen reported that the University Avenue Overpass repainting has been delayed one year, as discussed, to coincide better with another City project in that area. He said that on DeMers Avenue overlay project, and we are all familiar with what is going on with the Sorlie Bridge, but it was programmed financially in 2017, and physically in 2018; but it is now being both financially and physically programmed in 2019. He added that, just as a reminder, the Sorlie Bridge project is being moved to the current T.I.P. and won't show up in the future T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

Haugen commented that this now brings us back to our earlier discussion of year of expenditure. He referred to the tables, and went over the changes briefly.

Haugen reported that the new FY2019 projects are:

Urban Program

1. Mill and Overlay of University Avenue.

Regional Program

1. DeMers Avenue Mill and Overlay/Reconstruction.

Haugen stated that North Dakota started requiring an additional year, outside the T.I.P., be included. He said that they had identified U.S. Business 2 and North 5th Street as that project, and that is being carried on in this T.I.P. as well. Noehre commented that the pavement on Business 2 and North 5th Street is really old, and with the work on the Kennedy, it is probably time to look at it.

Haugen said, then, as he just mentioned, North Dakota asked for Regional Projects a year beyond, so for 2020 the reconstruction of the Washington Overpass is being identified, however it isn't going to be programmed, just identified as the plus one potential project.

MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2016-2019 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM THE 50/50 PRIORITY RANKING ORDER, AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Kouba reported that staff has worked with Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planner, and put together what the City of East Grand Forks would like to see the consultant do to update their Land Use Plan.

Kouba stated that there is a budget of \$85,000. She said that, basically, one of East Grand Forks' biggest issues; a couple of their biggest issues are that there are some goals, policies, and objectives that a little confusing for their Planning Commission, so the consultant is being asked to clear those up for them and make them more user friendly; and looking at the future land use needs and identifying those areas, they are looking at industrial that they are going to be needing, that they are going to expand out; and solidifying a public involvement process for the planning; and providing a final report for both the MPO and the City.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

Kouba said that they have a final deadline of, they are hoping to have the proposed consultant approved by March 18th; and once they proceed they are hoping to have a draft of the Land Use Plan the beginning of October; and then the final draft available the beginning of November so it can go through all of the processes of the MPO, as well as the City of East Grand Forks.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Haugen reported that this was the number one project request from East Grand Forks. He stated that we have it included in our work program.

Haugen commented that it primarily consists of trying to identify what improvements can be done to alleviate a perceived traffic congestion problem occurring during the A.M. and early P.M. Peak periods. He explained that with the two schools at the end of the roadway, both being all-City schools, with a lot of parent traffic dropping students off during those time frame, Bygland Road is carrying a lot of peak traffic during those times, so people trying to go in the opposite direction are having a difficult time getting onto Bygland Road, so we have that conflict going where there aren't enough gaps to allow them to get on to the roadway.

Haugen stated that the City is also asking that we look at the on-road facilities to see what can be improved, particularly the bike facilities, to see what can be done on Bygland Road to improve those facilities. He added that there is also a City Bus route that crosses Bygland Road, as well as School Bus routes that interplay as well, so we need to work on multimodal aspects for Bygland Road.

Haugen pointed out that the study limits are essentially from the traffic signal at 1st and 3rd down to the Middle School.

Williams asked about the scenario with or without 32nd Avenue South proposed bridge, is it being assumed that there will or will not be a bridge at that location, or that it will be located further to the south. Haugen responded that the existing 2025 and 2040 forecasts include additional bridges; and the illustrative list of projects show a bridge at 32nd or at Merrifield; but the scenarios we are running on this study are proposed to just utilize the 32nd Avenue location. Williams said, then, that if you do the scenario without the 32nd Avenue South bridge, you would not be assuming that there is a bridge at Merrifield. Haugen responded that that would be correct, there are no additional bridges. He said, again, that the existing 2025 and 2040 scenarios, what we have is what we have for river crossings, no additional capacity. He added that East Grand Forks has asked us, in this study, to identify to assist them, if 32nd Avenue were in place, does it dramatically change the recommendations. He said that East Grand Forks has

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

adopted a separate document called their “Strategic Plan” for the next five years that identifies construction on the 32nd Avenue Bridge, so that is why we are including the scenario of what would traffic be like on Bygland if there were a 32nd Avenue Bridge as part of the analysis. He added that this is very similar to what we do with I-29 traffic ops, where we will be looking at scenarios with additional interchanges, with no additional interchanges, etc.

Williams asked at what point the Merrifield Bridge comes on line in our Long Range Transportation Plan, is it after 2040. Haugen responded that, technically, both bridges are after 2040, but in the past 32nd Avenue has always had a bigger impact on traffic on Bygland Road than Merrifield. Williams said that what she is getting around to is that if you did a scenario with the Merrifield Bridge, with 32nd, without 32nd, and then with Merrifield she thinks you might get a better look at exactly what is going on with all of it. She said without doing that it is kind of like not getting the whole story. Haugen responded that the hesitation is that whenever we have looked at Merrifield as the only additional bridge, traffic on Bygland isn’t altered much, if at all, and 32nd is the one that give us the most impact, do they want to focus the scenario on if there ever is a 32nd Avenue Bridge, does it change the recommendations that this study would come up with, is there enough traffic change that it causes a different design of an intersection, or something along those lines, that is why they are just using 32nd, because that is the one that seems to have the biggest impact. Noehre commented that he would imagine that a 32nd Avenue bridge would have an impact on all three of the other bridges as well. Haugen agreed. Noehre stated that Merrifield may have an impact on two of the other bridges. Williams added that you would have a lot of vehicles that would bypass even coming through Grand Forks, or coming over any of the existing bridges if they could get around to the south, especially trucks. Noehre said that it would then have an impact on the Kennedy, not on DeMers or the Pointe Bridge, at least off the top of his head.

Haugen stated that they have impacts on other corridors and other roadways, they are studying Bygland Road with this one, and back to the I-29 traffic ops, they will look at different interchanges individually, but they won’t be looking at how they impact any other intersection, at least that is the scope that is currently scoped, they won’t look at DeMers/Washington, Washington/32nd, and other areas, but will be focused on that corridor. He said, then, that in their minds 32nd is the only real swing improvement, that they are aware of, that would change Bygland Road.

Noehre asked if there has been any shift in an actual feasibility of a bridge at 32nd. Williams agreed that that is what she was thinking. She said that it isn’t on a truck route, you can’t allow trucks through there and you have schools down through there, so she doesn’t even know what feasibility of having it with the current development that has occurred. Noehre commented that it would still be an inner-city bridge. Haugen stated that twelve years ago it was determined that it was feasible. Williams said that that is probably something that we should look at with our next transportation plan update.

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE BYGLAND ROAD STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Kouba reported that this is a requested item about every three years, and we are going to work with them on updating with what we have currently. She stated that we have a budget of \$50,000, so we are looking for approval to do that.

Kuharenko referred to Page 16 of the RFP, under Specifications, the very last bullet, and pointed out that it indicates “suitable for a 1-inch to 100-foot scale mapping or +-3.33-foot positional accuracy is to be used. He said that below that you are using the aerial photography acquisition in the component through the digital orthophoto production going from a +-3.33-foot positional and then going to a +-1-foot, is that going to cause problems because you are going from potentially less accurate to more accurate. Kouba responded that it isn’t going to be a problem mostly because it is roughly the same thing, basically. She added that she is also requesting that they use the National Map Accuracy Standards, and that is part of the standards, so as long as it is part of the standards, they are still at, a pixal is roughly ?? Kuharenko said, though, that it looks like it is positional accuracy, with that one pixal being one-foot away versus 3 and 1/3.

Kuharenko commented that another thing he noticed is that it looks like there is, under Component 3, 3 or 6 inch pixel ground resolution, and then you end up indicating...Kouba responded that she had them delete that, so she will make sure that is corrected in the Final RFP.

Dame referred to Page 18, and asked how definite the boundaries are there. Kouba responded that the boundary of the shoot will basically be in the footprint of the image that it is right now. She stated that the red line is, basically both Cities’ boundaries. Haugen added that the same territory will be flown, three years later, with no additional territory.

Noehre asked how many years this has been done. Haugen responded that he recalls that half-tone aerials photos were taken back in 1985, and 1999 was when the first colored digital photos were taken. Noehre said that reason he asks is because, and this is something he just recently learned about, but there is a program called Google Earth where you can go back to previous shots. He said that he hasn’t used it yet, but he is interested to, so his question is, when we display this, can we go back and look at previous shots. Kuharenko responded that in our City GIS you can. Yavarow added that they have three years listed on the City’s GIS.

Discussion on Google Earth versus City GIS ensued.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

OTHER BUSINESS

East Grand Forks Functional Reclassification Update

Haugen reported that they are down to differing between the two Stub-Principal Arterials; 220 North and Bygland Road, so they are going to meet with the Oversight Committee to give our side of the story versus their side of the story, after which the Oversight Committee will make a decision, which we will accept, otherwise we are in agreement with the new Functional Classification.

Haugen stated that sometime in March we will formally be finally adopting the updated Functional Classification for East Grand Forks.

Information only.

Project Update List

Williams commented that we have talked about this a couple different times, but she would still like to see an update on all the projects we have going including the Long Range Transportation Plan for 2045, and everything, even if there isn't any change from last time, if they could just get an update on where we are and what we are doing. She added that it doesn't have to be individual items, but maybe just on a spreadsheet that says where we are at on the different items that we've got, because we have a lot of things on here now that you've got going, a lot of different projects.

Information only.

U.S. #2 Access Study

Noehre asked if there is anything happening on the U.S. #2 Access Study. Haugen responded that January 29th is a meeting of the Steering Committee, all afternoon Thursday, over at RDO.

Noehre asked if the MPO, or the City of Grand Forks has heard about a potential development north of U.S. #2 and east of 69th. Gengler responded that nothing is coming to mind. Yavarow asked if he was referring to the area west of 55th. Noehre responded he was, right up against 69th. He explained that NDDOT was approached by someone looking for some comments on changing an access. Gengler asked who it was that came to them. Noehre responded it was CPS. Noehre said that it may just be preliminary yet, and they are just doing some due diligence. Dame commented that he thought he saw some Greenberg signs for commercial property for sale up there. Gengler said that he could look into this further. Noehre commented that, at least conceptionally they had a frontage road, and that is what they talked to them about before the U.S. #2 Access Study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

Gengler reported that he is familiar with one project, the former American Defense was sold, and he knows there was some talk about the company that bought it doing some expansion, but they haven't seen anything yet, so if there is anything out there it could be that, which would be just directly north, basically they would be expanding the former ADI, so that is probably what this is. Noehre stated that he wonders if he shouldn't send it to KLJ to look at it in the Access Study, not traffic wise, but if it is all about development, how a frontage road might be incorporated into it. Gengler commented that with this particular business you would be looking at just employee trip generation opposed to retail type traffic.

Noehre asked if KLJ had been working on anything since last time. Haugen responded that they have been working on quite a bit, which you will see in your pre-meeting packet that you will be getting to digest before the meeting on Thursday, January 29th, and then at the meeting itself you will get to look at some of the alternative concepts, and you will spend a good four hours at the meeting.

Dame commented that Mr. Haugen had indicated at the last meeting that we should have some thoughts put into what solutions need to be there. He said that he was kind of taken by surprise by that as they haven't seen alternatives coming out of KLJ, so is this something they should have some preconceived ideas on what they think should be there, or, he knows the City has since started somewhat taking a look at their intersection, at their request, so he understands that that one is. Haugen responded that everyone is going to come to the meeting with a preconceived concept of their particular intersection, or the corridor as a whole, but if there is something that you think is outside the box, that would be something to give to KLJ, or through him to KLJ, so it is at least on the table and they can do a little work on it ahead of time, but there wasn't anything yet, that he has seen, that hasn't been already looked at. Dame said that you were saying from a funding standpoint, and he has been waiting and not saying anything because he assumes that they are going to have a lot of alternatives laid on the table, in terms of, they are the ones, the experts doing the study, and he didn't feel it was their place to be making alternative recommendations, or starting to request funding of a project that they have no idea of what would potentially happen.

Haugen stated that, just like with the T.I.P. Candidate projects that we looked at; take DeMers Avenue downtown, there is a dollar amount that the project scoped, ranges from a mill and overlay to a reconstruction; or take the Sorlie Bridge project when it was at \$30,000,000, it wasn't defined as to what the project was, so the advice, not from a fiscal constraint point of view, but the advice is to get as much as you can ask for reasonably so that you aren't limited for what you get.

Williams asked if there was going to be a packet sent out before the meeting. Haugen responded there would. Williams asked when they could expect it. Haugen responded that he would anticipate it would be the end of this week, or most certainly the beginning of next week.

Haugen reiterated that the meeting will be on Thursday, January 29th, at 1:00 p.m. at RDO.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 14th, 2015**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY
14TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:21P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 11th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Mike Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government (via Conference Call); Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Public Transit.

Guests present were: Peg O’Leary, Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission; Troy Schoreder, NWRDC; Michael Ferguson, Grand Forks Police Department.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen said that since there are some new faces here today he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 14TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kuharenko referred to Page 8, last paragraph, and pointed out that Nick West, not himself asked about the reason for the time request.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 14TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE AFOREMENTIONED CORRECTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that MnDOT sent him an e-mail letting him know that there would not be anyone here today. He added that they also stated that they do not have a design engineer under contract yet, and it might be another couple of weeks before they do.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen commented that, as indicated in the staff report there was a meeting held last evening of the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission. He asked that Peg O'Leary please give a brief overview on what transpired at that meeting concerning the Sorlie Bridge.

O'Leary reported that KLJ representatives drove up from Jamestown, and Rob Christianson drove up from Bismarck. She said that there was good discussion, with people from Grand Forks Engineering attending as well.

O'Leary commented that the focus of the commission was primarily on colored lights, and how they would be utilized. She stated that the upshot was a motion that passed with the DOT's concurrence that there would be no adverse effect. She said, however there were restrictions in regard to the structural issues on the bridge such as that the paint remain in the silver/grey range; and that a decorative lighting use policy would be developed by a team that would include the City of Grand Forks, the City of East Grand Forks, MnDOT, NDDOT, ND-SHIPO, and MN-SHIPO, and the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that it did pass unanimously. She added that what it does is leave KLJ able to incorporate colored lights into the plan, but at some point before the maintenance plan is finalized, this group will come up with a policy as to when colored lights will be used, what colored lights will be okay, etc..

O'Leary reported that SHIPO was on the phone with them, and basically concurred with this plan, although they did indicate some concerns with level of illumination of the new lighting versus what is currently there now, as well as some other concerns. She added that the Grand Forks Preservation Commission also had some other various concerns as well that KLJ is going to address, but the basic question everyone had concerning colored lighting was addressed and will move forward as long as a way to use it effectively is determined.

Haugen asked if the other restrictions would be similar to those discussed on the Kennedy Bridge, as far as only one color at a time. O'Leary responded that the discussion was a variety of things. She said that they first went into what the capabilities are, and they are really endless, which makes a policy that much more necessary; and there was a lot of discussion on the frequency; and there was a lot of concern with the fact that the pedestrian lighting will be moved up much higher than it currently is, following the arch instead of running across at an 18-foot level all the way across the bridge, and it they were thinking those lights would be colored, but

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

colored lights aren't really conducive to safety, and it is also very difficult to discern cracks in the pavement and ice and such under red or blue or green lights, shadows just kind of disappear, so there was a lot of discussion on whether it would be workable, and whether there would be enough ambient light from the traffic lighting to mitigate that. She said that a lot of this will have to play out with models, and maybe with the actual lights once they are in place.

Discussion on pros and cons of colored lighting ensued.

Noehre commented that the pictures of bridges using colored lighting from around the country are really nice, there is some aesthetic value. He added that he does agree wholeheartedly, and has actually been pushing equally as hard to have a policy that sets out the days, and the colors, and those kinds of things so that it is not changing every day, three time a day or for every event that goes on, to make sure there is a way to effectively manage it. O'Leary stated that the commission was feeling that white be used 95% of the time, and that the colors would be used only for really special occasions, and limited to one color at a time, maybe with the exception of the 4th of July.

Noehre referred to the staff report, the last paragraph, and pointed out that it states that this fix will be done outside of the preventative project, but will occur at the same time. He asked where that information came from, and done at the same time by whom. Haugen responded that that information was provided by the City of Grand Forks' Staff Report, although it may not occur at exactly the same time, but they are fixing the dip, but not as part of the signature nor the painting project. He said that he would follow up on where that information came from. Noehre commented that that information did not come from him, and certainly not from their Bridge Division, as they talked to the Bridge Engineer just before he came today and he had no knowledge of that occurring, and he had no knowledge of it either. Kuharenko responded that the only thing he can think of is when they talked about shifting it from a reconstruct to just a painting project, he brought up the question of when that work would be done, or if there was any kind of coordination that was happening.

Haugen reported that the "fix", as he understands it, is going to be done this year as sort of a temporary fill-in the dips that are at each end, and then in 2019 look at that as an opportunity to do a more permanent repair. Noehre stated that he has suggested that that could be a possibility, and looked at depending upon what kind of project it is in 2019, but who is going to fill in the dips. Haugen responded that he thinks it would be the City of Grand Forks' resources, that is why it is outside the painting project, and then MnDOT resources on the Minnesota side, but he will follow up on where he got that information and distribute it out to everyone.

Noehre commented that it certainly isn't in their plans, and he would be concerned, or is concerned that there would be two different contractors trying to close two different roadways, two different sides, and if someone is filling in the dip and it causes an increase in cost for the Sorlie project, who is paying for that. Haugen responded that he believes they are going to approach that as a separate project from the NDDOT project, so those questions and answers would be coming through that other project process, and the timing he might have said the same time, he may have been referencing it in the same year instead of the same timeframe. Noehre

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

said that his comment even applies to that, because now there is traffic control out for the painting, that is going to cover the area of the dip, so that means that the traffic control in the dip and the painting job has to be moved out of the way and moved back. Haugen reiterated that he will resource, again back, it was a Service Safety meeting at which Mark Walker did a presentation on this, and he knows that his board is particularly interested in trying to repair those dips, both temporarily and then more permanently. Noehre said that he understands that, but it doesn't mean it will be in their plans. He added that traffic control is just one element, there are other potential points of conflict as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2015 ANNUAL ELEMENT T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that there are several T.I.P. amendments that need to be processed. He explained that some of them are amendments that we have known about for quite some time, while others are more recent.

Haugen commented that there are amendments on the Minnesota side, on the North Dakota side, and then there is one amendment that impacts both sides of the river.

Haugen stated that they did advertise the opportunity to appear before this body, so he would like to open the floor to anyone from the public that wishes to comment on these amendments. There was no one present for discussion, so Mr. Haugen closed the public hearing. He added that there was also the opportunity for written comments to be submitted until noon today, however there were none submitted.

Haugen referred to information included in the packet, and went over each amendment briefly.

Bergman asked if the Good Samaritan vehicle has to follow the federal guidelines. Haugen responded it does because it is a federal purchase. Bergman asked if Good Samaritan would be reporting to East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that he isn't sure how that works. Kouba responded that she believes they will be talking to Kent Ehrenstrom about that. Ellis added that they have to go through the State. Bergman asked who would be doing the reporting. Ellis responded that Good Sam will be doing the reporting, they asked for the funds. Haugen added that Kent Ehrenstrom, as the District Transit Planner, has to follow through the oversight.

Haugen stated that MPO staff recommends approving the T.I.P. amendments as presented.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2015 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS SUBMITTED

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2015-2016 UPWP TO INCLUDE THE NORTH
GRAND FORKS AT-GRADE RAILROAD CROSSING MITIGATION STRATEGY
STUDY**

Haugen reported that this is a technical assistance request the MPO received initially through the North Dakota State Mill. He referred to the map included in the packet, and gave a brief summary of the request.

Haugen explained that the North Dakota State Mill is currently expanding its operations by 30%, which means that they also need to receive 30% more raw material. He stated that the economies of shipping are driving them to have to receive grain via unit train, which they haven't done in the past, but they are basically land-locked where they are located and they cannot provide a landing for a unit train.

Haugen reminded the committee that we did a freight rail access study last year and identified some sites on the Glasston Sub, and also on the Hillsboro Sub where a unit train could be landed. He said that the Study identified one site and the Mill has identified a site a mile north of that that is also a potential site for them. He stated that their plans are to construct and start receiving unit trains at either of these two sites by the end of next year, and as part of this their facility would require they also provide a track reconnecting the Mill Spur to the Glasston Subdivision. He stated that their hope is to make this new connection between the two lines their daily route, as well as how the unit train grain gets to them, so from their perspective they see a possibility of removing the mill spur line south of Gateway Drive. He explained that our concern is not just with the Mill and their potential rail traffic increase, but also with additional rail traffic from the proposed nitrogen plant, so the proposed scope of work we would work on would be to start identifying some of the mitigation strategies for the three major at-grade crossings that exist now on the Glasston Sub, plus mitigation strategies for the new crossing on North Washington.

Haugen stated that we would also work with the property owners that do receive sporadic train service in and around the mill to see if they would be receptive to having their train service come from the north so that we can also work towards possible removal of the Mill Spur south of Gateway Drive.

Haugen commented that he has been working with State and Federal partners on how best to approach this scope of work, and what is included in the packet is the third or fourth draft, so he hopes he is getting close to having a final scope completed soon.

Noehre asked if the draft scope addresses the desire or need for a curve down on 42nd and DeMers. Haugen responded that it doesn't, however the Mill has been working with a consulting firm already to figure out a site, and a way to get the tracks back, and that same firm, as part of the initial reaction from BNSF, they had asked for the State Mill to consider putting back in place the westerly curve at DeMers and 42nd Street, next to the REAC Building. He added that from BNSF's point of view, most of the unit trains that they are servicing off the Glasston Sub are coming from the west or south, and will have to come into the yard and then get pulled back out at the Glasston Sub, so from their perspective they felt that if they could

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

reestablish that curve then all of those trains wouldn't have to come into the yard and then go back, but most people who have heard this idea, and have looked into it have determined that it is nearly impossible to do, but the Mill has tasked their consultant to investigate it and satisfy the BNSF that it isn't possible.

Haugen commented that originally one thing the Mill asked us to do was to assist them in maybe figuring out how to reconnect the Glasston Sub and the Mill Spur, but that is no longer part of this study, the Mill is doing it themselves.

Haugen stated, then, that we will be primarily focusing on engaging the stakeholders on the Mill Spur to let them know what the Mill itself plans on doing for its train service, and to see if they will also accept getting their train service from the Glasston Sub, and then work with all of the stakeholders and the public to ensure they know what is happening at all three at-grade crossings on the Glasston side, and then also the new one that will most likely be created on North Washington, however there is a small potential it might include Columbia Road.

Kuharenko asked if there were any businesses south of Gateway that use the Mill Spur. Haugen responded that when we did the Mill Spur study there were none identified at that time, but we will have to reaffirm that with this study.

Haugen reported that the Mill has stated that they would provide the necessary match to the \$60,000 budgeted for this study, so there would not be any local monies necessary from either city, we would just be releasing consolidated planning grant funds. Williams asked, then, if the MPO dollars come out of their budget then, or is there going to be federal dollars that come from someplace else. Haugen responded that it would be allocated out of our current CPG dollars. He pointed out that our Technical Assistance line item does have a dollar amount already programmed, so the Grand Forks Land Use Plan and Code Change were originally going to start by now, but probably now won't start until June or July. Kuharenko said, then, that the balance of the monies, because he thinks the Technical Assistance line item had \$17,000.00 programmed for consultants, so the remainder of the \$60,000.00 would be needed, so \$43,000.00 would come out of the planning line item then of the Land Use Plan. Haugen responded that that would be correct, however it wouldn't be that exact amount because the match would need to be subtracted from it as well, but it could possibly come from that line item.

Kuharenko asked what the split is. Haugen responded that it is an 80/20 split. Haugen added that with the timeline the Mill desires, obviously that is the reason why it is being processed as a Technical Assistance request right now.

Williams commented that the scope includes redevelopment concepts for the potentially abandoned Mill Spur. Haugen said that that is definitely one of the question marks our partners have for eligibility. Williams asked if that wasn't already done for the Mill Spur, didn't they come up with a concept. Haugen responded that they haven't. He explained that with the Mill Spur study the concept they came up with was keeping the railroad line in place but then greening it up and potentially doing a parallel shared use path. He added, however, with the Mill Spur completely gone, you have lot of potential frontage on North Washington, north of 8th

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

Avenue, that would free up, perhaps, considerable commercial property, redevelopment potential. He said that south of 8th Avenue it sort of becomes an alley railroad line, with homes on both sides, and probably not a whole lot of new development potential. Brooks pointed out, however, that it is BNSF's property. Williams asked if it would be better if they waited until they actually figure out what they are going to do, and if it was going to occur before spending money on looking at something that might not ever occur. Haugen responded that we still haven't gotten clearance that it is something we can even fund, and even if we get that clearance we still have the ability not to execute that portion of the scope of work, so he would rather error on having it in and not utilizing it than having to go back and get it in, based on the timeliness they are requesting.

Williams said that she knows that Mr. Haugen kind of explained this, but she would like to add something in there that specifically says what the impacts are to the North 42nd Overpass/Underpass, whether this is or isn't potentially going to affect it, or something like that to tie that little circle closed so that there aren't any questions at the end of the study.

Williams commented that you said in there that they are developing some cost estimates. She said that she would like to have an exact specification of what it is, if it is just the project itself does it include right-of-way acquisition, does it include utilities, and engineering, and if it doesn't include all those, if we just make a note that it doesn't so that no-one gets the idea that, oh, well it's only going to cost this, and it's like, well no, not really.

Haugen reported that one other tangent that has been happening since this started, the Mill has also approached the EDC to assist in engaging the stakeholders up along the Mill area, so it is part of a steering committee, and as they were a member of the steering committee of the freight rail access study, the EDC is sort of being asked to assist and be a member of the steering committee on this study as well.

Haugen commented that they can certainly add in here to identify what impacts, if any, it might have on the proposed 42nd Street Grade Separation, and however you want to define cost; construction cost only, or do you want to be more inclusive of any and all costs.

Kuharenko asked if we know exactly what the Mill Spur has for their scope for their consultant, to make sure we aren't overlapping. Haugen responded that he has not seen the scope of work they have for their consultant, but the Mill Spur is aware of the scope that we are doing. He added that originally we were going to look at a couple of things, but now their consultant is because we were told that they weren't really eligible dollars for us so their consultant is taking the lead with that, and he isn't aware of any other places we are both doing the same thing.

Haugen reported that their consultant will be the lead on determining BNSF's satisfaction that the westerly curve can't be done, and how the connect of the Glasston Sub to the Mill Spur on the northend will be done. He stated that they are working with, of course, the local road authorities as well, to determine where that crossing is that our consultant will take a look at and how we develop some mitigation strategies for the conflict that is currently occurring at that crossing. Kuharenko said, then, that our study will end up covering how long our crossings are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

occupied by trains and all of that, and are we also looking at potential alternatives, then, to mitigate that, whether it be underpasses, overpasses, all that. Haugen responded that it will. He added that they have also identified how it impacts not just City Area Transit routes, but UND Shuttle routes, and how it impacts the bike/ped movements across that corridor.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen had any idea on when they might see the final draft scope of work. Haugen responded that it should be available at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting a week from today.

Noehre commented that it sure seems to him that the MPO is the right vehicle to look at all these things because it has impacts on many jurisdictions. Haugen added that he believes it is nice that a lot of the same people that will be working to assist the MPO on its study and consultant, the Mill will have to bring in their information and share with those same people their process and thoughts as to how they are going to land the unit train and reconnect over to the Mill Spur, so it is sort of the same people working on similar issue at the same time.

Johnson reported that he will be sending an email later this week stating that the DOT and FTA looked over the revised scope and they had no more comments or issues, so you are good to go to move forward with the UPWP amendment to get this study going. Williams asked if this includes looking at the Mill Spur for redevelopment. Haugen responded what you see in black and white is what they are saying is good to go.

Kuharenko asked for clarification on Page 15, second paragraph from the bottom, where it says: "While each of these crossings experience blockage by unit trains of 20 minutes, all three at-grade crossings of the Glasston Subdivision are blocked for approximately five minutes during the movement of individual unit trains". He asked what the distinction is between 20 and 5 minutes discussed. Haugen responded that the five minutes occurs at all crossings, and the 20 minutes is at each individual crossing. He explained that it takes a unit train time to go from north to south, it is long enough that it closes all three crossings at one time, but as it goes from north to south it will not enter the northern most one for quite some time after it has closed University Avenue and it will have exited University Avenue sometime before it exits Gateway, so five minutes is the total time all three crossings are closed, twenty minutes is the time that each individual crossing is impacted.

Kuharenko stated that we may not know this because we don't know the route, but if we have the Mill loading off a unit train, he would guess the Mill study is taking care of track location for loading out and off-loading. Haugen responded that that would be correct. He explained that, again, the Mill itself is property locked, so they are going to be breaking down the unit train over at the Glasston area, and their concept is described to date as being in thirds, and transporting those trains over to their mill by taking a third of the cars at a time. He added that those familiar with NPN study, you will find out about later in the meeting, they have to keep their unit train intact the whole time so they will be blocking 55th Street for hours at a time, where here the potential to block any roadway for a longer period of time because the train is loading and/or unloading shouldn't occur, it should be all off-site and then broken down because they don't have enough property to put all the unit train cars on their site.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

Brooks asked if they really see this being a transfer center that won't be, in the end, Mill specific. Haugen responded that the Mill has stated that they don't need all the land around this unit train landing spot, and the Freight Access Study did identify that if you found one to spur the development of the landing unit train spot then others could tag on. Brooks commented that he already has a party that is interested in doing something like this, and they were further south of the Glasston Sub, but they could maybe utilize something with the State Mill's center. He added that he thinks that where development is going on the industrial side everyone wants to get in on the rail if we can get something like this set up, and with the State Mill being a partner with the State, since he doesn't know where the money will come from, in the end we are only talking about the study monies today, but it will be a huge cost to get that rail in, so this is just coming up with some answers to some of those questions being asked, which is good.

Haugen commented that the unit train landing site and the new rail-line connecting to back the the Mill Spur is all part of the Mill's business plan for 30% increase in production. Brooks stated that the only thing he could see is; and you had mentioned in the staff report about those three crossings; but he thinks 27th almost becomes a fourth just with the amount of traffic as we start to grow to the north in that area, and 40th doesn't cross over the tracks, but he thinks 27th will be a... people will maybe try to go around there in that direction so that almost becomes a little bit more of a factor than it ever was before, wrapping that in with the NPN discussion obviously as well. Haugen asked, then, if he would want to add the fourth at-grade curve, existing at-grade crossing. Brooks responded that we might want to look at that as well.

Noehre stated that they don't know the value of property, so it might be way off, but that is where just considering that including redevelopment of that land north of 8th might assist with railroad decisions and others that if that land becomes valuable and can be developed after the tracks are gone it might influence their decision on what they are willing to fund and not willing to fund, and, again, he is making an assumption that those dollars could have some influence in them, but if they are tiny probably not.

Williams said that she has reservations about including the suggestion for redevelopment of that Mill Spur. She stated that too many times we get ahold of something and someone says "you promised me five years ago there was going to be a park here" or something to that effect, so she is wondering if we should make that a different study at a later date once they figure out exactly what they are going to do. She added that she isn't saying it isn't a good idea, she thinks something definitely should be done, but she just hates to see us go through and do all this and then it never happens yet we spent money on a report subject to what ifs.

Haugen stated that the discussion he would place on the table is there might be some resistance to the current railroad serviced industries north of Gateway Drive to having a change made, and the thought behind providing a concept of what could happen south of Gateway Drive might assist in alleviating or countering some of that resistance. He added that the question will be what will you do with the land, so this is a way to provide a conceptualization of what could happen to the land, so, you're going to be asked the question, so it would seem reasonable to have possibilities available.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

Noehre asked who owns the right-of-way between the railroad and the DOT, is it city or privately owned. Brooks responded that he thinks the railroad butts up to the DOT's right-of-way. He said he could check their GIS, but it is pretty old so they may need to do some additional work to determine if there are any other owners involved. Haugen commented that the Mill Spur Study should have this already identified. Williams added that there are a couple of slivers along there where there are actually privately owned buildings within the railroad right-of-way. Haugen agreed, adding that there is a lot of public use of the railroad property, and some of it the railroad is trying to reclaim.

Williams commented that, in light of what has happened over the past six months or so, do you think BNSF would give that right-of-way up, or do you think they will want to hold on to it. Brooks responded that if they are getting rid of the track, he thinks it would be easier for them to let go of it, but he would bet they are wishing, along DeMers, they wouldn't have had some of those conflicts, so he could see them wanting to hold on to it then, but if the track is abandoned he could see them wanting to get rid of it. Noehre added that they have gotten rid of it in lots of other places.

Kuharenko asked if the intersection of 42nd and DeMers added. Haugen responded it was. Kuharenko asked if there was a recommended alternative to that study that was done by KLJ a while ago, which option. Williams responded there are several different alternatives. Haugen added that there is one, and then there is a back-up one. He said that he would share them with the committee. Williams commented that there is one alternative that pushes 42nd to the west with an overpass.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WEST, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUEST TO THE 2015-2016 UPWP TO INCLUDE THE NORTH GRAND FORKS AT-GRADE RAILROAD CROSSING MITIGATION STRATEGY STUDY, SUBJECT TO THE AFOREMENTIONED CHANGES.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Kouba referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Kouba reported that staff has been going over a lot of things with our Transit Development Plan, they have been looking at how federal funding is coming in and things of that nature; and have decided on some changes that are needing to be made into our plan.

Kouba commented that one of the changes involves inclusion of increased operating costs due to increased driver salaries.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

Kouba stated that with less federal funding we are also looking at removal of our planned 30-minute headway, as well as the buses we would have needed to attain that 30-minute headway.

Kouba reported that there are some illustrative projects that have been programmed now that funding for them has become available.

Kouba commented that East Grand Forks received some additional funds from the State allowing them to start their Route 10/11 an hour earlier, so that has to be included. Ellis interjected that they are actually starting the route a half hour earlier, not an hour earlier; and it will run on the hour.

Kouba referred to slides illustrating project changes, and went over each change briefly.

Williams referred to Page 5 of the document, Goal 3, “Reduce vehicle hour delays every year by improving transit signal priority”, and asked if the word “improving” could be removed. She explained that the reason for this is because we are only going to get to the point where we can improve it so much, and we want to continue to do it, but she just doesn’t know whether it is going to continue to get better every year, and if that is a target, then we won’t be able to meet that target when we get to that point.

Bergman said that he would hate to have you listen to the radio today because you would hear a lot of violence from drivers because the lights are not operating as they are supposed to be. Williams commented that she has talked to a couple of the drivers and they don’t understand how they are supposed to operate. Bergman responded that they have been told lots of times how they are supposed to operate them. He added that a question they asked yesterday, and he was visiting with Keven about this, but they need to sit down with GTT, with Traffic Control and figure out how to better address these issues. Williams agreed. Bergman said, though, that he doesn’t feel the word “improving” should be removed from Goal 3.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY

Haugen reported that the Steering Committee met a few weeks ago, and assisted us in narrowing down some of our alternatives. He stated that one of the things that we worked on was adjusting our forecasted future traffic. He explained that with the growth going on out at the Air Force Base, potential growth with the Grand Sky development, and as part of getting in a full access into the proposed development site a traffic operation study was done on that proposed development and that is where these trips are coming from, from the U.S. #2 full access into Grand Sky Development Report, and it shows that 75% of the trips are coming to or going to Grand Forks, so they have moderated the forecast for our segment of U.S. #2 that is in our study.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and pointed out that these are the numbers that we are using. He said that the black numbers are essentially 2013 volumes, the red numbers are 2025, and the blue are 2040

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

volumes. He pointed out that there is an increase in volume as we go out into the future, at virtually all of the locations along U.S. #2.

Haugen commented that there is a substantial improvement, or growth occurring on the northbound off-ramp, so starting from the west and moving east at key intersections, the Steering Committee considered several alternatives at Gateway Drive. He added that, as you will notice, he does not have the ability to play all the things the Steering Committee enjoyed at their four hour meeting a few weeks ago, but he does have the essential information for you today.

Haugen reported that the Airport Intersection does have a crash history, and in the future it will have a level of service issue, and it has a speed issue occurring as well. He said that as part of the process they did evaluate a lot of alternatives for this location, but discarded some of them because of issues, but of those that remain they went through a four-pronged criteria process, and they are being presented from a low to high cost perspective.

Haugen went over the alternatives briefly:

- 1) Dynamic Speed Display Signs - \$14,000.00
- 2) Intersection Conflict Warning System - \$300,000.00
- 3) Restricted Crossing U-Turn Intersection - \$900,000.00
- 4) Staggered T-Intersection Configuration - \$2,700,000.00
- 5) Diamond Interchange - \$20,000,000.00

Haugen reported that there was considerable discussion on the cost estimates for the alternatives, as well as the benefits each would offer. He said that they asked the committee to rank the alternatives, and the Staggered T-Intersection received the most votes, and the Dynamic Speed and Interchange Warning System were tied.

Williams asked for an explanation of the make-up of the group that was there. Haugen responded that the Steering Committee is made up of a mixture of technical staff from the various agencies, it also includes property owners along the corridor that were fashioned via the Chamber of Commerce, and the Economic Development Corporation has a seat on the committee as well. He added that the Steering Committee makeup was identified in the RFP as well as the contract.

Kuharenko asked to go back to the slide indicating the weights of the scores. He said that one of the questions he has is in the environmental impact scoring, as well as the cost scoring, you have a fairly wide range in your costs, from, he thinks it was \$14,000.00, and \$900,000.00, all of those were 10s, and he is just curious as to what was the development of that scoring system, as well as the environmental impact scores, they had a number of options in there that had no environmental impacts, yet they had scores of 8s, and he is kind of interested as to why that was chosen, what was the reasoning behind that. Haugen responded that those are good question, but he can't provide an answer to the other than on the cost; since local road safety improvement program had identified \$900,000.00, that sort of seemed to be the point where there is already an acceptance of a cost alternative for this, so everything at that level, or less, were scored high, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

then as you start getting more costly you start to distance yourself from previously accepted cost considerations for that intersection.

Haugen continued on to the I-29 interchange area, and stated that there are several deficiencies occurring right now, and that are proposed to worsen in the future. He stated that there were several alternatives that were considered, but not forwarded on to the Steering Committee for consideration. He added that the same four factors were used for the remaining alternatives.

Haugen went over the alternatives briefly:

- 1) Northeast Loop - \$5,709,000.00
- 2) Roundabouts - \$6,176,000.00
- 3) Single Point Urban Interchange - \$18,360,000.00
- 4) Diverging Diamond Interchange - \$7,241,000.00
- 5) Modified Single-Point Urban Interchange - \$11,300,000.00

Haugen reported that all of these alternatives work, from an operations perspective, but they do have different environmental impacts and safety impacts, and varying costs. He added that there is also the technical scoring that took place, and then there was the ranking by the committee, and the Northeast Loop was the most favorable alternative.

Haugen commented that access management was discussed, however we probably don't need to go over why we need it, but they did include a new way of considering access management. He pointed out that it is determined by the number of conflict points and conflict potential instead of just a straight distance of no access within twelve hundred feet of another access, so it would go by what are actually access conflicts. He added that they ranked them in different categories, identified in the process, and they also referenced the 2040 Land Use Plan concepts for access spacing and came up with a couple of alternatives.

Haugen went over the alternatives briefly:

- 1) Frontage/Backage Road Strategy
- 2) Context Specific Approach
- 3) Restricted Access Corridor

Haugen stated that the more basic one, Frontage/Backage Road Strategy, is already out here on Gateway Drive. He said that there are some places, however, where the frontage road concept may not be able to develop through to the intersection with a signal.

Haugen reported that the Restricted Access Corridor is where really nobody has full movements at any access, but they do a U-turn sort of like the reduced conflict intersection. He said, however, that the comparison and cost to implement to fully is somewhat pricy because you have to build the frontage or backage road.

Haugen pointed out that, again, the scoring was varied.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the study looked into traffic signals, warranted now and into the future, and came up with a list that includes 55th Street, 51st Street, and 58th Street. He stated that the scoring determined that one should go in at 55th Street.

Haugen reported that concerning the NPN Fertilizer Production site, going into the meeting, based on information they had there was sort of a toss-up between 55th and 69th Streets working best for traffic flow in and out of the proposed plant. He explained that what sort of helped convince the committee that 69th was the best choice was due to the issue of landing a unit train, as we previously discussed. He said that BNSF is insisting that they can't break up the train, and the way they are loading and unloading the trains 55th Street, right at the intersection with 54th Avenue, because the track is dissecting that intersection, it would be blocked so they would have to modify and essentially build a minor radius connection for northbound/westbound or eastbound/northbound traffic, but for traffic coming from the south they would have to build a new roadway paralleling the railroad track. He added that initially they had hoped they could get the crossing developed here, but as he understood it BNSF has forced them to look at this alignment, requiring they build a new roadway for the one time a week a unit train would be blocking that intersection for hours at a time.

Noehre commented that the way NPN was portraying this, from what he recalls, was that BNSF said absolutely not, they would not let them break the trains, and yet they are willing to let the State Mill break their trains into smaller pieces, is that realistic. Brooks said that his guess is that you absolutely won't get your discount if you break the trains, but he doesn't know that for sure either. Haugen responded that maybe BNSF didn't talk to NPN about that west curve for their unit train traffic, they only mentioned that to the Mill. He added that he knows there is a meeting being proposed with NPN and others, including township people, to talk about this issue. He said that Advanced Engineering is supposed to be setting this up.

Haugen stated that the last alternative was just extending Bike/Pedestrian Facilities on one or both sides, cost versus need.

Haugen reported that they have scheduled an open house for the public to present a lot of this information, although not all of it to the detail you see, and it is scheduled for Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at the Ramada Inn at 6:30 p.m.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **MPO Senior Planner Position**

Haugen reported that Friday is the deadline for application submittal for our Senior Planner position, so if you know of anyone that might be interested, please let them know.

Information only

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2015**

2. FTA 5310 Program Funds Applications

Haugen reported that we are currently soliciting, on the North Dakota side, for FTA's 5310 Program Funds. He stated that applications are due to us March 4th, 2015. He said that once received they will be taken to this body and the MPO Executive Policy Board, then submitted to the NDDOT-Transit by their deadline of April 1st, 2015.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE
FEBRUARY 11TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT
3:17P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 11th, 2015, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:40 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Mike Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Nels Christianson, BNSF Bergman, Grand Forks Public Transit.

Guests present were: Peg O’Leary, Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission; Allen Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Wentz, NDSU/UGPTI; and Mike Bittner, KLJ.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen said that since there are some new faces here today he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 11TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 11TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that he would like to suspend the agenda in order to discuss Agenda Item 9 – Traffic Counting Program.

MATTER OF TRAFFIC COUNTING PROGRAM

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that it includes the staff report, and the Draft Grand Forks Data Collection and Archival Study – Phase II document that were included in the packets, and explained that it discusses the counting effort that took place in Phase II of the program. He added that Phase I just helped us determine if the program was feasible or not.

Haugen pointed out that included in the report they also developed a web-based tool that allows the public to look at the traffic counts that are being collected.

Brad Wentz, NDSU/UGPTI, was present for discussion. He stated that he actually works at Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute where he is the director of a couple of programs; one is the Advanced Traffic Analysis Center, and the other is the DOT Support Center. He explained that they do most of their work with the DOT and the MPOs. He added that prior to this he was with the County Engineering Department in Minnesota.

Wentz reported that, as Mr. Haugen said, from last year when they did a kind of pilot project on an intersection; they had been looking, prior to that, about using the traffic detection video cameras that they have out there at some of our signalized intersections to more than just do the detection but to actually count the traffic so they did a pilot project with the City of Grand Forks and the MPO and looked at one intersection and the results were pretty favorable, so they went ahead and did it at 30 intersections. He then explained the entire process used to gather the data and went over the results briefly.

Presentation continued.

Wentz concluded by explaining the benefits of having this data now; how it will help with signal timing, improved traffic safety, etc. He added that further enhancements will be made to the Traffic Analysis Tool, which will include making the tool compatible with other traffic signal controller based data collection technologies such as loops, and may further include capability to reasonably predict missing data, and automatic exclusion of data deemed to be bad.

Haugen commented that two things to cover are: 1) Brad just sent the link to him a couple of hours ago, so that will be distributed out to the Technical Advisory Committee members; and 2) Phase III - Not every intersection is currently being counted, there are a few that in our work program we will be asking ATAC to add into the system; and also there are none on the Minnesota side so there are a few on that side that we would like to add as well. He stated that it is also being looked at to have the traffic signals capture the frequency and duration of train pre-emption, which will allow us to have better information on the impact trains have at these intersections.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

Williams referred to the staff report and pointed out that there is an update or correction needed. She pointed out that the report states “Additionally, there is thought to have the traffic signals capture the frequency and duration of train pre-emption”; and asked where are we doing that, so if they need reports, they can run reports, and are you talking about getting it into this system. Haugen responded that it doesn’t necessarily have to be reported in this system, but he knew that they had captured, periodically, at specific times that train detection would be helpful.

Haugen reported that in the future they will have the scope-of-work for Phase III processed, the Master Agreement Addendum processed.

Discussion on whether or not NDDOT would still be doing their 48-hour counts at these intersections ensued.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that there is little in the staff report, but he did communicate with MnDOT and they said that they would not be able to attend today’s meeting, but there are two updates: 1) they still do not have their design consultant on board; and 2) if you recall, there has been a lot of discussion about the dip in the road, and that the determining factor is the bridge over River Road. He explained that if you look at Governor Dayton’s \$10 billion dollar transportation program proposal, he has listed several projects, and one is to replace that bridge, so the Kennedy Bridge will have its work schedule and if the Minnesota Legislature agrees to Governor Dayton’s proposal then the River Road Bridge will be replaced and that will offer an opportunity to raise that roadway at that time.

Haugen stated that this project is still scheduled to be done in 2016, although with the negotiations that are still taking place, there could perhaps be discussion about pushing it back, however none has taken place to date, that he is aware of.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen commented that two big things that have taken place on the Sorlie Bridge since the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting are: 1) the TIP has been amended to reflect the 2015 project schedule change. He asked if the STIP has been amended as well. Johnson responded that he believes it is done, but he has not had a chance to coordinate that with them yet. Haugen stated that it has been done on the Minnesota side, so it is officially a 2015 project. He said that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

the second thing is that the actual lighting that KLJ has worked on, and presented to the various local agencies, has been approved. He referred to a photo of the proposed lighting plan, and went over it briefly.

Noehre reported that the bid letting is scheduled to take place May 8th, 2015.

Information only.

MATTER OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REPORT

Kouba reported that they finally have enough up-to-date information in our pavement management system for Goodpointe to put together a report. She referred to the report, included in the packet, and went over it briefly.

Kouba pointed out that there are a couple of graphs in the report that show the pavement condition levels for both cities. She said that overall the ratings are good. She added that the report also goes into some actual scenarios of how to continue on, giving suggestions, and using the budgets based on those each city has set.

Kouba commented that three scenarios were developed to analyze potential impacts and implications over a five-year period:

- 1) Current Funding Scenario – reflects each city’s current approach to pavement investments, using current funding levels to establish a baseline for comparison.
- 2) Current Funding with 1.5% Budget Increase Scenario – improves upon the funding scenario by increasing the budget 1.5% per year for the next five years.
- 3) Maintain Current Condition Scenario – determines the level of investment required to maintain the current condition of the roadway network for the next five years.

Noehre asked when the data was collected. Kouba responded that the imagery was done in 2013, in the spring, and from there they used it do the analysis in 2014. She commented that there were some areas where the condition rating was increased because construction was done since the imagery was done, so there may be some minor discrepancies.

Haugen reported that this is the draft report that is out for comment and review. He referred to the two maps included in the packet, and explained that from the ICON software, Teri produced these two maps that are just on the federal aid eligible roadway. The program includes data covering both cities, some county roads, plus UND has its roadway network.

Kuharenko commented that one thing he likes in here is the fact that you do have these budget scenarios in the report, and it gives us a good reconnaissance level as to what we can see going forward, and then we can start a little more in-depth look at it. He added that the only comments

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

he has are on the budget area; and just has to do with using an inflation factor of 3%, and he knows that with a lot of their construction estimating they have been using 4%, and then for the budget column just indicate that that is all of the available funding, it is local, state and federal so there isn't any confusion with that going forward.

Haugen reiterated that this is the report; and these are the samples of some of the mapping they are capable of doing, and the software itself has more abilities, so unless we are hearing that there are a lot of changes needing to be made to it, it is kind of at the point where we turn it back over to the two cities and then there is some county and some state highways that are included in this data, and as much as we can maintain we will do that. He added that we have been doing it every five years, but if that isn't quick enough, or it is too quick, we can adjust it if needed.

Kouba stated that she would like to get comments back on the report by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, March 16th.

Johnson reported that he has one thing to add, and it affects the frequency of updating we just talked about. He explained that, you may or may not be aware that Bismarck/Mandan MPO did something very similar a few years ago, and they were just getting ready to ramp up their efforts for pavement management, and federal highway headquarters shot them down on it being CPG eligible, so this effort, in terms of collecting the data, analyzing it, and laying out your pavement conditions, was done prior to this recent determination so it is eligible. He commented that they are still working with them to see if they will change their mind, or allow some of it, but right now that is their stance. He added that they have said that it is not a planning effort, it is strictly data collection only, it stands by itself, it is only data collection. He said that you are allowed to do some data collection that translates into a planning study or a planning effort, but this is stand-alone data collection from start to finish. He added that he disagrees with this stance, because it may act as that, but the intent is to use this information to plan roadways.

Johnson explained that the reason they are having discussion right now, and the Bismarck/Mandan MPO did a little digging and some effort, and the St. Cloud MPO just released an RFP to basically is was approved for another state to allow an MPO to do this work. He added that the question was even asked by our local federals about tying this in to performance management and targets, and their response was no. Haugen said, then, that before we talk about frequency we need to talk about eligibility.

Noehre asked if we didn't talk about going to a performance measure of IRI at previous meetings, to do an IRI analysis rather than a pavement condition index. Kuharenko responded that he thinks that MAP-21 indicated that it isn't just IRI but also rutting, cracking, bulbing, general distresses that you would probably pick up in a PCI. Noehre stated that it seems to him that having a frequency of five years or less would probably be worthwhile.

Discussion ensued.

Kuharenko said that he has one question regarding the recommended action on this item. He pointed out that it recommends approving the Draft Pavement Management Report, but he is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

wondering if it is really more of an informational item or are we accepting it. Haugen responded that he thinks the intent was to get approval, but it came out later than we had asked Goodpointe to deliver it, so it is up to this body if you want to approve it based on corrections as noted, or if you want to wait for the final report next month. Kuharenko said that he is just wondering what kind of a difference is there between approving it versus accepting the draft with comments. Haugen responded that approval would be indicating that this is something that we would be utilizing in the future, while accepting would mean that we receive and file the report and it will just sit on a shelf.

Haugen said that he will put it on the for the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting. He asked that everyone get their your comments to staff, and they will resubmit a draft report prior to the meeting to allow you to review the documentation and make sure it is agreeing with the concepts and relays the message it is trying to relay.

Information only.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA FTA #5310 PROJECT APPLICATION

Haugen reported that one thing MAP-21 did was to consolidate separate funding programs, including New Freedom and JARC. He stated that JARC was absorbed into the regular fixed-route operating systems program, 5307; and New Freedom into the 5310 Program, which is more specific to the elderly and disabled services. He added that another thing that happened was that MAP-21 provided a state-wide distribution, but they reserved a portion of it just for the urban areas, so in North Dakota their three urban areas, state-wide had about \$360,000 available this program year.

Haugen commented that solicitation for the FTA #5310 program went out to our coordinating committee. He explained that not only does the project have to be consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, but also with the Public Transportation Human Service Coordination Plan, and we have a coordinating committee to assist us with that.

Haugen stated that we received only one application, which consisted of four projects that are listed in the priority order that the Cities Area Transit ranked them. He pointed out that the first two are things that have been historically funded in the past with this program; one being the Mobility Manager position which has been funded four or five years now, the other is the replacement of four ADA vans, the demand service vans. He added that Grand Forks is also requesting operational assistance, however there has been some discussion as to whether or not this is eligible or not, and the last is for the addition of one 25-foot low floor bus to provide the requested operation assistance project.

Haugen said that staff recommendation from the MPO; looking at the funding that is available state-wide, and with the request coming from the Cities Area Transit, and the negative impact it would have on the ability of Cities Area Transit to continue service down the road should all four projects be funded, staff is recommending that we just move on the mobility manager and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

vehicle replacement projects and not forward the other two projects on to the state, which is the operational request and the 25-foot bus.

Rood commented that she can support the MPO's recommendation, but she has struggled with it because priorities three and four are eligible for local match, are consistent with the Transit Development Plan, and as they have a long back log of service requests, whether it be in the south end, industrial park, later service, Sunday service, so when we see year to year in the different programs an opportunity to fund those services we like to go after them. She added that with all the unknowns on the future of federal funding, and even on a local level as we are carrying over local funds, if we are getting into a position where we have enough carry over to purchase vehicles with 100% local funds that should be something that we are considering moving forward, and she thinks that discussion is definitely going to happen, so next year when 5310 comes along we are on the same page, so erring on the side of caution as the MPO is recommending is the right move at this time.

Haugen reported that they are going to be doing a full update of the Transit Development Plan, but this is where we are sitting. He pointed out that the updated financial plan shows that if they all got funded, the entire grant application in full, if you operated just the one year the money is available, and not operate it the next two years, what has been sustaining the system has been the carry over, and you will see that in 2017 there isn't enough carry over for the system to operate, not only the additional route, but the current service as well, so a real challenge for us with the next TDP is to try to find all types of funding sources to maintain the service we currently have.

Rood added that one challenge has been to try to accurately forecast how much capital funding we are going to be awarded because this graph is showing a backlog of capital needs under the fixed route bus replacement of \$1.2 million; and this year we were only awarded one bus, so do we spread those purchases out, and let our buses get older and older, or do we take some local funds that we would like to see put into additional service, and replace vehicles on our own. She said that as far as she knows this hasn't been done in the past, and she doesn't know how that would impact our ability to get federal funds to replace that vehicle if FTA no longer has an interest in it, so there are just a lot of things that need to be cleared up.

Williams asked if Ms. Rood was okay with the recommended motion. Rood responded that, personally she would rather see three and four remain just to show that this is a need under this program, even though we aren't expecting them to be funded. Haugen stated that they will be aware that these two projects were submitted, they will be aware that they were part of the application. Rood asked if they would be provided with the details of that part of the application. Haugen responded that he isn't asking for any changes to the application.

Williams asked why, if we have the local match available to purchase replacement vehicles, they are shown as illustrative. Rood responded that we wouldn't have had the local match available, but they budgeted for several replacement vehicles but were only awarded one, so not all the local match dollars were spent.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE PRIORITIES ONE AND TWO OF THE GRAND FORKS CITIES AREA TRANSIT 5310 GRANT APPLICATION, THE MOBILITY MANGER AND FOUR REPLACEMENT ADA MINIVANS; AND REQUEST STAFF CONTINUE TO TRY TO FIND FUNDING SOURCES FOR PRIORITIES THREE AND FOUR; ENHANCED ROUTE 12 AND THE 25-FOOT LOW FLOOR BUS APPLICATIONS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DRAFT GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE RFP

Haugen reported that in the MPO Work Program we show this project not only 2015, but in 2016 as well, to assist both cities update their land use plans. He stated that the East Grand Forks RFP already went out, and is due at the end of March.

Haugen explained that we were originally just going to assist the City of Grand Forks with their Land Use Plan Update, however we have since agreed to venture into revisions to their Land Development Code as well. He said that Mr. Gengler has a Land Use Subcommittee formed that we have met with a couple of times to go over the scope of services, and have also been communicating with our state and federal partners on the Scope of services to get their critique on what has been suggested be done.

Haugen said that the full description of the Scope of Services in the RFP was included in the packet, and it looks at an April 27th deadline, with a May execution of contract dependent on the negotiation of service agreement. He added that there are varied deadlines throughout the RFP for the different portions of the work being done. He stated that there is some work that is exclusive to the Land Development Code, exclusive of the outcome of the planning document itself, so those deadlines come a little bit sooner. He added that in the presentation there is the actual dates of all the different items.

Haugen reported that they made a presentation to the Grand Forks Planning Commission last Wednesday night, and there are some continuing concepts they are proposing, as well as some new ones. He said that Grand Forks has a long history of growth management; trying to make sure that growth occurs contiguous to existing development, and then to reserve areas for future growth of the City, as well as ensuring that a lot of the area under the City's control is maintained for agricultural purposes, so there have been a series of planning documents that have been carrying out that system. He referred to the one that is in the 2040 Land Use Plan. He added that even though the City actually has exclusive land use regulatory authority in the two mile area they have asked us to maintain a four mile planning area, as well as to maintain and update their current tier system. He briefly went over the tier system, and explained what each tier involves.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

Haugen commented that as part of the effort for the 2045 Land Use Plan Update we will examine where the tier boundaries are and determine if they need to be adjusted. He added that we already included the livability principles and will continue those.

Haugen stated that they also had concept of design and pilot areas; and are still thinking of developing pilot areas in the plan, however the pilot areas are not in the green field type development, if you will, but are in the existing built environment. He added that Mr. Gengler has identified a couple of priority areas; the Grand Cities Mall, and the area around the Downtown; but we also added a third one, which we drafted in the RFP as one that is to be determined once the City has hired a consultant. He said that once the City and the consultant have communicated about future land uses, they can then reach agreement on the third pilot site, and work on how to develop a concept of working within existing built areas that perhaps underutilized or vacated land surrounded by built land and how those could be developed.

Haugen commented that with the ladders of opportunity with the federal funding source we do have to express the emphasis that our federal friends are placing on us, and that is to try to improve the ladders of opportunity, and to try to get where we have look at our underutilized areas, where we do have low income minority and other Title VI type populations to see if we can do some improvements that strengthen their abilities to climb the ladder of opportunity.

Haugen stated that Mr. Gengler has identified the Land Development Code Update that he is seeking. He said that there are four activities specific that we are asking the consultant to work on and Mr. Gengler has, with his staff, areas that they are going to work on that they feel are more administrative in detail and not so much trying to make major revisions to how the code addresses those areas.

Haugen reported that the timeline for the actual completion of this project would be October 16th we would seek final approval before the Planning Commission and the City Council and then have the consultant deliver everything in its final form in November of 2016. He added that the timelines the consultant actually has for the different components are listed in the RFP. He referred to those timelines and went over them briefly.

Grasser asked if Mr. Haugen could explain more on what the transit design as part of the revision to the Land Development Code. Haugen responded that for the Land Development Code they are asking the consultant to assist us in identifying some ways that any development could make it easier to afford the delivery of the different types of transit services because not everything is going to be on a fixed route, and at some point we will have a demand on transit to provide a service to a development.

Haugen explained that the Land Development Code Updates, those would have to go through the amendment process that the Land Development follows, and he doesn't know if because each one of these will be individually drafted, will they be submitted individually, or wrap them up all at one time. Gengler responded that he thinks that if the information, and the work is being done in a timely manner they would have the opportunity to pass through Planning and Zoning and City Council just a few at a time rather than waiting until the end and have them have to digest

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

twelve different zoning code amendments. He explained that for some it will take some time to educate them in terms of what the existing ordinance is versus proposed amendments, and that is kind of a task in and of itself. Haugen agreed, adding that with the timeline they have the overlay already exists you are just changing how to each individual corridor, landscaping already exists so what he is hearing is we should process those in October, November and December and get them off the table, and then bring the others when there are ready. Gengler said that would be their preference.

Grasser asked if, as part of this, will we be doing an inventory of the zoned land we currently have, and how many acres or whatever that we think we need in a year or whatever, basically doing an inventory of all our zoned properties. Gengler responded that in the actual plan update part of it is doing an inventory to update how many acres of commercial, residential, population, etc., pretty much an ongoing update of a lot of those variables, then we can take that information and look back at the last plat, then internally we can do as much analysis as we want to.

Haugen commented that Ms. Kouba has been having the MPO interns update all of the land use data for both cities so that when we do have a consultant on board that inventory will be updated through 2014. Kouba responded that she is in the process of checking that information and then she will arrange meetings to go over it to make sure it is all up-to-date.

Grasser asked if Mr. Gengler would be assembling a team, internally, that is going to review, from the City's side, the different aspects of the code. Gengler responded that in addition to staff, for some of this they can utilize the Land Use Subcommittee, in terms of having Planning and Zoning involvement up front when we are doing some of the code changes, but we can have anybody that we'd like to as far as what Ms. Kouba will be providing, certainly Planning and Engineering can sit down and review that information so that once we get ready to let it go we are all on the same page. Grasser commented that last time we used the Land Use Subcommittee. Gengler stated he would like a little more staff control this time.

Haugen reported that the draft report that is before you today has been approved by our State and Federal Partners in its current format, so staff is seeking a recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve it so we can release it to the consultant pool, and wait until April 27th for responses.

Kuharenko referred to the RFP, Task 1, and stated that it talks about new release of ACS data will be utilized to update these and other population characteristics, etc., etc. He asked if there wasn't an e-mail from Mr. Haugen a month or so ago saying that the US Census Bureau wasn't going to be producing ACS records. Haugen responded that you did receive an e-mail from him but that is related to just 3 year data release. Kuharanko said, then that it that is only the three year aggregate. Haugen added that one year, which would only be good for the county area because the population has to be 65,000 or more, but the five year data will still be released on an annual basis and that is the data that we would use.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO FORWARD A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FLOOD OUTLOOK 2015

Haugen reported that this is our annual report on our potential flood fight, although this year it doesn't look like there will be much potential for a flood event.

Haugen commented that part of our process is to release this contact list to make sure it is up-to-date annually. He said that UND has requested they be added to the list, so if there are no objections they will be added. He asked that everyone look it over and let him know by this Friday afternoon if there are any corrections needed to be made, other than the addition of UND.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **East Grand Forks Functional Classification Result**

Haugen reported that, as if you will recall, we went through an arbitration process with MnDOT concerning two areas we wished to have remain Principal Arterials, while MnDOT wanted them to become Minor Arterials. He referred to a slide of the East Grand Forks Functional Classification Map and pointed out that the first one was an area on 220 North. He said that, as you can see, MnDOT won and that area is now a Minor Arterial. He then pointed out the second area, and stated that, again, MnDOT won and it is also now listed as a Minor Arterial.

Haugen stated that with those changes, as well as one other little correction that needs to be made to the map, this will be the final classification for East Grand Forks that we will be processing next month.

Information only

2. **Bygland Road Study Submittals**

Haugen reported that they received two submittals, and are interviewing them tomorrow morning, and expect to have a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board for approval at their meeting next Wednesday.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2015**

3. Aerial Photography Submittals

Haugen reported that they received six submittals, and the selection committee met this morning to review them, and they will also be forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board for approval at their meeting next Wednesday.

Information only.

4. Senior Planner Update

Haugen reported that the MPO has offered this position to a planner out of Winnipeg, and he has verbally accepted the offer and will be introduced to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their meeting next Wednesday. He said that his first day of work will be April 1st.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 11TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:30P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the April 8th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Mike Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer; Darren Laesch, MNDOT Planning Director; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Public Transit.

Guests present were: Jon Markusen, KLJ and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MPO SENIOR PLANNER

Haugen said that it is his pleasure to introduce the newest MPO employee, Jiaro Viafara. He reported that he sent out information earlier on Mr. Viafara, and he began his duties with the MPO on April 1st. He added that he would like to give Mr. Viafara the opportunity to highlight his past experiences and give us a glimpse of who he is.

Viafara introduced himself, and shared that he is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), and of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). He added that he has some experience, most recently, in working on sustainable transportation, doing things for the City of Winnipeg on traffic and transit, and also for the Provincial Government on the introduction of electric vehicles to Manitoba. He added that he also assisted the Canadian Federal Government in harmonizing emissions related service relations with the United States through the APA.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Viafara stated that he enjoys being a city planner, and has past experience in working for an MPO in Florida, so this is basically kind of my middle name. He added that he plans on regaining his bearings and is very excited about this opportunity, so he would like to thank everyone for this opportunity and will do the best he can.

Haugen then asked that everyone please introduce themselves and state who they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 11TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Kuharenko referred to Page 5 of the minutes and pointed out that the word “bulbing” should actually be “faulty”.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 11TH,
2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO
CHANGE AS DISCUSSED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the draft scope of work that MnDOT is signing with SRF. He stated that, also noted in the staff report, there was an addendum that has not yet been forwarded on the approach elevation for the Minnesota side.

Haugen commented that the whole scope of services included the draft are in the staff report. He said that highlighted in the staff report are two sections on it that were of great interest, as the Kennedy Bridge study went through the process, the first one is the ped/bike facilities – it is identifying the 2C Alternative as the preferred alternative; and the 2C Alternative in the range of alternatives is a bike/ped multi-use trail inside the truss system. He stated that the second one that is highlighted is just the signature features aspect, and many of the things we discussed as signature type features include lighting, interpretive plaque on the history of the bridge, revamping the welcome to signs, etc.

Laesch reported that a meeting has been scheduled for this Friday, kind of a kick-off meeting to get this process going. He said that one thing that will be discussed is establishing the letting date, which is currently programmed for April of next year, but they aren't sure that is feasible at this point as it took considerable time to get a consultant under contract, so the last he heard they are most likely looking at moving it to July, but they hopefully will have a definite answer on Friday.

Laesch added that as far as the scope of work is concerned, they are definitely going to look into the grade raise, they got the preliminary findings back from the Corps of Engineers, kind of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

approving about a 1-foot grade raise there, so they will probably do a little bit more indepth design to verify that is doable and what kind of impacts it has beyond the road, but, hopefully they can address something there to get a little bit more flood protection in that area.

Grasser asked about the hydraulics, adding that they might as well get the Corps of Engineers opinion right away, but if we raise the road, last time with the road in its existing condition the Corps of Engineers allowed us to do some temporary measures, so we should find out early on over there if they will still be allowed additional temporary measures in addition to a road raise, while you have their attention on the hydraulics that would be a wise thing to deal with during an emergency flood fight. Laesch agreed that that is a good point, and by this you mean sand bagging along the highway there. Grasser responded that that would be correct, or even adding gravel like they did last time when they put it on both sides, which gave us another foot or so of protection. Laesch stated that he would pass this on to Joe McKinnon and Roger Hille.

Johnson said that he is assuming that someone from NDDOT is involved in the meeting Friday. Laesch responded that he thinks they will be involved via conference call, he just isn't sure who. Johnson said that that is fine, just wanted to make sure someone is involved.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that he made an extra effort on the staff report to see if there has been a more clear decision made concerning whether or not the temporary fix on the approaches is going to occur this year, or if that is still a work in progress and there might be a more permanent fix being considered in 2019 when North Dakota has DeMers scheduled for work. He said that included in the staff report were the different pieces of information that has been discussed about the fix at various meetings.

Yavarow responded that originally Mr. Hille was going to be handling both sides of the bridge, but he didn't realize at the time that there was another situation, he is leaving in a couple of weeks, but in any case Grand Forks is looking at it and he has had some discussions with Mr. Noehre, and it has been determined that it cannot occur at the same time as the bridge work is done, but they are looking at a temporary fix to be done once the bridge work has been completed.

Laesch responded that they haven't really determined what the appropriate fix is yet on the Minnesota side, if they will approach it using maintenance forces or if they will look at a more permanent fix and program it out a few years, but he hopes to get some of that finalized over the course of the next few months, but he is fairly certain that nothing will be done in 2015 unless their maintenance forces can do it.

Haugen reiterated that it appears, then, that the North Dakota side will have something done this year. Yavarow responded that that is their hope. Haugen said that it also looks like it is less likely to happen on the Minnesota side unless their maintenance crew can take care of it this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

year. Laesch added that when he talked to their maintenance group they didn't feel like they could do it, but they will look into it more in-depth, but he would rather get the right fix identified and get it taken care of, so if they have to hold off for a year or two that is the route he would like to take.

Yavarow reported that the bid opening has been delayed again. He said that he hasn't been able to find out from anyone yet as to why this happened, whether there hasn't been an answer from Minnesota, or whether the answer they gave required it be delayed, but in any event it will now be taking place June 5th. He added that he does know they were waiting for a letter from Minnesota SHIPO, which may be why it is being delayed. Laesch commented that he will follow up on this, but he thought they got some preliminary approval from Minnesota SHIPO. Yavarow responded that they wanted two reviews, and this is the last one, and he tried to call Ed, the district coordinator, and also the engineer in Fargo, but he wasn't in, so he is at a loss to know why at this time.

Johnson commented that he hasn't received any comments back from MnDOT Central Office on the MOU yet either. He said that Colleen has had it for quite some time. He added that Mr. Hille gave him some comments and the necessary changes were made and sent back to MnDOT, but he hasn't gotten anything back yet. Laesch stated that he would pass this on to Joe McKinnon and have him follow up on it. Yavarow added that their cost participation and maintenance agreement is being added for signature right now, so they will be able to build their half.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY2015 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this amendment is allowing East Grand Forks to utilize some remaining FTA 5307 funds.

Haugen pointed out that the project is up on 5th Avenue N.E., and it involves the installation of ADA compliant driveway aprons. He explained that East Grand Forks did a TAP project last year, and at that time it was pointed out that the sidewalk along the east side of 5th Avenue N.E., the part of the sidewalk going into the driveways, was not ADA compliant so this project will remedy that situation. He stated that it is a \$92,000 project with \$63,000 in FTA funding and \$29,000 local, which the East Grand Forks City Council has approved.

Haugen commented that staff did advertise for a public hearing for today's meeting, with written requests needing to be submitted by noon. He said that no written comments were received, and there is no one present for discussion, so staff is recommending that we approve amending the T.I.P. to include this project. He added that fiscal constraints are being maintained as we are bringing in new FTA dollars, therefore we are not jeopardizing or taking away any funds from another project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2015 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Kouba reported that after our March Technical Advisory Committee meeting staff took back the comments received on the report from Goodpointe, and the necessary changes were included in the new Draft report included in the packet.

Kouba stated that staff is looking for approval of the Final Report. She added that she knows that Grand Forks Engineering sent a memo about the deterioration curves limitations, so they can get some more input into our local roads. She said that they stated in the report that they are using global instead of local deterioration curves, and until such time we can use more local information they will.

Kuharenko said that he has a couple of comments. He referred to the photos included in the report, and pointed out that at the top it shows Walnut Street and 28th Avenue South with a PCI of 38, and a verbiage of good, but he isn't sure if that should be 38 or 83.

Kuharenko commented that, overall this is a good tool to have, but there are some limitations to it as has been stated previously, and as such he would move that we accept the report.

Ellis pointed out that Walnut and 28th Avenue South is shown twice; on one page it shows it as good, and on the back page it shows it as poor, but with the same score of 38, so she doesn't know if that is a typo on their part in the report. Kouba responded that is it is part of the staff report, but it doubled in there for some reason. She added that the first one isn't supposed to be in there. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the actual report itself, and pointed out that 38 is the correct score. He stated that, as Ms. Kouba described, they were putting the staff report together when they got the memo from Grand Forks Engineering indicating a different way of presenting the PCIs. He added that Ms. Kouba put together, from the report, some of the language and tried to show what the suggestion from Grand Forks was versus what the verbiage or the nomenclature to use was, and as she is indicating the one was just a complete error. Kouba agreed that that is correct.

Haugen stated that, just to highlight these two pages are using a 4% inflation rate instead of the 3% used in the original report. He added that staff is recommending approval, but the motion before you is just to accept the report.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY DAME, TO ACCEPT THE REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Johnson commented that, assuming these 28 pages or whatever is the extent of the report, and he realizes that this comment is probably late at this point, but he isn't finding anything in here that directly ties this back to the planning process that they had to develop as part of the RFP, originally, and unless you can show him where that language is laid out in here, and why this being done helps you as an MPO, as well as what it does for the local jurisdictions, he thinks you need to add something to the executive summary, or have a preface that explains that because, as you will recall from the last meeting, he informed everyone that this is no longer going to be an eligible activity, so in order for this study that's complete to remain with its eligibility we need to provide the tie-back to the planning process. He said that he would ask that the motion add that language, and then approve the document.

Kuharenko and Dame both agreed to include language that a preface explaining how this ties-back to the planning process be included in their original motion.

Motion, as amended:

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY DAME, TO ACCEPT THE REPORT,
SUBJECT TO THE ADDITION OF A PREFACE EXPLAINING HOW THIS TIES-BACK
TO THE PLANNING PROCESS.***

Grasser commented that, just to interject a bit, the difference between approving and accepting the report is; pavement management is a good tool, but it does have limitations, and they just want to be kind of clear as, they don't want, he is afraid that, per the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, if we use the wording "approval" sometimes it may infer that it has a level of precision that maybe it doesn't, and accepting he thinks is a way of maybe recognizing the limitations of the tool that we have, it's a great recon stance tool, and the data and stuff is good, but to redevelop some of those curves and figure out how to bring in curb and gutter and some of those things into the discussion it's a tool, but it's not the tool.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA SIDE DRAFT FY2016-2019 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that, as reflected in the several months leading up to, and also in compliance with the Draft ATIP that the Northwest ATP has out, all the projects from the previous T.I.P. have not seen much change, and we already made the biggest change and that was to move the Sorlie Bridge from 2018 to 2015, which is before the years being covered in this T.I.P..

Haugen commented that a lot of the projects are transit operation related, especially the out years. He pointed out that in 2016 are the major projects that will be taking place outside of transit, with the exception in 2018 when the next round of City Sub-Target funds are available for East Grand Forks City to enjoy federal funds, and they have identified a project up on 10th Street N.E., just east of 5th Avenue to convert that classified collector from a gravel road to a paved road.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Haugen said that, again, staff advertised for a public hearing at today's meeting, and asked that written comments be submitted by noon. He stated that no comments were received.

Ellis commented that it is her understanding that there will be an added project, that the City of East Grand Forks just received funds to lower 5th. Haugen asked what year those funds are available for. Bail responded that he believes they are available this year. Ellis questioned if they were for this year or next year. Bail responded that the project is going to be done this year. Haugen stated that if the funds are for this year we would be amending the current T.I.P. and wouldn't show it in this Draft T.I.P., but if it is for 2016 we would.

Bergman reported present at 1:56 p.m.

Bail reported that he knows that the intent is to do the project this year. Laesch asked where the funding was coming from. Bail responded that it is coming from Local Road Improvement Program (LRIP). Laesch stated that it would have to be authorized before July 1st, so will the plan be authorized by then. Bail responded that that is the goal, they are trying to include this project with the Lift Station work.

Ellis commented that Mr. Boppre will have to send the MPO a copy of the award letter so he knows what we were awarded. Bail stated that he will try to find out for sure what the intent is, but it is his understanding they wanted to get it done this year. Haugen said that once the MPO receives the letter we will decide which document it needs to be put into. He added that the good thing about this is that this is just a draft that won't be finalized for several months, so if it is decided that it is a 2016 project, when we do the final T.I.P. document we will act appropriately, but if it is decided that it is a 2015 project we probably need to hurry and get the amendment in.

Laesch reiterated that the Kennedy Bridge project may slide to funding year 2017. He asked if this would be doable on the North Dakota side as well. Johnson responded that we might be talking two different things here; you're thinking of a State Fiscal Year, right. He stated that right now North Dakota has the funds in Federal Fiscal Year 2016, so moving it from an April to a July bid opening doesn't affect us, if it is an April of 2016 or a July of 2016 it is still Federal Fiscal Year 2016 so it doesn't affect us. Laesch explained that their T.I.P. will show Fiscal Year 2017, and they are using federal funds, and their typical process is that if it is after July 1 they show it in Fiscal Year 2017, but as long as that letting date is before, or the project is awarded before October 1st, North Dakota is... Johnson interjected that as long as they authorize funds before October 1st, the last bid opening they can use an end of fiscal year money is in November as the plans are sent to Federal Highway mid-September and money is authorized at the end of September. Haugen stated that, if you all were to look at the current 2015-2018 T.I.P., you would see for the Sorlie Bridge, prior to amending it, we had North Dakota money in 2017 and Minnesota money in 2018, so on the Kennedy, if we have to we can show it as, again, North Dakota in 2016 and Minnesota in 2017.

Laesch stated, again, that it is hoped that a decision will be made by the end of this week, and once it is he will let Mr. Haugen know. Haugen commented that even if the decision is made by Friday, he won't change this draft because this is the draft that went out for public comment, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

if he changed it he would have to re-advertise, and have to wait another month, and by that time in another month we would be doing final approval, so, if at all he would like consensus to use this draft for the short duration. Laesch said that he is comfortable with that.

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2016-2019 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Haugen asked Mr. Johnson where North Dakota is on their next T.I.P./S.T.I.P. program. Johnson responded that he doesn't know for sure. He added that they are holding meetings every other week to try get everything finalized and figured out. He explained that the problem they are dealing with is trying to figure out what projects might go in the S.T.I.P. based on how much State oil monies they will get. He said that they are shifting federal funds out east because of potential State oil monies going to the west, but if they don't get as much State oil money they will have to shift federal funds back to the west, and that screws up the entire project listing in every fiscal year, so that is what they are battling with right now. He added that he does think they are close on the Urban Program, but he can't say for certain when it will all be completed.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY

Haugen reported that several drafts have been distributed around for review and comment, this is the latest draft, and staff is seeking approval.

Haugen commented that May 29th will be the due date, and the completion date is scheduled for the end of 2016, the end of April, for the final report.

Haugen stated that this draft is taking and incorporating some MAP-21 initiatives, for the first time probably in the MPO Planning Process, and that is the Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) process, part of the everyday counts initiative and MAP-21's streamlining project delivery we are trying to make as much of the work that we do on this and incorporated or available for incorporation into any environmental documents, or projects that come out of it in the back-end, so the language regarding the PEL is straight out of the federal register.

Haugen said that they are looking at the stretch of I-29 that starts, essentially, north, up at the North Washington Interchange and proceeds south to the Merrifield Overpass. He commented that included in the study are the existing interchanges, and also to look at potential overpass or interchange sites. He said that they tried to identify that there has been some work, or ongoing work at a couple key existing interchanges, so we aren't trying to reinvent the wheel, and can incorporate as much as we can the work that has already been done.

Haugen pointed out that there is a sequence of tech memos that will be produced out of the study, with ultimate compilation of those tech memos into the draft report and the final report; and public participation with three meetings, and three presentations to key groups, one being the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Service Safety Committee in Grand Forks, one being the MPO Board, and the third one to NDDOT Upper Management. He said that there will be a Steering group, or Focus group working with the consultants, and some of the preliminary players have been identified, but other players will be invited. He added that each of the tech memos will be presented to the working group for review and comment.

Haugen reported that they have a dollar amount of \$175,000 for the consultant costs, and the next agenda item identified that North Dakota is going to provide \$19,000 towards the 10% local match that we will be utilizing to offset the CPG dollars that were programmed towards this.

Haugen said that with the draft that is before you, and as he said before there have been many iterations circled around to get to this, he appreciates the review and comments received.

Kuharenko stated that he has a question regarding the tech memos. He referred to Section VII – Public Involvement Process, and pointed out that it states there will be three general public meetings and three in person presentations, but he is wondering if the tech memos that are to be presented to the Steering Committee is that something that will be an in-person presentation. He said that the main reason he brings up a concern for that is that will be additional trips for the consultant, depending on where they are located. Haugen responded that it identifies that the tech memos will be presented to the Steering Committee in-person or via teleconference, in order to stay within the budget, he will leave that up to the consultants.

Johnson asked if there was a Selection Committee in place yet. Haugen responded that that is normally included in the Scope of Work, however he sees that there are some blanks, as well as the use of an old version, so he will update that. He added that the committee is made up of someone from the NDDOT Headquarters, NDDOT District Office, City staff, and because the Merrifield Interchange is connected to the County there will be a County staff person, City Planning staff, and MPO staff. Kuharenko suggested that someone from City Engineering should also be included. Johnson stated that as long as NDDOT has a representative, if you want to offer it to Les Noehre first that would be fine, but if he doesn't want to do it then he would be willing to do it.

Johnson commented that he has a couple of other things: first he just wants to make sure that, and he thinks that this is understood, but Mr. Noehre and himself talked about this a little bit, and as mentioned earlier, trying to provide these linking MAP-21 Planning and Environmental Linkages is an important part of this planning process and can be a useful tool in the future. He said that the steps that are laid out in this study are really good for trying to develop that purpose and need, but what can sometimes happen with a study like this is that the purpose and need can get a little more generalized because it is talking about an entire corridor, whereas maybe one interchange has a different need than the other ones, so you might end up with multiple purposes, multiple needs and they kind of get lumped together and you may not be able to get as concise as you maybe would at a NEPA level, so don't be surprised if someday this moves into an environmental document so that those needs and purposes are a little more refined or narrowed down when it comes to that time; and second, more for Mr. Haugen's knowledge, with the experience he has seen on the study that Bismarck/Mandan did, some of their other divisions and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

management has wanted more review, more often on these types of studies, so don't be surprised if you have to get more people involved more often, and it slows you down so they are comfortable with everything. He added that another thing that has been done on some of these studies with the other MPOs is to offer other divisions to sit on the Steering Committee, so if you're comfortable with that he would invite the programming division and the planning division as well.

Grasser commented that in terms of the process end of the study, he thinks there will end up being quite a few comments going back and forth throughout the process, and he thinks it would be helpful if there was some way of documenting those comments, and the resulting changes that come from them. He said that they get hit with these documents that are multiple pages thick and it is difficult to go back and try to track back what comments were made, and the result of the changes, if any, so he would like to that as a procedural issue, not just on this one but anything that comes out and has comments come back so we are able to follow those comments and the resulting changes. Haugen responded that it is noted in the Scope-of-Work that the consultant is responsible to keep track of comments and document how they are addressed, but they will do the best they can to ensure this is done, not only on this study but future studies as well.

MOVED BY JOHNSON, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY, SUBJECT TO NOTED CHANGES ON THE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT AGREEMENT WITH NDDOT FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR I-29 STUDY

Haugen reported that NDDOT is going to provide up to \$19,000.00 for the I-29 Study. He added that they have submitted a separate agreement for us to sign in order to access those funds.

Haugen stated that this is the first time North Dakota has offered financial assistance to an MPO Planning study, and he hopes it will become a regular item in the future.

MATTER OF U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that included in the packet, attached to the Staff report, is the Executive Summary of the U.S. #2 Corridor Study. He added that a link was provided to allow you to download the full draft report.

Haugen referred to the Staff report and pointed out that it indicates that the Steering Committee is planning to meet on Tuesday, April 21st. He added that the last public open house will also take place on Tuesday, April 21st in the evening.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Haugen stated that there shouldn't be many surprises. He said that for the Airport Road the staggered "T" intersection concept is what has been discussed, and favorably viewed by the committee and the public as being the most viable. He added that the Northeast Loop Ramp concept has also been favored by the Committee, and the public. He stated that the favored location for the next signal is at 55th.

Haugen reported that in terms of access management, the discussion indicated that the concept of looking at potential full-access every half-mile would be the preference, with identifying that at the half-mile mark, or in this case 62nd, that if warranted a signal be installed; but the concept being forwarded is to only have ¾ accesses at the quarter-mile and not set them up to be potentially signalized in this study, but if more development occurs, it can be revisited.

Haugen stated that they are presenting this draft on the 21st to both the Steering Committee and the Public for review and comments.

MATTER OF EAST GRAND FORKS' LAND USE PLAN UPDATE CONSULTANT SELECTION

Kouba reported that one of our Work Program items this year is the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update. She stated that they went through the RFP process, and received three proposals. She said that the Selection Committee met, reviewed the proposals, interviewed the three firms, and selected SRF Consulting Group to do the study.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Grand Forks Land Use Plan And Land Development Code RFP

Haugen reported that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan and Land Development Code RFP is due at the end of April.

2. Rail Road Crossing Mitigation Study

Haugen reported that the Railroad Crossing Mitigation Study is also due at the end of April.

3. TIGER VII Release

Haugen reported that the USDOT has released TIGER VII. He explained that there is a pre-application process and then final application process. He stated that the pre-application needs to be in the first week of May, and you have to have a project that is a minimum federal request of \$10,000,000.00, which means your minimum total project needs to be \$12,500,000.00.

Haugen stated that you can submit up to three as the lead applicant, and at some point before the final application is submitted you need to have the MPO indicate, via some type of letter of support, approval of potential inclusion into the T.I.P. that it is funded.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 8th, 2015**

Haugen asked if the DOT was planning on submitting any projects that might be in our area. Laesch responded that they aren't on the Minnesota side. Johnson said that he isn't aware of any and would have to check into it further.

Haugen commented that on the Grand Forks side he knows there are at least two projects mentioned as possibilities, but he isn't aware of any for East Grand Forks. He explained that the Grand Forks projects being considered are the 42nd Grade Separation and the Bus Barn and fixed coach replacements.

Haugen asked if the 42nd Grade Separation project had ever been submitted for TIGER funds. Grasser responded that it has not. He added that he thinks they are going to try to work with one of the local consulting firms to see about putting together an application for 42nd. He said that if the TIGER Funds are going to be a repeat, which it seems like they are, he thinks they will put together kind of a canned package of applications for submittal both now and in the future.

Haugen commented that this is the seventh solicitation, but if you have submitted a project before you can ask for a critique or suggestion as to how to improve your prior application. He added that this is very competitive, as most things are.

Grasser asked, if they make an application for a TIGER grant, would that trigger them being able to submit their environmental clearance for federal highway approval. Haugen responded that it would only if awarded funds.

Johnson commented that if the City of Grand Forks does 42nd you have discussions with the railroad. He explained that when they did the TIGER project in Minot, with the Northeast Bypass, there was a lot of coordination with BN, with BN even pitching in money, and that has been looked upon favorably before when you get other entities impacted involved in the funding.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 8TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:30P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the May 13th, 2015, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Mike Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Steve Emery (Proxy For Brad Bail), EGF Consulting Engineer; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Darren Laesch, MNDOT Planning Director; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Public Transit.

Guests present were: Larry Zitzow, UND; Mike Bittner, KLJ Engineering; Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-ND; Sheri Lares, FHWA-ND; Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; Andrew Emanuele, FHWA-MN; and Kris Riosenberg, FHWA-MN, Becky Hanson, NDDOT-Transit.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because there are so many new faces here today, he would ask that everyone please introduce themselves and state who they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 8TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 8TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reminded the committee that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting Mr. Laesch had some information regarding a meeting that was scheduled for that Friday. He asked Mr. Laesch if he had anything to report on the kick-off meeting that was held last month. Laesch responded that he doesn't, adding that Joe McKinnon didn't have much to share other than that started work on the project development and NEPA.

Haugen asked if next month they hoped to have discussion on where the project will be in the T.I.P. Laesch responded that that would be their hope, to decide on a funding year, and he would lean more toward that being 2017 because they know that construction is going to happen in Minnesota's 2017 funding year, so that is the direction it will probably go.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that they are still trying to flesh out more fully what both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks are planning for their approaches, whether it would be temporary or permanent fixes.

Haugen reiterated that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting Grand Forks was fairly certain they would be able to accomplish something this construction season. He asked if there were any updates on this from Grand Forks staff. Williams responded that they are continuing to work on this, but they need to let everybody know that anything that is done has to accommodate the drainage out there, and currently the inlets are at the low spot so if when they do something they may build up the crown a little bit, but it won't be the ultimate fix until they can change the drainage and everything, so we will just have to see what we can do, but she doesn't want to give the impression that this is fix to end all fixes, because there will be more.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side their maintenance group still needs to look this over to see if they can do anything. Laesch added that he needs about six months or so to be able to sort this out, but he doesn't anticipate anything happening this construction season.

Haugen reported that they do know that DeMers Avenue, on the North Dakota side, has been programmed in 2019, so as Ms. Williams described, there may be a temporary fix done this summer, but with a more permanent fix occurring in conjunction with that major job in 2019.

Haugen commented that there was some discussion at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting that they hope that the bridge isn't down because one State decides to do the fixes one year and the other State the next, so they are trying to coordinate when the approach spans will be worked on as well. Laesch commented that that is a good point. He stated that the only reason he hesitates to couple with the 2019 project is because by having it as a cooperative project there would be two contractors working at the same time, and that would certainly present some challenges, but they can consider it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

MATTER OF U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY

Haugen reported that since the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting they did have a public input meeting, and also made a presentation to the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee and also to the Airport Authority. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the presentation was included.

Haugen explained that, for the benefit of our State and Federal partners here today, they were asked to look at access management along this growing corridor; specifically from I-29 to the Airport. He added that included in this was a request to look at a couple of key intersections and to come up with some operational improvements for them. He pointed out that the consultant working on this study is present today, Mike Bittner from KLJ.

Haugen commented that they did come up with some recommended access spacing guidelines, and have provided them to the City of Grand Forks, which has most of the subdivision jurisdiction in this area, however it is following what the plan has already identified for access, and that is essentially full access every half mile; and then at every quarter mile $\frac{3}{4}$ access, with $\frac{3}{4}$ hopefully preventing full operation of traffic signalization along the corridor.

Haugen stated that they also talk about the importance of preventing less than full access points; primarily right-ins/right-outs within a functional area of the intersections, trying to identify, and this is based on two differing speeds of forty and fifty-five miles per hour at the functional area is different from those speeds to try to keep those key access points operating as best as they can by identifying a need to try not to allow additional turning movements conflicting with the areas that they are identifying as a major access points.

Haugen reported that they have had some discussion, and some individual property owners commenting about the individual access points to their properties, and by-and-large the biggest comment and feedback we have gotten is on the Airport Drive intersection.

Haugen commented that, since KLJ provided the video, he will highlight the video in process. He explained that in the present situation the traffic signalizations that have been there for roughly twenty years create a lot of rear collision accidents, some have been severely angled. He added that prior to the signals going in there were a lot of angled, but they also had 30% fewer crashes occurring at the intersection. He said that, as we project out into the future of our Long Range Transportation Plan we do see that leaving it as is we start to not only have safety issues occurring, but we also have operational failure occurring at that intersection as well.

Haugen said, then, what does the public basically tells us we should be doing, well lowering the speed limit. He explained that the speed limit is 55 through the intersection, it is 70 miles an hour west of the intersection, and 55 all the way into Grand Forks. He stated that the speed limit was lowered to 55 not too long ago, but when they did the speed study they are still seeing that people are driving 70 miles an hour even on the east side of the intersection, so posting it doesn't make much difference, so even though they would like it to be posted at 40 we have been telling them that national studies are saying that just the nature of a rural high speed corridor, with a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

traffic signal kind of in the middle of nowhere doesn't solve a lot of problems. He added that both the Airport and the City of Grand Forks fought very hard twenty years ago for the traffic signal, and so there is a lot of desire to keep it in place.

Haugen reported that, as KLJ has done, they have provided us a lot of research and proven data that just changing the speed limit sign, and more enforcement, just won't accomplish what people perceive or expect it to achieve. He added that there were quite a few other alternatives that we looked at, some were low cost, some higher cost, but they were all rejected for one reason or another. He said that these included an interchange, a round-a-bout, etc.

Haugen commented that roughly a year ago the NDDOT did a Local Road Safety Program, and in that document they identified the alternative of a median restriction, or as Minnesota calls it, a restricted crossing u-turn, or "R-cut". He illustrated how this type of alternative would work, but noted that for the most part this alternative has not had much support, if any.

Haugen stated that one of the things that would help us safety wise, it really has limited assistance for our level of service, particularly with future operations.

Haugen referred to a drawing of the interchange option, and explained that because of the airport flight patterns, this would be an underpass going underneath U.S. #2. He pointed out that the cost of this alternative is most likely what prevents it from being seriously pursued.

Haugen said that the one alternative that seems to have some favorable results is the "Staggered T". He explained that of all the traffic going into the airport, there are two major patterns. He said that the movements of right turns into the airport and left turns out of the airport is one of the predominant movements, and just opposite of this movement is left turns out to go west and eastbound turning right to go south, so we have east to north and west to south dominant movements occurring out there currently, and less than five percent of the traffic is trying to go through the intersection. He stated that this Staggered T is trying to separate those conflicting movements.

Haugen commented that in order to assist the public in understanding, they also have video of the "R-cut" and have visualized how these individual movements would be done, and explained the increased safety that would be included in the movements. He added that the first one is just to show people how the through movement would be operational, one is showing left turns, and there is an acceleration lane dedicated for those left turns to help them get up to a certain speed.

Haugen reported that the next example would be near side crashes. He said that they have approach detection taking place so that vehicles on U.S. #2 are warned that cars are approaching. He added that this is another strategy that is in the Local Road Safety Improvement Program, already elsewhere in Grand Forks County, so it is new but it will be implemented elsewhere in the county. West asked if this was going through, that other "R-cut" along the State 18. Haugen responded it was. West said that the last time he talked to the DOT a couple of weeks ago it was still undecided. He added that the DOT is paying for it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

Haugen explained that what Mr. West is talking about is, if you recall, in our T.I.P. we had a \$2,000,000 project for NDDOT to do turn lane improvements on U.S. #2, and the termini were Grand Forks out to the west district line, and so they finalized the intersection of Highway 2 and 18 as it heads north out of Larimore, and at that intersection they are proposing to do the “R-cut”, and they have been going through the project development process, and at our public input meeting Mr. Noehre said that was the alternative that may even eliminate the left outs so everything is doing u-turns. West commented that when he last spoke with NDDOT he was told that it was still to be determined. Haugen added that the community involvement in that project out by Larimore has been more favorable of the “R-cut” design and other things whereas here at Airport Road it was kind of DOA almost.

Haugen referred to the Staggered T alternative and pointed out that it has a potential to reduce crashes by 67%, and has a cost estimate of \$1,700,000. He added that of all the alternatives looked at for this intersection it had the highest benefit ratio, and is one of the new alternative intersection design concepts that Federal Highway is promoting across the nation, and in our region as well.

West asked where they came up with the crash data reduction, because in looking at the R-cut alternative, it has a lot less reduction than the “T” intersection design but they seem like very similar types of improvements. Haugen referred to a slide with this information and commented that, as Mr. Bittner would like to say, if you add all of these up we would have a 200% reduction, but in any event by working through and using these, and this solution is a build-up of several strategies, so it is taking the reductions and combining them into a 67% reduction. Bittner commented that they specifically had the crash data with the two way stop control and the signal, and looked at exactly what was happening at each one, so it wasn’t just an overlay of minus 30%, it was – what is happening here, how would this be improved, etc..

Haugen said, then, that most of the comments they received have been specifically from the Airport, interest in taking out the signal and modifying how their typical daily operation is, and so they are still in the process of getting that public input, and hopefully it is favorable. He reiterated that they did present this to the Airport Board, and they are supposed to providing a letter to us soon.

Haugen commented that they noticed that it takes time to build up a \$1,700,000 project, or a \$20,000,000 project, or even a \$1,000,000 project, and there are some issues going on out there so we do see some temporary things, some interim solutions that will provide some help, but they aren’t meant to be the final solutions.

Haugen reported that the other area they looked at is the I-29 Interchange with U.S. #2. He said that even though we have issues occurring here today, this is just identifying 2040 operations. He then shared a video of this area and said that, again, this is all 2040 traffic volumes under the existing geometries, etc.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

Haugen commented that one thing to be aware of is that this is displaying, he thinks, more common everyday back up of the ramp that would be occurring in 2040, but there are occasions occurring right now where traffic gets backed up and starts to get into the I-29 traffic lanes.

Haugen stated that, again, there were a lot of alternatives that were reviewed, but the preferred alternative would entail installing a northbound off loop on the northeast corner. He explained that this would mean that all that traffic, instead of having left turns would be able to do more right turns that could be accommodated with fewer phases at the traffic signal. He added that they would also eliminate some of the full access points to the properties immediately east of the ramps, and convert them to right-ins/right-outs, or 3/4 access.

Haugen said that, again, they would anticipate this would reduce vehicle delay, decrease crash potential, and would be working pretty much within existing DOT controlled right-of-way. He added that for improvements to interchanges, etc., it is a fairly reasonable \$6,500,000 cost estimate. He stated that this recommendation has been well supported at all levels of the process.

Haugen reported that a couple of smaller things that they addressed, when Walmart went in there was a lot of discussion between Walmart, the City and the State about where the next traffic signal should be going in on Gateway Drive. He said that through their process they have reached an agreement, or have a favored location of 55th Street instead of either 51st or 58th.

Haugen stated that the next thing they looked at is the proposed fertilizer plant on the northwest part of Grand Forks. He explained that all of their 2040 travel demand forecasts did not incorporate any additional traffic this project might generate, so one of the things they asked KLJ to assist us with was understanding what the potential impact a nitrogen plant would have. He said that although one would think that a three billion dollar facility would create a huge amount of traffic, but in reality, while it is a large high cost investment, the traffic impact is fairly minimal to the total system.

Haugen said that one thing the City of Grand Forks asked us to determine was which intersection with U.S. #2 would be the best way to route all the traffic up to the plant. He stated that it was a close decision, a close process in trying to determine this and make a recommendation, but then they found out that as part of the rail service into the plant, and they will unit trains and other things, that 55th Street and 54th Avenue intersection would be blocked for many hours one day a week, so their 24/7 360 day operation makes 69th Street the best location to route the traffic to.

Haugen reiterated that, as he mentioned before, North Dakota did have a \$2,000,000 turn lane project in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., and they did do some work on analyzing turn lane improvements, and they incorporated and verified a lot of those improvements along U.S. #2 in our stretch of our corridor study and those are included in this document as well.

Haugen reported that this corridor does lack bicycle and pedestrian facilities. He said that, again, they received a lot of individual property comments about how that would be assessed against them, if at all, and that dictated a little more on whether or not they were favorable to adding bike/ped facilities. He stated that they did come up with a phasing recommendation, and they do

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

have some existing along the southern side, and as either U.S. #2 has made improvements, to incorporate it with that project or as development occurs we try to get the improvements on the northern side as well, although it seems that development is occurring more on the southern side, so as that development occurs we will get the bike/ped accommodations in on that side, as we will on the northern side when development occurs there.

Haugen commented that we are towards the end of the U.S. #2 Access Study, and we did give you access to the Draft report for your review and comments, and did go out to the public with that draft report as well and did receive comments, which I just reported to you today. He said that we are just about ready to present the final/final draft, and will give you until the end of the week to comment on it and will be seeking adoption of the document next month.

Kuharenko asked to go back to the list of proposed projects for bikes and peds, and said that in just looking at it projects two and three; project two on University, that is a half mile long project, and project three is on 62nd and is a three-quarter mile project, and they are both the same dollar amount, and he would like to know why. He added that, if possible, for future cost notes if we could get an asterisk next to it describing what is going into those costs, is it construction only, is it construction and engineering, is it based in the year being proposed, that type of thing. Bittner responded that that information is from other plans, it is just ?? of other recommendations that are already on the corridor, but in their report, the recommendation they have the have an appendix with the breakdown of all of it, itemized costs that we normally see for cost estimates.

Williams asked about the “T” intersection, the realignment of the “T” intersection where you move the north leg of the intersection to the east, in order to come north and make a right turn, and then try to make a u-turn to go back, is there sufficient weaving room at 55 miles per hour to get over two lanes to do this, and is that intersection far enough to the east to accommodate that weaving. Bittner responded that it is still 1,000 feet, and the way they designed it they would have the option to go all the way across if they feel comfortable weaving, but also the model allows us to analyze that and look into it and it is okay.

Williams said that on the 2040 analysis of the intersection level of service, was that assuming the existing configuration at that intersection, or did you add any lanes, or dual-left turn lanes, or two lanes north and south, or any of that. Bittner responded that it is just with the existing conditions. Williams said that she thinks that that probably needs to be noted because the majority of what they looked at now, in the future there would probably be some intersection improvements.

Hickman commented that Federal Highway North Dakota has probably not had a chance to look at this yet, they have been either out of the office or swamped, so she will try to get her comments in by next Wednesday if that would be sufficient. Haugen responded that his understanding was that this draft that is currently out was just given to this group, and then when we get to what this collective has drafted on them they would produce the final draft and then that is when it will be distributed to Federal Highway for review and comment. Johnson added that he essentially hasn’t submitted this draft to Federal Highway, it is just a TAC/Steering

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

Committee draft to review. Hickman said, though, that she is technically on the Steering Committee. Haugen commented that Ms. Hickman is on the Steering Committee and has been getting the drafts. Johnson stated, though, that the official one hasn't come out yet. Hickman said that that is fine, she is just trying to coordinate with the engineering team. Haugen stated that if she has comments, and you get them to staff by Wednesday, that would be acceptable.

Information only.

MATTER OF RE-DRAFT OF I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS RFP

Haugen reported that last month the Technical Advisory Committee did recommend to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the RFP as drafted at that time, but as noted in the update section of the staff report the MPO Executive Policy Board did not approve, but instead requested that we revisit an issue. He explained that they want to include in the study that, should any additional river crossing occur; either the 32nd Avenue crossing, or the Merrifield crossing, or both in the timeframe we are doing this operation study out to 2040, the study address what those impacts might be, so during the last month he has been looking at our historical travel demand model outputs, looking at what happens when we do add in additional river crossings. He added that, if you recall on the Bygland Road Study we also agreed to a request that we look at how a 32nd Avenue crossing would affect it as well, and based on the historical travel demand model, and what our current model output is showing 32nd Avenue, most of the traffic that is attracted to the additional river crossings is traffic that is really internal to city to city, there isn't a lot of I-29 traffic that would be attracted to, or crossing the river bridges. He stated that he did work with ATAC to do what is called "select link analysis" of the new river crossings to help us track back to where the traffic came and went from, and again there isn't a lot of traffic coming off the interstate to use the new bridges.

Haugen said that he tried to add in language to essentially try to say to the consultants that we basically want a sensitivity test for your alternatives. He commented that the model is sort of swinging a 2,000 car difference, when you play with it, depending on whether all the alternatives are added, so is your alternative that sensitive to a swing of 2000 cars a day, and just give us that type of analysis of what the river crossings do as opposed to adding every alternative, also look then at whether 32nd is in play, or Merrifield is in play, or both of them are in play to sort of give us an idea of how sensitive the alternative is to a swing of roughly about 2000 cars a day.

Haugen stated that, again, the intent that the MPO Board is trying to achieve is some knowledge of what happens on I-29, and any of the improvements or alternatives that would be considered, what happens if an additional river crossing or two were to occur. He said that the RFP was expanded to ask the consultant take a sensitivity approach to it, not a full, in-depth evaluation of each river crossings impact on that alternative, but just how sensitive that alternative is to a couple thousand cars a day.

Haugen commented that he did not add anything to the proposed budget, therefore he isn't asking the NDDOT to add any monies to their contribution to the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS RFP, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Kouba reported that this is, basically in update for the Technical Advisory Committee. She stated that they brought Alliant Engineering on board back in March, and in April were doing some turning movement counts along Bygland Road. She said that they gathered that data and were able to set a date for presenting the information to the public as well as holding a Steering Committee meeting, both of which took place yesterday. She added that they actually a very good turnout at the public meeting.

Kouba commented that they presented pretty much the same information to both the public and the Steering Committee. She explained that they presented a lot of the things they discovered in the data, mostly, as well as seeing the issues that were out there. She stated that with the traffic counts they definitely saw that there is a spike in the morning where people are coming in and bringing their children to school because the southend has a middle school and an elementary school, and then they are proceeding to go back to get out of the southend of East Grand Forks to proceed to work. She added that there are also the residents that live in that area who also trying to leave for work, so it makes for a combined spike of people, and then those two spikes of people coming back are leaving at two different times of the day.

Haugen asked if there was a graphic included in this package. Kouba responded that there isn't, it was a graph not a map.

Kouba stated that it was something that, of course all the residents of that area knew about already, and they brought it up at the meeting as well, that it is difficult to get out of, to get on to Bygland Road, that what their turning movements counted. She said that their turning movement counts were showing that it is difficult to get on to Bygland Road, and most of the traffic was on Bygland, it wasn't so much going on and off of it. She added that we have very low crash, which is amazing for the volumes of traffic that are coming along there.

Kouba reported that they also, at the public meeting, besides the traffic volumes and that information they also presented giving them information on what is out there for, as well as, not just, a lot of people know about roads, and they know about stop signs and they know about signals, and they are hearing a lot about roundabouts and these are all fixes for roads for cars, but they are just starting to hear about on road facilities for bicycles, what happens with certain pedestrian facilities, and things like that, so we were also hearing about how people were using the roads, that area for biking and pedestrian use as well in the meeting, as well as giving information about how these different facilities for bike and ped are, especially on road facilities like sharrows and bike lanes, and protected bike lanes, and things like that, as well as giving out a range of costs for what those things cost to put into that area so that the general public gets an

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

idea of costs so that they don't get too carried away, one of the biggest problems is that they get a little upset, it's like, okay, we ask for all the ideas, and then it's like, well, then we start putting up costs and they don't like it, so we gave some cost information out as well to let them absorb that information as well.

Kouba commented that they gathered all the information, and all those comments, and they are putting back together. She added that there is also a website that is available to the public, and they have a survey out to gather information from the public as well, which will be available until the middle of June. She said that they are advertising this in various ways, and they will get more information out by the middle of June as well, and then they can hopefully come back in the middle of July with alternate fixes.

MATTER OF GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN RFP SELECTION

Haugen reported that the Selection Committee received four proposals for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update. He said that they were able to unanimously agree on the top three choices, and those three choices were interviewed yesterday afternoon, and after a lot of discussion the committee chose WSB, along with Nelson/Nygaard and Community Engagement Group as their top choice.

Haugen commented that their proposal did follow the scope-of-services identified in the RFP. He said that the Project Manager for WSB and himself are finalizing the scope-of-services and the cost. He stated that their initial cost proposal was about \$1,500 below budget, so that is the status of where we are at with the Grand Forks Land Use Plan. He said that they hope to have a contract, and they have already exchanged our draft contract with all the federal clauses, etc., with the consultant. He added that this is the first time that WSB will be under contract in Grand Forks, even with the MPO, but we hope to have a contract available to the MPO Executive Policy Board to execute and submit it to Mr. Johnson for his concurrence on the process selection, etc, so we can have them on board as soon as possible.

Williams asked, because the land use is so closely tied to our Long Range Transportation Plan, when will we be seeing the Long Range Transportation Plan RFP. Haugen responded that next year we will have the transit focused portion RFP out, and in 2017 we should have the Street and Highway which gives us almost twenty-four months for the Street and Highway Side, twelve months for the Transit Side; and on the Bike/Ped side we will do in-house during the 2017-2018 timeframe. Williams said, then, that you're planning on finalizing the Land Use Plan prior to beginning the transportation. Haugen responded that we will have the Transit Plan, the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan will be done by then, and also Grand Forks will be in the draft stage of their update, so we say 2016 for the Transit, we get the RFP out hopefully in January, but we won't have anyone under contract until April, where the Grand Forks Land Use Plan will be done in April of 2016, we will have a draft document out by then, so we aren't too overly concerned about starting the TDP before the "T's" are crossed and the "I's" are dotted on the Land Use Plan. He added that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan scope-of-services is heavily invested in trying to better coordinate transit with land development, so transit will be a topic throughout the Land Use Plan update process, so again, we aren't overly concerned about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

starting the transit operation plan before the Grand Forks Land Use Plan is finalized. Williams agreed that she feels that the transportation plan needs to be started before it is finalized as well.

Kuharenko asked who the fourth consultant was. Haugen responded that it was MMM Group out of Winnipeg, and he believes they were solo, they didn't have any subs on board, but the other two consultants up here also were teamed up with several subs as well.

Haugen commented that one of the things the Selection Committee loved about WSB was that they did actually have a community engagement sub-consultant as part of their team, so we will see some rather innovative and very concerted effort to engage the public with the Land Use Plan Update.

Information only.

MATTER OF STATUS ON GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING RFP SELECTION

Haugen reported that this is the study that will look at potential consolidation of the Mill Spur traffic over to the Glasston Subdivision. He said that part of the impetus of that is that the North Dakota State Mill is increasing its production 30% and it needs to gather 30% more wheat and the wheat needs to be shipped maybe 30% further away from where they are currently shipping, so they need to start landing unit trains in Grand Forks. He explained, however, that they are land-locked, so they are looking at the area along the Glasston Subdivision to do this, and then they will try to connect by rail over to the State Mill. He commented that our RFP is looking at, when they do that, can we abandon the Mill Spur line and eliminate all those railroad crossings, and focus on the Glasston Subdivision where we have half as many crossings, and see if we can come up with some mitigation strategies to make it more co-existent with increased train traffic and vehicle traffic conflicts across the whole track.

Haugen commented that only two proposals were submitted; Olsson Associates and KLJ Engineering. He stated that, if you will recall, Olsson Associates just helped us do the Freight/Rail Access Study, and obviously KLJ has been involved in several studies.

Haugen stated that the Selection Committee did recommend KLJ, and one of the reasons Mr. Bittner is here is because after this meeting, he and I are going to begin the negotiations for the final scope-of-work.

Haugen reported that for both of these RFPs they did have a diverse Selection Committee involved, a lot of perceptions that were different from what we usually see.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 13th, 2015**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 13TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:35 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 10th, 2015, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Becky Hanson, NDDOT-Transit (via conference call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Erickson (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Darren Laesch, MNDOT Planning Director; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Public Transit; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District.

Guests present were: Larry Zitzow, UND and Craig Collison, MNDOT-District Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen said that, since there are some new people present today, he would ask that everyone please introduce themselves and state who they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE MAY 13TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen asked Mr. Laesch if he had anything to share on the Kennedy Bridge project. Laesch responded that they have established that the project will be funded in FY2017. He stated that the letting date is set for August 2016, at least that is what is planned at this point, and added that the focus is to get some early SHIPO approval before they get too far into the process.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen commented that he hopes that everyone has noticed the Dynamic Message Boards that have been set up in both communities informing the public that the Sorlie project will begin next week, June 15th.

Haugen said that he assumes that the bids came in favorably, as they were lower than the engineer's estimate.

Noehre reported that a pre-construction meeting is scheduled tomorrow. Yavarow added that there is still no contract, it hasn't been signed, and they don't know when it will be signed as the contractor has still not provided a license in North Dakota or amended his insurance to include the State of North Dakota, so that is still on hold at this time.

Haugen stated that he noted in the staff report that Bob Christensen from the NDDOT Cultural Resources Section is leading the process on the development of the lighting agreement. He asked if there is a schedule for this yet. Noehre responded that there isn't, adding that he talked to Mr. Christensen a couple times over the last several weeks trying to get it set up, but they have been pretty busy with the bid openings so nothing has been done on it yet.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF EGF FUNCTIONAL RECLASSIFICATION

Kouba reported that, basically this is something that has been brought before the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board a few times, with many iterations going back and forth between MnDOT and the MPO, but now they have finally made agreements on what should everything be called, basically.

Kouba commented that the changes that they went through the last time have stood, and she believes the last time we were talking we were still trying to get the Bygland Road and 220 to stay Principal Arterials, and they went through arbitration, but it was determined that both roadways would be classified as Minor Arterials, so that change has been included on this map, as have all other changes that were previously discussed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

Williams asked how many tenths of a mile in classified streets did we lose. Haugen responded that we didn't lose any classified streets. Kouba added that it just changed the designation, from either Principal Arterial to Minor Arterial or Major Collector to Minor Collector, as there are a few Minor Collectors within the city limits now as opposed to last time when there weren't any.

Haugen commented that another thing this map does not display is future designations. He explained that in the past the functional class showed what was the existing class and also highlighted future roadways that might become classified or are planned to become classified at a later date, and this map is not showing future designations. He said, however, that the Long Range Transportation Plan still has a map that does that, so we still have a map that shows future classifications, but the one that is out for signatures and approval by us, MnDOT and the Feds will only show existing designations.

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE 2015 FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION FOR THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT REPORT

Haugen reported that included in the staff report were all of the public comments they received after the last open house. He said that they all primarily addressed Airport Road, there was one that did not address Airport Road, but all of the rest of the comments specifically made connection to the Airport Road/County 5 intersection.

Haugen stated that the Airport Authority did submit a second letter. He said that, as you may recall, at the very beginning of this study the Airport Authority submitted a letter voicing their concern with the R-Cut alternative being the de-facto decision, and since then they sent a second letter with revisions.

Audette reported that the Airport Authority Board held discussion on this topic and they did submit a new letter to Grant Levi, NDDOT Director, and, again stated their concerns. He explained that one of those concerns was the desire of the Authority Board of Directors to retain the intersection. He said that there was some question about possible alternatives that weren't researched to keep the intersection in place, and the concern for the service of the passengers and their clients to retain the intersection, so they wanted that explored more fully, to not rule it out; and in terms of a long term alternative, understanding justification funding was the desire for an underpass, the true desire over the next forty to fifty years long range plan.

Audette commented that in the short-term, they identified stoplights, acknowledging that stoplights may contribute to the accidents at the intersection, but both of the options presented in the study eliminated the stoplights and replaced them with some form of dynamic signage; and other options added some acceleration lanes, and the Authority Board feels that a combination of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

some dynamic signage and acceleration lanes added to the existing intersection would be a measureable first step to improve safety.

Haugen stated that on that specific letter they received, the final report in the section that addresses the Airport Intersection, concludes the stakeholder involvement comment section, they did point out what they grasped as the three major points of the Airport Authority, in that. He said that the Airport Authority did offer to pay for an engineering firm to look at some of these possible alternatives, and there will be a meeting following today's Technical Advisory Committee meeting with Les Noehre, Rick Audette, KLJ, and himself to discuss alternatives that haven't already been considered, and whether or not we should amend the KLJ contract to incorporate those alternatives so that an analysis for each can be included in the report.

Haugen commented that their initial hope was that they would be able to finalize and recommend approval of the report as it was submitted, but because of the Airport Authority's letter, and the option that we might amend the contract, we will not seek action by the Technical Advisory Committee today. He added that if they are able to identify alternatives, and agree to amend the contract, that may be something that will just be presented to the Executive Policy Board next week so that we don't lose too much time in the process, so be on the lookout for our Executive Policy Board packet when it is released tomorrow or Friday to see whether or not there was a recommendation to amend the contract.

Williams said that if we are going to amend the contract there is one thing that she did not see an analysis of; FHWA recognizes that retiming of the traffic signals has a certain level of improving intersections and percentages of accidents that could be reduced, and she hasn't ever seen that computation in the report, as far as what retiming the signals would actually do to help the situation. She said that she knows that that was something that was recommended to be done, and maybe already has been done, but she did not see the computation as far as the percentage and such of improvement at the intersection based on the retiming, and that was in the FHWA briefs that was put out concerning different things that can be done at intersections, and that is where that information was contained. Haugen responded that he is trying to remember if this was addressed previously, how Mike was going to address it. Williams said, though, that it isn't in the report. Haugen reported that the report is going through all of the different divisions of the NDDOT for review and comment, and they still have Federal Highway's review and comment forthcoming so it isn't too late to make sure this gets addressed in the report.

Haugen commented that in the staff report the Executive Summary was added, and all the other comments they received, again most of them dealt with suggesting that we should look at lowering the traffic speeds on U.S. #2 to 40 or 45 mph, and don't remove the traffic signal. He said that they did add some language into the report to document that, but the speeds were already lowered from 70 to 55 mph, and traffic is still going roughly 70 mph out here; and they also documented that research studies and case studies have shown that posted speed limits don't necessarily achieve the speed reduction that the speed limit sign suggests, so they are trying to further educate everyone that just changing the speed limit sign doesn't mean people will follow it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

Haugen reported that the one comment that didn't specifically address Airport Drive, and is something that perhaps Grand Forks Planning and Engineering give consideration. He explained that it is a comment from Whitewater Truck Wash concerning their interest in trying to have either a frontage or backage road created between 47th Street and 51st Street. He said that Whitewater Truck Wash is located on 51st Street so he is suggesting this to help ease some of the traffic from the truck stop to his truck wash that would eliminate the need to go back out onto Gateway Drive or U.S #2, there be some sort of frontage or backage road. He referred to an aerial photo of the area and went over how this could be accomplished.

Haugen stated that the report is in its final draft form, out for review and comment, and, again, they will be meeting later today to discover if there are alternatives, and whether the cost estimate would be reasonable to investigate them and amend the contract. He said that the other option they will discuss is that there is no project programmed for that intersection in either the TIP or STIP currently. He added that when a project is programmed, then, of course, the more detailed project development process will take place, NEPA will be engaged, and other alternatives might be better addressed then then in this report. Williams asked if this would be included in the report, a disclaimer or something like that. Haugen responded that the section he highlighted earlier, in the final report, the Stakeholder involvement section, there will be an added paragraph should we decide not to amend the contract; but if we decide to amend the contract then there will be a whole lot more included in the report about any additional alternatives and analysis.

Williams asked, once the report is finalized by the Executive Policy Board, where does it go from there, what is the path this will take. Haugen responded that it is an MPO study so there isn't any formal action being sought by any other agency or local jurisdictions in the report. He said that it does become, as most of our corridor studies do become, a sub-plan to the Long Range Transportation Plan, so as these intersections or areas are requesting being programmed in the TIP we will look at consistency with our planning documents. He added that there is somewhat of a timing element as well, so we will look at whether it is ripe for being programmed, or if it is a longer term solution that can wait.

Williams referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it states that the MPO Unified Planning Work Program identifies the study for completion in 2014, should that be 2015. Haugen responded that it should be 2015. Williams pointed out that this should be changed in the findings as well, for consistency.

MATTER OF THE FY2015 WORK PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Haugen reported that a while back the MPO got a request to highlight our Work Program and all the different activities that are taking place, the schedules that are connected with all those individual activities. He said that this is one of Jairo's first jobs to get acquainted with our work program, he asked him to fulfill that request, and this is the document he prepared to present to you today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

Viafara commented that everyone should have received a copy of the work program activities, the ones scheduled for completion in the year 2015.

Viafara referred to a slide presentation (included in the file and available upon request), and explained that the idea behind this is to provide all of stakeholders and members of the committee with an update on each of the projects we are working on. He pointed out that the information includes the Project name, description, objective, cost, product, timeline, and who is responsible.

Viafara stated that he hopes that this information serves the purpose you were seeking, however, if you find that you still need further information, that could be an opportunity for them to work on the main table and add any other information you require.

Williams commented that she thinks this is really nice, it is very very helpful as far as knowing what studies are coming up. She said that perhaps, maybe what would also help is if we could squeeze another column in there that give the current status of the project; such as preparing the RFP, or out for bids, or such so we can know where we are at with each project. She added that if you can add the status of each project, it would be nice, then, if you just stick the information in under other business each month, and then if there is something that we need to discuss we can, but at least we would have a new status on each project each month.

Viafara stated that what you are requesting can be done, so for the next meeting he will provide an updated version.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON UPCOMING MEETINGS

Haugen reported that this is just to highlight three meetings that are scheduled to occur before the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

- 1) East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update 2045 – Public Open House will take place over at the Riverwalk Centre on June 18th, 2015, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- 2) Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update 2045 – This is not a Public Open House format, this is a sub-committee of the Planning and Zoning Commission, it is a kick-off meeting with the consultant and will take place in Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101 on June 18th, 2015, starting at 5:30 p.m.

Haugen commented that there is some time overlap with the two Land Use Plan meetings, but they feel that the audience is pretty unique to each so that there wouldn't be much public overlap.

- 3) Glasston Railroad Crossing Study – The Steering Committee kick-off will take place on July 8th, 2015, at 10:30 a.m. at Dakota Hall at 1015 North 43rd Street in Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

Williams asked what the difference is between the Railroad Mitigation Study and the Glasston Railroad Crossing Study, are they going to be kind of run together, or separate. Haugen responded that it is really just an inconsistency in titling, it is the same project.

Noehre asked if the meeting invite has been sent out for the Glasston Study already. Haugen responded that he sent an email out notifying people of when and where. He explained that there was a Doodle Poll that went ahead of it and this was the date that seemed to work best for the majority of those involved, but there will be a full meeting packet sent out later, he just wanted to let everyone know of the date and time.

OTHER BUSINESS

1) Sorlie Bridge Closure

Ellis commented that she just has a question about the Sorlie Bridge project that might have been covered when she wasn't here; the East Grand Forks Public Works and Fire Departments were wondering if, with the Sorlie Bridge Project starting on June 15th, they should maybe be routing ambulances that come over a different way. She asked if they were planning on shifting people from one side to the other, or if there was only going to be one lane opened. Noehre responded that there would only be one lane open to the signal. She said, then, that they should probably block off the parking areas on the wet side of the flood wall on both sides of DeMers. Noehre commented that he would direct those kinds of questions to the Project Engineer, Jesse Kadrmas. He said that he would get her Mr. Kadrmas' phone number.

Haugen asked about the pre-construction meeting that Mr. Noehre discussed earlier that was taking place tomorrow at 10:00 a.m., and whom from East Grand Forks might be attending it. Yavarow responded that the Public Works Director was notified of the meeting. Ellis asked where it was taking place. Noehre responded that it would be taking place in his office at 10:00 tomorrow. Ellis said that she would talk to Jason about this. Noehre commented that that would be a good place to bring these questions up, not that they can necessarily be answered, but that is the place for everyone to see everyone else and get everyone's contact information. Ellis agreed, adding that they have Art Fest going on so they will have some areas blocked off anyway, so it might be something that they leave up.

2) MAP-21 Extension

Haugen commented that at our last meeting we discussed congress almost taking action to extend MAP-21 two months, and they did do that, through July 31st.

Haugen stated that last night the House adopted an Appropriation Bill for 2016, that is about status quo, but with a few tweaks. He said that at least they are funding next year, starting the process to fund next year, but authorizing the money is another question. Noehre commented that this means that the State of North Dakota hasn't received a federal aid package.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 10th, 2015**

Haugen reported that this means that we have two more months of appropriations, we just don't have a full year of 2015 appropriated yet. He said that the money is available, it just has to have the authorization to take it all the way to Denver.

3) 5339 Funding

Haugen said that Mr. Bergman is waiting for 5339 awards, which might not happen until after July. He asked Ms. Hanson if she has a timeline on when they might make those transit awards. Hanson responded that later this week, or next week, they should be getting the 5310 funds out, it has been approved, just haven't been released yet.

Haugen asked about the 5339 funds as well. Hanson responded that the 5339 funds are still scheduled to roll out for advertising in October just like last year.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 10TH,
2015, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:10 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 8th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Planning; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Erickson (Proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineering; Nels Christianson, BNSF; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District.

Guest(s) present: Kim Greendahl, Grand Forks Greenway Specialist.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 10TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 10TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that it does state that there would be verbal updates provided as available. He said that yesterday MnDOT met with East Grand Forks officials, sort of a meet and greet for new staff members, etc., and they talked a little about both bridges.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen distributed copies of an illustration of the proposed improvements to the Kennedy Bridge and explained that this is what they are identifying as the likely cross-section of the structure, and, although it hasn't yet been finalized, this seems to be where things are heading.

Haugen referred to the illustration, and pointed out that the top is the existing cross-section, and the bottom one is what they described as "everybody giving a little in order for everything to fit", so instead of a 10-foot trail, or a multi-purpose path it will be an 8.5-foot one; and instead of a 12-foot or wider driving lanes there will be 11.5-feet wide; and instead of 4.5-foot shoulders there will be 4.25-foot shoulders. He explained that this will allow for everything to fit inside the existing truss system. He added that nothing is being cantilevered or outside the truss. He also pointed out that there is also no median through the structure.

Haugen commented that this, then, is the concept that is moving forward, however it is still subject to change.

Haugen stated that some of the questions the City Council had included: 1) how far back from the actual bridge itself will median removal entail, particularly on the Minnesota side as there is no median on the North Dakota side that extends beyond the bridge. He said that there was also discussion about the west-bound on ramp and its merging problem and whether that could be mitigated. He commented that the road raise is still in play as part of the work that MnDOT is doing with SRF, they are still evaluating the possibility of raising, slightly, the east side .

Haugen commented that the last bit of information was their stating that it is likely that construction will occur in 2017/2018, and that there is very little possibility that much will go on in 2016.

Haugen added that for the multi-purpose trail connection, MnDOT's plans are to extend the trail on the north side along the on-ramp all the way to River Road, and then connections to anything else would be the responsibility of the City and others.

Haugen reported that there are still two public engagement meetings that will be scheduled. He explained that the consultant is under scope to engage the community at least twice, so they will be scheduled soon.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there was a lot of push on MnDOT to do something with the approach dip on the Minnesota side of the bridge, sooner rather than later. He stated that he thinks the best that the City got, was perhaps a bit more serious consideration of trying to do something temporary this season. He added that they talked about the possibility of developing some

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

cooperative agreement with NDDOT so that when DeMers Avenue is being done on the North Dakota side to maybe work on that approach area on the Minnesota side as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT FINAL REPORT

Haugen reported that last month we were trying to prepare for final approval of the report, however, there was contemplation of possibly adding to the scope of services to have a re-examination of all of the Airport Drive/County Road 5 Intersection to see if there are any other alternatives worth looking at more closely. He stated that the Airport Authority considered that request, but denied executing the funding for the scope of work that was developed, therefore we are proceeding as we noted we would if the extra work was not done, to seek final approval of the report.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet were the comments we received from the NDDOT staff. He said that since then he sent KLJ's comments and reaction to the pertinent comments to the committee, and included in that e-mail was this matrix showing the comment, page, paragraph, who made it, and how the report is linked to address the comment.

Johnson commented that NDDOT will want to make sure they get a new and updated copy to make sure all the comments get addressed. He added that the information in the packet and e-mail helps for them to review and get a starting point. He apologized for the delay, adding that it was mainly on his end, but he thanks everyone for their patience.

Haugen stated that he doesn't think there are any show stoppers or any real contentious items that need to be clarified on the comments that were received. He added that staff is recommending approval based on the feedback provided and incorporated in the final report, and hopes that the Technical Advisory Committee will also recommend to the Executive Policy Board that they concur as well.

Williams referred to Page 5 of 12 of the memorandum that was sent, and pointed out that Dan had asked about 69th Street being the recommended access for the fertilizer facility, however we have proposed signal at 55th; and she doesn't have copy of the final report, but 69th had a traffic signal in the future didn't it, didn't it show. Haugen responded that it does, way in the future.

Kuharenko asked if it would be possible to include these comments as an appendix to the final report. Haugen responded that they are part of all of the public participation that takes place. He commented that if you ever look at one of our public participation appendices, they are massive.

Williams asked, when this is all completed, will you send an electronic copy with all of the appendices with it. Haugen responded that we would provide that information.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY FINAL REPORT SUBJECT TO ALL THE COMMENTS AND NOTES BE INCLUDED AS PART OF THE STUDY.

Noehre commented that if he heard correctly the motion was to include these comments as an appendix, but really some of them need to be included directly in the report and the report needs to be modified, not just having them all in an appendix as comments. Ellis responded that she feels that the motion was wide open in terms of placement of the comments. Williams agreed, adding that her intention was that the report needs to reflect those comments needing to be included in it, and then the comments also be included as an appendix.

Dame stated that he would make further comment that the Airport Authority still does not agree with the airport drive portion of this agreement. He said that in order to get the whole thing passed, from the standpoint of the study, without the airport in agreement, it would be his opinion that the airport intersection be pulled out of this portion of the study at this time until they have time to do their complete review. He added that the Airport Authority does not feel that having Kadrmas, who has looked at the original portions of the alternatives analysis here, they will be able to produce anything that Kadrmas is going to say: "Oh, wow, we didn't think of that". He said that there isn't a feeling that there has really been an independent review of what is there, or having Kadrmas doing it is like having a fox in a hen house, from that standpoint, so getting full agreement and full adoption of this going forward he thinks there will be some pushback as this goes to a higher level, whether it is approved by this committee or not, since the Airport Authority is not agreeing to the Airport Intersection.

Williams asked if Mr. Dame had seen the comments that were sent out. Dame responded that he had. Williams asked if he saw Paul Bennings' comments specifically about that intersection on Page 12 of 12. Dame responded that he hadn't. Noehre asked if Mr. Dame was asking to remove completely the intersection of Airport Drive and U.S. #2. Dame responded that his personal opinion is that that would be a good idea. Noehre stated that he would strongly disagree, absolutely.

Williams asked if they need to add something to the statement that Mr. Benning made about it maybe being studied by a traffic engineer or something. Dame said that when it comes to the NEPA process there will be additional chance to comment, so the Airport is just wanting to take time to be able to budget for this, and move forward a portion of it, but right now to say that they are going to launch in and fund a portion of this study between now and the end of the year, when it isn't in their budget, is unrealistic, and this is a request that he doesn't think is appropriate.

Noehre commented, however, that removing it would suggest to him that further study would replace it, and that won't be the case at all. West stated that it is his understanding that this study doesn't dictate when anything would happen, or where the funds would come from to do anything, because he is in the same boat, he doesn't have any money budgeted to do anything. Dame responded that the Airport Authority understands this, but the fact of the matter is they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

don't like the alternatives that are there and that are being put forward. West said that that is fair, but the funding issue would be separate, and if we decide to do anything then at that time we would need to budget for it. Dame stated, however, that the proposal was for the Airport Authority to fund, at their expense, Kadrmass Lee and Jackson to do an alternatives review, and of anything that was brought forward, so if you are expecting them to come up with \$22,000.00 out of blue, today, it's not going to happen. West said that he thought Mr. Dame was talking about construction. Dame responded that he is just talking about the study of the intersection that is there. Haugen added that it was portrayed to them that the Airport Authority was willing to expand the study. Dame stated that what they said was that they would partner in the cost, that doesn't mean that they would pick up the entire cost, a partnership means that they would pick up a portion of the cost. Haugen responded that the representatives involved in the discussion held about the amended scope of work didn't indicate anything other than that the Airport would pay the cost. Dame said that their letter to the DOT stated that they would partner in the process, so, again, they did write Grant Levi, he was directed to send a letter to Grant Levi that said that they would partner on this, so, from that standpoint there is not an agreement from the Airport Board, so he would have to vote against a motion to go forward to finalize this plan as they want time to be able to address this before it gets put forward on a hard and accepted plan, whether or not the reality that this plan will ever go forward is realistic or not, they can't agree to it. Noehre stated that he thinks that is perfectly fine, but removing that portion from the study would be inappropriate.

WILLIAMS WITHDREW HER MOTION, ELLIS CONCURRED.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY FINAL REPORT SUBJECT TO NOTATION OF ALL OF THE COMMENTS MADE BY NDDOT; TO THE REPORT BEING AMENDED PER THOSE COMMENTS; AND ALSO TO NOTATION OF THE FACT THAT THE ALTERNATIVES PRESENTED IN THE STUDY ARE NOT ALL INCLUSIVE AND THAT THERE WILL BE PUBLIC HEARINGS TO ALLOW THE GRAND FORKS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND OTHERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS VARIOUS CONCEPTS IN MORE DETAIL.

Noehre said that this is redundant because that is all going to occur during the NEPA process anyway. Williams responded, however, that it might just give a level of comfort knowing that this is not, that we're not approving plans here, we are looking at a planning document, not a set of construction plans. Johnson commented that putting it as a planning document by definition, if you do this this time you are going to have to do that on every study from now on. Noehre stated that he would have to vote against this.

Haugen asked if there was a second to the motion.

MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF SECOND.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

MOVED BY WEST, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY FINAL REPORT SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT THE COMMENTS PROVIDED BE INCORPORATED INTO THE FINAL REPORT; THAT FULL DOCUMENTATION OF ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED BE IN AN APPENDIX; AND THAT IT RECOGNIZES THAT THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY DOES NOT AGREE WITH ALL THE ALTERNATIVES PRESENTED FOR THE AIRPORT ROAD INTERSECTION.

Williams commented that she thinks there have been a couple of studies that we have noted, and she can't remember exactly which ones, but it was something to the effect that in the future there is different technologies that develop, and there are different alternatives developed at a later date. She said that she thinks it might have been the Washington/DeMers study, but she thinks that things are always subject to change, and she thinks that that is what Mr. Dame is looking at, that this isn't the absolute final decision on what is going to happen.

West asked what would happen if this body doesn't approve this report today. Haugen responded that staff's recommendation is still to approve it, so the Executive Policy Board would receive and file two different sets of recommendations; one from the Technical Advisory Committee and one from the MPO Staff, and they could decide to take action on either one of those, or they might create their own action. West said, then, that what the Technical Advisory Committee does doesn't really matter because the Executive Policy Board has the final authority. Haugen explained that this body is an advisory committee.

Williams said that she is going to ask NDDOT if there is any reason this report needs to be approved right now, is there any kind of funding that they are trying to secure or something so that if we delay the approval it might affect funding for another part of the corridor. Noehre responded that there isn't anything that he is aware of. Haugen stated that it would only affect our contract with KLJ. Williams said, however, that we could extend that for another month or so if necessary. Haugen asked what the purpose of extending it would be. Williams responded that she would like to see everyone in favor of what's in here so that it satisfies everybody's needs, not just a few. Ellis asked, though, if that is going to happen because the Airport isn't in favor of any of the alternatives so at this point it isn't going to happen. Noehre added that pleasing everyone isn't always possible.

Johnson commented that his issue with the situation is that this is a unique situation here in that Mr. Dame is part of this committee, where if it was Wal-Mart having these issues and they didn't like any of the alternatives we proposed, we would note that in the document and move on. Williams said, however, that Wal-Mart isn't a government entity. Johnson agreed, but added that the Airport is an impacted business on the corridor, and should be treated as such regardless of their authority or their position. He said, again, that this is a unique situation in that Mr. Dame is on this committee, so we need to be careful how we approach this. Noehre agreed, adding that that is exactly the objection that he heard, and you can correct him if he is wrong, but Mr. Dame is talking about impact to your business, that is the same thing. Mr. Dame agreed, but added that he also thinks that you are going to be put in the situation where the board that has to approve

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

this is going to want some sort of agreement with the Airport, so let's get past the remainder of the document without the airport section and get that taken care of and done, get it approved and revisit the airport section at a later date. Noehre stated that, again, if it's a planning document, and all the public comment has been clearly identified, as you said you've written two letters that are in there, he doesn't know what the issue is as it is already clearly defined and communicated. He added that, again, this isn't the NEPA document with the details of the project selected, that's not what it is it is a planning study, all of that stuff occurs later, and all of those things come into the decision matrix and then a decision is made. Dame responded that, from that standpoint is they are connected to this, he can recuse himself from the vote here, he doesn't have an issue with that; but he has been invited to the steering committee, he has been invited to this group, so from either standpoint he is either going to vote no on this or he is going to recuse himself. Noehre said that either would be perfectly fine.

Ellis called the question.

MOTION CARRIED WITH DAME VOTING NAY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL

Viafara reported that copies of the Final Draft of the Environmental Justice Manual were included in the packet. He gave a brief overview, explaining that the MPO is required by law to produce an Environmental Justice Program, and this is in connection to the development of the Long Range Transportation Plan, it is one of the main functions of the MPO.

Viafara commented that the document you are seeing here is the final version of the previous two documents that were submitted to this body for consideration in February and October 2014. He stated that for both applications the MPO received a series of comments, some of them dealt with language, but then became more profound in terms of the structure and the questions that the partner agencies would like to see addressed in the document.

Viafara stated that we recently received correspondence suggesting that our federal partners would like to know the answer to the following questions:

- 1) How does the Environmental Justice analysis impact the Long Range Transportation Plan?
- 2) How does it affect Transit Planning?
- 3) How did the MPO responsibly implement the Environmental Justice Principles?

Viafara said that in order to address these three questions we needed to redraft completely the language of the document; but nonetheless continue using portions from the past documents, the maps, and the data analysis that had been developed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

Viafara reported that this draft was submitted to the NDDOT and Federal Highway for their review and comments, and those comments have been addressed.

Viafara stated that after redrafting the document, it is our belief that this document adequately addresses all the questions, so staff is asking for approval from this body in order that we can continue advancing on developing our Long Range Transportation Plan and implementing our Environmental Justice Program.

Haugen commented that this has been a long journey, we took a major detour last fall and had to approach the document from a completely different perspective than our previous drafts over the last fifteen-plus years, but we now believe we are in the position where we have agreement with our state and federal partners, and are on the right path with this document.

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AS SUBMITTED.

Kuharenko said he has a questions and some comments on what we have here. He said that the first question is that in the NEPA documentation he thought he saw some language saying that you had looked over the projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan and that there wasn't an impact to the EJ populations, or a significant impact, and he isn't able to locate it now. Haugen referred to the document and pointed out that this language is located under 8.1 Primary Assessment, third paragraph down.

Kuharenko said that the comments he has are minor, specifically in the Glossary, Pages 27 and 28. He said that on Page 27, under Adverse Effects you have four bullets in there, underneath the structure, disruption of; and then you have a colon, and then the four bullets underneath there, those probably need to be sub-bulleted because it looks like that is supposed to be underneath that area. He stated that the other comment is, on Page 28 you have Low Income twice with two different definitions and references.

Haugen asked if there could be a friendly amendment to the motion to incorporate these changes to the Glossary. Rood and Williams concurred.

The motion, with the amendment reads as follows:

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE NOTED CHANGES TO THE GLOSSARY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PHASE III OF THE A.T.A.C. COUNTING PROGRAM

Haugen reported that this agenda item is titled Phase III-A of our A.T.A.C. Traffic Counting Study. He stated that there are thirty-one intersections we currently have going on, and this agenda item is labeled “A” because there is only a certain amount of work that can be accomplished prior to the expiration of our current Master Agreement we have with A.T.A.C., and the two other MPOs and the NDDOT, so they can squeeze in this amount of work under the current Master Agreement. He said that there will be a Phase III-B process after the Master Agreement is agreed to later this fall, and that will take care of the remaining sixteen intersections in Grand Forks. He added that part of the scope-of-work you will see when that Phase III-B comes in will also include East Grand Forks’ traffic signals, and what is necessary to bring them up to compatibility with this counting program.

Haugen referred to the memo from NDSU, and pointed out that the seven intersections identified under Phase III-A are: 32nd Avenue South and South 24th Street; 32nd Avenue South and Northbound I-29 Ramps; 32nd Avenue South and Southbound I-29 Ramps; Gateway Drive and North 47th Street; Gateway Drive and West I-29 Ramps; South Columbia Road and 11th Avenue South; and South Washington Street and 47th Avenue South. He added that the timeline shows a September 2015 closure date, and the cost is roughly \$21,600.00.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve engaging with A.T.A.C. to provide us the scope of service as identified in Phase III-A.

Williams commented that she has never received the credentials, or anything, so that she can get into this program and run reports. She said that she asked Sharma about this several times, and he keeps saying it is up to Mr. Haugen to generate a list of who should have access.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE PHASE III-A OF THE A.T.A.C. COUNTING PROGRAM, SUBJECT AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL RECEIVING THE NECESSARY CREDENTIALS TO ACCESS THE PROGRAM.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
SCHEDULE FOR 2015**

Viafara reported that at our last meeting members of the Technical Advisory Committee recommended, to this particular summary of work program activities, to be added one extra column that will allow you, at a glance, to see the status of each one of the projects, so heeding your recommendation, staff went and produced this most recent table that gives you an idea of the status of each one of the programs that are now in the Unified Work Program. He stated, though, that this does not replace the official reports that every consultant will send, and it is not

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

meant to provide you official information, but it is just an overview of the status of each program. He added that he hopes that with this information the members of the Technical Advisory Committee are satisfied with the response the MPO staff has provided.

Williams said she has a question on one of the items. She referred to 300.53 on the table and pointed out that it states: “Established Steering Committee, and Received Draft SRTS Map”. She asked what the steering committee is going to do, what is the purpose of that group. Viafara responded that there are six E’s within the Steering Committee; one of them is Engineering, but there are five remaining ones. He said that one of the remaining ones is Encouragement, another is enforcement, another is education; and what they would like is those members with that ability to come and bring their concerns and views to the new Safe Route To School that they are about to delineate for the Discovery School. He stated that they are grateful that they can count on Engineering’s support, and for the information that they have thus far given to them, but, again, conversation with others, particularly with Carma Hanson, Patty Olson, and others, that are also very much involved with these activities, and dealing with safety for children, they have found that it is very important for them to also heed their advice, so, in part, the Steering Committee will provide the vision for establishing a new Safe Routes to School for the Discovery School.

Williams stated that she thinks they are treading on thin ice there because you’re getting into traffic control devices, and traffic control devices are done by the MUTCD, and they have a federal standard that they have to follow, and it isn’t a wish list of “oh we’d like to do this, or we’d like to do that”, there is certain criteria, there’s warrants, there’s everything else, so she isn’t sure that you’re going to get out of the committee what you want. She added that this also duplicates a committee that Safe Kids is already doing, they have already gotten this established to work on methods of teaching kids to walk on the sidewalk, or such, so this is a duplication, and she isn’t sure that what you’re going to get out of it is what you think.

Viafara responded that that’s what it appears to be, but in conversations with Safe Kids, that is not the impression they give, they are willing to come, because in their opinion Safe Routes To School is completely a different program than the programs they do. Erickson commented that she co-chairs the Safe Kids Bike and Safety Committee, and they don’t do the plans, they just kind of organize different activities. Williams responded, though, that the plans are dictated by what the traffic control devices are, and where we can provide stuff, and that is already all done, it has already been...

Haugen reported that the map is under the MUTCD, but the other five E’s they aren’t under the MUTCD, and all of our past safe routes efforts have included and used a steering committee so why would this one be different, it is a little bit beyond him. He said that if you look at the national recommendations on how to conduct Safe Routes To School, a committee is one of the first steps, establish a committee, every other school has a working group that we accessed to develop a Safe Route Program with that school.

Viafara explained that as part of that project, also it is intended to capture the views of the users. We would like to survey their opinions, in terms of the routes and recommendations for improvements or modifications, doing those things, that’s one; but also the point of view of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

users, which are the kids, so those issues are not really dealing necessarily, or projecting with the controls that you are bringing to our attention at the moment. He added that they appreciate that you are very concerned with that, but in addition to these controls, which are really the bone of the whole project, there are issues with the users, and that is what we are striving to get.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet is a copy of the presentation given this morning to the Steering Committee. He explained that they are just kicking off this study, and have a public input meeting tomorrow evening in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Haugen commented that in essence the study is to try to help educate and inform all of us, including the public, as to what the increased rail traffic potential is on the Mill Spur and/or the Glasston Subdivision. He said that another thing will be to look at how to be proactive and mitigate some of the increasing conflicts that will be occurring at the crossings; and the last thing will be, if there is a possibility, to explore allowing the Mill Spur line to be abandoned south of Gateway Drive, and to provide a concept of how that abandoned area could be redeveloped.

Haugen stated that there have been a series of base maps provided that show the two spur lines, and some of the basic information we currently have to date. He said that some of the information is still in draft form, however it is being presented at the meeting tomorrow.

Haugen reported that the Glasston Subdivision study is underway, also associates are under contract, and a Steering Committee was formed and the did meet to organize this morning, and the first open house will happen tomorrow evening.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen had the same base map for the Glasston line. Haugen responded that he did. Williams explained that she had spoken with the consultant engineer working on this, Al, and he had asked about the number of train crossings, and he was going to double check with Mr. Haugen because anything they get from a traffic signal is not truly accurate because the traffic signal thinks there is a train there, it isn't absolute, so they should probably use the BNSF numbers. Haugen responded that that conversation is taking place. Christianson added that they are having their Public Projects Department run those numbers and get them to the City. He added that there are a couple of things that could skew the numbers; things such as if the signal maintainer is testing the signals, that could show us an activation, also they do have some overrides for high rail vehicles on track which can impact the numbers as well.

Haugen commented that what these numbers represent are, during the month of April, primarily, they asked, and the City provided all of the train pre-emptions on those three signals; so from thirty-plus days of data they tried to summarize it into these maps, and the data was very sporadic. He said that he initially thought you would see a train start at one, see it hit the second,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

then the third, but that isn't the case at all with the pre-emption data they got so they are working on what the numbers are.

Haugen reported that in terms of the bike/ped traffic, when they did turning movements counts they also noted the bike and ped traffic the last week of April through the first week of May and those numbers are reflected here as well. He added that the vehicle counts are from the North Dakota DOT maps.

Haugen reiterated that the Steering Committee did meet this morning, and added that the consultant team is out interviewing stakeholders and other interested parties the rest of today, they started yesterday, and will do so most of tomorrow as well. He said that once this is completed we will hopefully have a good understanding of some of the key interests. He added that part of the impetus for this study was initiated by past expansion out of the North Dakota State Mill, and some of their discussions have led them to consider building a unit train landing facility somewhere on the north end of Grand Forks. He stated that their goal is to make a decision before the Industrial Commission yet this year, and they stated this morning that their goal would be, if they built something that it would be operational in 2017, but they did note that their capacity expansion is ongoing and it will be up and running next spring, so there will be a period of time where they will have to rely on the Mill Spur for increased train traffic to meet their capacity needs, as well as an increase in truck traffic to their facility.

Noehre asked if Mr. Haugen had asked the State Mill to provide a traffic operation study for their increased operations. Haugen responded that for this twelve month period, no, that would be a city request if they issued a building permit, which would typically require a traffic operation study.

Williams asked if Stephanie Erickson was the project lead for the Mill expansion. Erickson responded that she is not. Williams stated that some of the improvements like the new rail crossing on Mill Road, if they aligned that there have been a couple of things done on it.

Haugen commented that what we are doing is; if they build the new facility west of North Washington, or Highway 81, we will look at what mitigation should occur to that at-grade crossing, assuming an at-grade crossing at Highway 81 and North Washington, that's in our scope-of-work.

Haugen stated that they will work with the Mill between now and the conclusion of the study to get a better understanding of how their operations will work, because one of the conclusions of the study is that they might not build that unit train facility, and we will have to deal with their increased capacity with the track in place. Noehre commented that he will have to think about this some more, but he will likely ask them for a traffic operation study based on their expansion.

Williams said that the site plan they are currently reviewing is not the expansion one, that one hasn't come to them yet, the one they are looking at is where they just added a couple square feet to the one building along the Mill Road, and then they realigned the railroad track, but she doesn't believe the site plan they have right now is the full-blown expansion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

Noehre commented that this will likely impact two State Highways, and they will most likely make them do a traffic operation study.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Kouba reported that Alliant has gone through, and after the public meeting they had in May, they came back with several alternatives on how to address the issues along Bygland Road. She said that pretty much every intersection was given some kind of alternative, adding that there have been some very interesting issues along Bygland Road that needed to be addressed.

Kouba referred to slides illustrating the various alternatives and went over them briefly.

Kouba stated that they will be presenting these alternatives to the Steering Committee at their meeting tomorrow, and then once we have their input they will be holding a public meeting for public input as well.

Ellis commented that she would give a resounding “No” to a four-way stop at the intersection of 13th and Bygland Road. She said that they would have traffic backed up, and it would take more than twenty-five minutes to get through it if they did this intersection with four-way stops, plus when there isn’t any traffic you would be stopping for no reason. Williams stated that maybe the reason for putting this alternative in there is really just to be able to explain to the public why it isn’t a good alternative, and should be removed, otherwise people will keep asking why they didn’t look at putting in a four-way stop here.

Erickson asked how long they would be gathering public input on this because it probably should go to the Greenway Group but they don’t meet until September 8th. Kouba responded that they won’t have a public meeting until the end of the month, so it will be extended out some more. Haugen commented that the meeting will be on the alternatives, so there will still be an input meeting when the draft recommendations are out, which would be in the fall. Ellis suggested that they could always send that out to Greenway members for their review even if there isn’t a meeting could they. Kouba responded that she could, and she will definitely take all of the Greenway Group’s comments as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION SELECTION

Haugen reported that interviews are occurring tomorrow afternoon. He commented that they did receive four proposals, and are interviewing all four firms. He said that there is a nice variety of approaches in the proposals themselves. He added that they hope to have a selection made, and a contract recommendation for the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve at their meeting next Wednesday.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

Haugen stated that the four firms that submitted proposals are: KLJ, SRF, SEH, and WSB. He commented that it has been a while since SEH has submitted a proposal to Grand Forks/East Grand Forks, so it is nice to see them back.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- 1) 2045 EGF Land Use Plan Update Web-Link:

Haugen reported that the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update website is up and running. It can be found at: www.theforksmmpo.org/Pages/EGF2045LUP.html

- 2) 2045 GF Land Use Plan Update Web-Link:

Haugen reported that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update website is still in progress, but should be up and running soon. He added that the site will be distributed when done.

- 3) MAP-21

Haugen said that one of the Senate Committees passed out a portion of a reauthorization, called "The Drive Act", so that seems to be the vehicle in play at this time, but it doesn't fund the major increases, it is funding maybe a slight increase of the current expenditures.

- 4) Transit Triennial

Ellis reported that they just finished their Transit Triennial. Rood commented that there was a big improvement from the last one, with single digit findings.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ERICKSON, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 10TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 12th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Grand Forks Public Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Planning (via conference call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineering; Nels Christianson, BNSF; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District.

Guest(s) present were: Mike Bittner, KLJ.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 8TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE JULY 8TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that it includes the typical cross-section that was distributed last month. He said that, as indicated,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

the two cities are in communication with MnDOT and NDDOT personnel, both expressing some questions about the cross-section.

Noehre commented that he would emphasize that the configuration is going to be on-going until the whole bridge design has been completed, as other things can come up along the way that would require adjustments be made; so while they could come out shortly and say that this is the final cross-section, and it could stay that way; they could also come out and say here is the final cross-section and it doesn't stay that way.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that he received an e-mail from Mr. Laesch yesterday stating that the only information he was going to provide on the Sorlie is that MnDOT will be doing a temporary asphalt fix on their approach this fall. He added that it does not appear that it will be done as part of the project that is ongoing now, but after it is completed they will try to squeeze in the temporary patch.

Yavarow commented that North Dakota will also be doing a temporary fix to their approach as well, after the project has been completed.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE 32ND AVENUE TRAFFIC SIGNAL COORDINATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that in our work program we identified our last major activity, and that is to update our signal coordination plan for 32nd Avenue. He stated that with our new A.T.A.C. Traffic Counting Program we have some very nice information/data that should allow us to review the timing plans to see if there are any streets or updates we wish to do, if we want to add any timing plans.

Haugen commented that this is our standard RFP format, and the Scope-of-Work is identified and follows pretty closely the signal work that we have been doing on the corridors in the past. He said that they are asking the consultant to come and visit the corridor after the timings are first installed in order to make any necessary tweaks, and are also requesting that a report be submitted that identifies how the signals were coordinated prior to what improvements are made and what the expectations are after they are installed and tweaked.

Haugen added that they also ask the consultant to give a presentation on the coordination study to both the Service Safety Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board, at their December meetings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

Haugen pointed out that the funding for this project is \$20,000.00; and explained that we have a pretty quick turn-a-round time, but because it is just a single corridor timing plan update, and they aren't starting from scratch, and they have a coordination plan to work from, they feel that the due date set for the end of December is doable. He said that they have had some interest expressed as to when this RFP is coming out, so we know there is already some pre-work being done on it as well.

Haugen said that this, then, is essentially the scope-of-work that we have in our work program, and this is the last major activity that would come from us, and we have a lot already.

Noehre commented that they talked about putting a loop or a camera on the northbound ramps, both on 32nd and on Gateway, and he is wondering if this can be done, either a loop or camera further down on the northbound ramp in this coordination so that should it get done before they are ready to do another coordination plan, it could just be rolled into it as soon as we turn the system on. Haugen asked if he was expecting putting plans in place to prevent Interstate back-up be the only detection on the west end ramp sometime soon, and this study could sort of help pull together data but perhaps to not have a coordination plan in place. Noehre stated that he can't imagine that it is would be very costly, and he doesn't know the "ins and outs", but it is all part of the discussion, and it is a good question; but again, he can't imagine it will be more than \$30,000.00. He added that they might be able to find \$30,000.00 fairly easily, and it might be better to do it sooner rather than wait a whole one or two T.I.P. cycles and then not get it into the S.T.I.P. Williams agreed, adding that she wouldn't think it would be very difficult to add to this because it is just going to be a program that, if an event happens to occur where the occupancy is a problem then the controller does something different, but if there isn't any input, if it never gets that information, then it won't do anything, so if you program it in there now it won't work until the cameras are actually in place, and that would eliminate the need to redo the timing program again.

Haugen reported that they did do turning movement counts for the I-29 Study at the ramps this spring, so they would already have a limited set of data to try to do a sort of coordination plan for this. Williams commented that she thinks that it would primarily only work when they have events, or if something very unusual happens on the Interstate that would require traffic be re-routed, so it wouldn't be a daily operational issue.

Haugen said that, just so we are clear; the termini is for the west ramp to South Washington; and they aren't talking about getting the videos to count the vehicles, they are talking about the Coordination Plan the signals have. He commented that the scope-of-work already included the two ramps and their signals. Noehre said that he is just wondering if they should include, in the timing plan or in addition to the timing plan, that in the event that a loop or camera gets installed in that northbound ramp to keep the Interstate clear.

Kuharenko asked if that wouldn't just pull it out of coordination at that time. Williams responded that it would, but added that it has to tell how long it is going to dump, it has to be one of those that basically is an if/else statement; if this then you do that, if that then you do this. She said that if something happens and you need to dump a lot of traffic, it will also affect 38th to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

where we would have to give a green light at 38th so that people can go somewhere, because there is no need in dumping the ramp if they can't go anywhere, and if it is going to stack all the way down to 34th, then there is something really serious going on. Kuharenko said, though, that this is something we should consider; if we are dumping a loaded ramp onto 32nd then it will also affect 38th, so that is something we need to consider as well. Williams responded that they already have some of those routines in there for their special events.

Haugen said, then, that in the Scope-of-Work you would like to see an added bullet with a statement or two that identifies the northbound ramp having a special timing coordination done to not allow traffic to back-up onto the Interstate. Noehre agreed, adding that it just seems like now is the time to look at this. Williams stated that you could probably just say: "Include timing to flush the northbound ramp at I-29."

Williams stated that she just wanted to know if, in your recommended action section it states: "Approval of the RFP for the 32nd Avenue South Traffic Signal Coordination Plan Update"; but then in the Consultant responsibilities it also talks about recommendations for improved traffic operations, and she would like to see that added to the recommended action. She said that it would just make it easier to find something, and it would make it clear that it isn't just a signal timing plan. Haugen responded that he could do that.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY NOEHRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE 32ND AVENUE SOUTH TRAFFIC SIGNAL COORDINATOIN PLAN UPDATE SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE AMENDMENTS DISCUSSED.

Kuharenko stated that when we talked about the Unified Work Program a while back, it was originally discussed that if there were any additional funds available that this could be expanded from a Coordination Plan Update to a Corridor Study. He was wondering if we know if there are any available funds to do so. Haugen responded that there are no available funds that he is aware of unless Bismarck or Fargo wants to give us more.

Williams commented that she has one other amendment. She pointed out that it states that the consultant will send the Synchro Files to the City for input, but the consultant needs to be responsible for inputting the times into the controllers, and that isn't really a big deal anymore now that we have Centrax, it is just a matter of downloading/uploading data.

Yavarow asked what the cost difference would be between a Coordination Plan Update and a Corridor Study. Haugen responded that it would be double, if not two and a half times as much depending on how extensive you would want the Corridor Study to be. Yavarow said, then, if you're saying we have \$20,000.00 in here for the Coordination Plan Update, but are we talking about two times as much work. Haugen responded that that would be true as a Corridor Study would involve quite a bit more. Yavarow asked if this means you don't have enough money to do what you want to do. Haugen responded that there is enough money to do what the RFP is asking for, and that is to do an updated Coordination Plan. He explained that the very first

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

Coordination Plan was 32nd Avenue, done back in 2008, and the report is highlighted in the RFP, and is an example of the report document we are expecting out of this one.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MINNESOTA SIDE 2016-2019 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we did advertise that at today's meeting we would hold a public hearing.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion. Haugen closed the public hearing. He commented that they also advertised that we would receive written comment until noon today, no comments were received.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the Draft Minnesota Side 2016-2019 T.I.P. was included for your review. He commented that staff worked with the District 2 staff from MnDOT to ensure that our T.I.P. and their A.T.I.P. are in-sync with each other. He stated that there were a couple of changes made since the draft document was approved back in April.

Haugen referred to the document, and went over the changes briefly:

- 1) East Grand Forks Project #3 – Originally the replacement of the fixed route vehicle was going to be funded using federal funds, but MnDOT will now be using State monies in place of the federal funds to purchase that vehicle.
- 2) Kennedy Bridge Project – MnDOT is now showing this project in Fiscal Year 2017, however the dollar amount was not changed.

Haugen reported that, as you will notice, there isn't a lot of activity going on in East Grand Forks during this time period. He said that all of the current 2015 projects are underway or have been completed, and, unless there are any other changes we are not aware of, staff is recommending approval of the Draft Final 2016-2019 Minnesota Side T.I.P., as submitted.

Williams asked if there is going to be a need for any type of amendment with the Bygland Road Study, is there anything in there that would require an amendment. Ellis responded that there isn't a need at this time. She added that everything that they have she thinks that would be in there right now would more than likely be local funds, but there is still some discussion on the City's Sub-Target funds. She said that there is a TED (Transportation and Economic Development) grant open right now, but it is only for Trunk Highways, and has to be the Long Range Transportation Plan, and based on discussion from our engineers, the project they would like to see funded doesn't qualify for it because it has to be directly on the Trunk Highway, so she doesn't foresee a need for an amendment for that either.

Haugen commented that if Bygland Road is finalized, and if it would result in a need for modifications, there might be an amendment at some point in time; but the Sub-Target funds

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

aren't available until Fiscal Year 2018, so there are a few T.I.P. documents that will be approved between now and then.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE 2016-2019 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON U.S. #2 ACCESS STUDY

Haugen reported that since the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting the MPO Executive Policy Board met and tabled a decision on this study. He said that they also asked that he give an informational update to the County Commission, which was done July 21st; and then last night he did the same for the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee, so he isn't anticipating any action from this body today, nor from the Executive Policy Board at their meeting next Wednesday.

Haugen explained that the reason the MPO Executive Policy Board tabled this was because of issues with the Airport Drive and County Road #5 Intersection alternatives, and the letter we received from the Airport Authority concerning these issues.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P./S.T.I.P.

Haugen reported that, as stated in the staff report, the Draft North Dakota S.T.I.P. was released prior to the MPO really having a chance to prepare a Draft T.I.P., so in essence for the sanity of staff it was determined that we would focus more on finalizing our T.I.P., and reconciling it with the S.T.I.P., rather than trying to quickly put together a Draft T.I.P., so included in your packet is the information that pertained to the Draft S.T.I.P., as provided us by the NDDOT.

Haugen referred to the information in the packet and stated that the first thing is a sheet that shows the Urban Program. He pointed out that, essentially, there has been a major shift in one of the projects in the Urban Program: Columbia Road, between 40th and 47th. He explained that two things happened here; the first is that in our current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. document this is programmed for 2018, but now it is shown as being programmed in 2017; and the second is that when we submitted our updated list in December this was originally requested for 2017, so when they deferred it back to 2018 they didn't do the year of expenditure adjustment, so we asked if they would consider funding it with the year of expenditure adjustment, and then when going through that process, the question came up as to why it isn't using our typical funding splits, so we updated the request to try to get a couple more dollars on the federal side to get it back to the typical 80/20 funding split.

Haugen commented that in 2019 there was a request to do a mill and overlay on University Avenue, and as you can see that was not funded. He said that also in 2019 the DeMers Avenue

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

projects we discussed in the past, along with US Business 2/North 5th Street, are being shown as being programmed.

Haugen said that that is basically the Urban Program for the Grand Forks area; but if you look at the total Draft S.T.I.P., in the Grand Forks District most projects are in here, however there are some additional projects that show up as well; such as safety projects, TAP projects, projects that expand across both the MPO Study area into the rural area. He stated that a couple safety projects that Grand Forks submitted were funded. He reported that, if you recall, in the Safety Program, North Dakota is now splitting it into two areas; one is their reactive high crash locations and the other is their systemic or proactive one and Grand Forks did receive funds for the confirmation lights that will go up on Gateway Drive. He added that Grand Forks also received funding for their TAP application for the DeMers Avenue shared use trail between 42nd and 48th. He stated that there has also been some shifting on the message boards on the Interstate and Gateway Drive.

Noehre commented that, just for clarity, back on the Urban Program, DeMers in 2016 he would imagine would be Fiscally 2016, but at this point he isn't sure what the construction year would be, it has moved a few times in the last several weeks between April and October, so funding years hasn't changed but the construction year would obviously change. He added that an October bid letting would make it easier to tie the City's TAP project to it, not that it wouldn't be possible if it stays with an April bid letting, but it would be harder.

Haugen reported that in our T.I.P. document we have a section called "remarks", and in that section it will show the construction year, so if the decision is for this to have a 2017 construction year, it will show that in the "remark" section. Noehre commented that they are trying to work that out. He explained that this makes a difference to the District, because if the District is designing it, and he isn't sure they are or aren't, but it makes a big impact on his staff if it is in April or October.

Haugen stated that on the TAP program, the TAP award, it's description, and the total project dollars are not what was submitted, so those will have to be reconciled between the T.I.P. and the S.T.I.P. He pointed out that the federal amounts the same as that is the max allowed, but the remaining funds are different.

Kuharenko commented that in regard to the HSIP funding, he did end up talking with Shawn Kuntz yesterday, and right now they still have until the end of August to figure out what they are going to fund and not fund, and then FHWA has another thirty days, so the information that we are seeing in this Draft S.T.I.P. is subject to change.

Haugen said that the only other project mentioned, and he will probably just leave it to Mr. Noehre to give us more of a description, is a pending project on US #2 between 69th and the Airforce Base, a \$23,000,000 project. Noehre explained that the District has a Scoping Section, that does scoping reports for their major projects, their preventive maintenance projects, and they came out and scoped this probably 18 months ago, and have been wanting to finish their scoping report, and the scoping report includes a range of alternatives and project data, but he has been

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

reluctant, and hasn't commented on the range of alternatives because he has been torn between them, and they continue to look at anywhere from a simple preventive maintenance mill and fill, to a total reconstruction, and depending on what week it is he goes between those himself. He said that during the Interregional Review he shared this with the team and they also were struggling with what might be the best fix so they decided they needed to truly do some further analysis, and come up with a fruitful conclusion, and a reasonable range of alternatives and cost.

Noehre added that they also need to determine the termini as well, because the concrete starts at 55th Street, so if we are going to do something major we should start at 55th Street, unless we are looking as a City, State, and MPO, looking at pursuing an urbanization of this section then it would make sense to adjust the termini from 55th to some other point. Haugen summarized that it is anticipated that the final will look similar to what we see now, but sometime next Spring we will have a better idea of the project description and the dollar amount.

West asked if Mr. Noehre thought that any part of that project may entail the Airport Road Intersection modification. Noehre responded that if it is a mill and fill it would not, if it was a total reconstruction we would be foolish not to look at everything that needs to be done.

Haugen commented that the City of Grand Forks provided the MPO with two comments; one was about the TAP funds, but he can't recall the other. Kuharenko responded that there were actually three comments. He stated that one was on Columbia Road, 11th to 17th, as it should be changed to 11th to 14th; another was the DeMers Avenue bikepath; and the third was some clarification on the 32nd Avenue Corridor improvements and funding adjustments.

Noehre stated that he would like to add some more clarification to the airport intersection by saying that it does not include an interchange.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Kouba reported that, as you have heard, they did have a public meeting on some of the best options for what could be done on Bygland Road. She stated that after going through the public process the Steering Committee met and narrowed things down a little bit, and with that they had Alliant pull together some rough numbers of what it would cost for each of these individual projects, as well as to make some suggestions as to where some of this funding could come from.

Kouba stated that all costs are very estimate, are very variable depending upon what type of application you do, especially when you're considering the striping.

Kouba commented that the timeframe can change up, and these will be part of the draft document that they are putting together, so suggestions can be made for timeframes being changed and things like that.

Kouba said that once they have a document it will be out for public input, as well as council input. She commented that some of the points she needs to clarify in our potential funding is that it is transportation alternative program instead of enhancement program, and Minnesota does not

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

have an Urban Roads program, but other than that they will be bringing a finalized document forward when completed. She added that the highlights are that they are looking at doing the striping along Bygland to include bike lanes, especially the signalized intersection along the very head of Bygland Road, and just doing some preventative safety measures by putting in striping to allow for people to know where they are located along the road.

Kouba stated that the next big thing that they would suggest doing, that was suggested be done, is a roundabout at Rhinehart and Bygland. She said that it is a location that it is easy enough to slow down and that is where you find you're starting of most the narrowing of the road. She added that they are also looking at doing some Hawk improvements down at 13th, probably just keeping the way it is until the traffic gets to the point where you need to do something more extensive; and placing a Hawk at that location to ease the pedestrian movement; and then finally doing a realignment of 5th so that it has a better view, so people have a better angle to get onto Bygland. She stated that with that realignment it would allow for a future roundabout at some point in time.

Haugen asked when the next public meeting is scheduled. Kouba responded that it is still unknown, but it will occur at the end of September.

Haugen stated that the Steering Committee has made recommendations, as Ms. Kouba mentioned, and they will now go through the public comment period, so sometime in October or November staff will be seeking Technical Advisory Committee recommendations on the report.

MATTER OF PERFORMANCE REPORT UPDATE

Haugen reported that Mr. Viafara will give an update on our modified, or revamped Monitoring and Surveillance Report.

Viafara commented that the current Long Range Transportation Plan for the MPO was originally done in the year 2008, and in 2013 an update was done. He stated that when the 2013 update was approved some comments were made by members of the Technical Advisory Committee concerning a particular characteristic of this plan. He said that this plan was basically drawn based on the requirements coming from MAP-21, which allows the MPOs and other agencies to aptly, for the first time, implement the use of performance measures in terms of national goals, state goals, and local goals, so this is what is happening at this time.

Viafara stated that one way to report on those performance measures is through the design of Dashboard Reports, so the comments you receive are basically the ones that we are submitting for consideration because the MPO is now advancing the work of responding to the performance of four areas or elements of the Transportation Plan; 1) Streets and Highway, 2) Bicycle and Pedestrian, 3) Transit, and 4) Freight.

Viafara reported that staff is asking the Technical Advisory Committee to take time to review this material and provide some kind of insight on the determination of the baseline year we will use to establish the performance trends and comparisons. He explained that once we have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

established the baseline year we can consider statistical information about existing transportation infrastructure, particularly the conditions and performance, and bring that information back to you.

Viafara stated that the last thing he is requesting is for you to determine, as a technical advisory committee, which of these measures and performances are the more important ones that will help us be able to come to a much more informed goal, and establish goal priority setting policies for the planning area.

Viafara pointed out that, as you can see, they have developed a project schedule, which indicates that this project is supposed to be done by the end of November. He added that they have established a series of tasks and activities that they are confident will allow them to complete this requirement, and also complete our Vital Metrics Dashboard, otherwise known as the Transportation System Surveillance and Monitoring Report.

Ellis asked when Mr. Viafara would be providing them something to review, as far as the different performance measures that they should be looking at. Viafara responded that they are working on this, and they expect to have something in a draft form in September. Haugen added that the performance measures and targets are identified in the Long Range Plan, so if you just want to review that again it will give you what we adopted as our measures and our targets, and that is what this report will be showing, how we are progressing.

Viafara commented that this committee's cooperation is vital, in the sense that there are so many performance measures at the moment, so it is up to you to help by telling them (i.e, three will be fine for this goal, or this is another measure that we want to better assess a particular goal); so later we can make a better determination.

Haugen reported that, again, this is another one of those outcomes of MAP-21 where we have now morphed into performance based planning and programming, and preparing annual reports on components.

Williams asked when they wanted something back. Haugen responded, early and often. Williams said that she remembers that when we were discussing all this stuff the last time that she had requested a minimum of two weeks review time to do anything on any of these things because it just takes so much time to go through and really look at them and do a good job on it, so what is the date that you would like to have something back. Viafara responded that if that is what you suggested prior to this, he certainly concur with it and doesn't find any difficulty in allowing a two week review period, so then if you are able, let's get that information at least by the end of the month of August. Williams commented that that presents another problem, in that in giving them a two week review time, they need to know that this stuff is coming up, she has her hands full with school stuff and everything, so, and Dave has his hands full with trying to design a traffic signal and stuff, so advance notice that this is coming so that they can put time slots in where they can review things makes it flow just a whole lot easier. Viafara asked if he is correct that you would like this project schedule to be more encompassing. Williams responded that she would like to see some dates, as well as exactly what you're expecting them to review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

She asked if they were going to go through all the performance measures at once, or are you going to look at goals individually, because it is a huge amount of stuff to look at, so are you going to section it off, or how are you going to do it. Viafara responded that he will prepare something with more detail so that it will help facilitate your contributions.

Kuharenko asked for clarification, he sees a couple of times talk about 50% reduction, 10% reduction, and it is in the Analysis and Finding of Facts, and also under the Executive Summary, where it talks about addressing concerns dealing with the perspective of not reaching some established performance targets; and it talks about 50% versus 10% reduction, and he believes that in December 2013 he thought that as a committee we decided to go with 10% on that, and he also thought there was also some language on per capita basis on that, so he is trying to figure out what is going on with the language in the staff report. Viafara responded that the quote was taken from that meeting. Williams said that she thinks that what Mr. Kuharenko is saying is that you didn't complete the whole thing, that there was a follow up to that that said we wanted to go with the 10% reduction, so it isn't a question anymore, but we can update it at any time as well. Viafara said that he will make that change.

OTHER BUSINESS

1) Update on 2015 Work Program Activities

Viafara reported that everyone should have received an update on the 2015 Work Program Activities via e-mail. He said that the only new project is the I-29 Traffic Operations Study, for which a consultant was chosen at our last meeting. He stated that now all of the projects have been approved and are underway.

Kouba commented that she has an update on the aerial photography, and that is that she just received the information the other day and just looked at it earlier so she will get it disseminated in the next couple of days.

2) 2045 EGF Land Use Plan Update Web-Link:

Haugen reported that the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update website is up and running. It can be found at: www.theforksmmpo.org/Pages/EGF2045LUP.html

3) 2045 GF Land Use Plan Update Web-Link:

Haugen reported that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update website is up and running. It can be found at: <https://mysidewalk.com/organizations/289837/grand-forks-2045-land-use-plan>

Haugen stated that throughout the month of August this website will be updated periodically, every two to three days. He commented that there will be some things happening during Potato Bowl Week - beginning on Wednesday there will be a public open house held in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers. He asked Mr. Gengler if he had any updates on what might be occurring. Gengler responded that he was meeting with the Grand Forks Info Center at 3:30 to discuss some additional events. Haugen stated that Thursday, Friday, and Saturday they are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 12th, 2015**

hopefully having some “pop-up” events where they go out to where activities are occurring throughout the community; and obviously there is the French fry feed on Thursday, JLG’s concert on Friday and the Farmers Market on Saturday.

Gengler reported that he learned a lesson; to not take for granted that when we have these special events, which seem to be all happy-go-lucky for the public and everybody’s invited and such, because when we assume that they wouldn’t mind maybe having a booth set up to tell people about their City and the long range plans and that we want their input; it probably isn’t the case. He explained that the consultants came up with this pop-up workshop concept where they just set up a booth and people can just walk up and ask questions and get maps, etc., but Farmer’s Market said no they didn’t want them there, and Potato Bowl said no, JLG said no, so even though the events that are taking place in Town Square, since it is City owned property, once we rent it out for a special event, the person in charge of the event is in charge of who can play and who can’t play, so he will be meeting with their Info Center, who does all the special events to see if there is any way to go around it by maybe setting up just outside Town Square, but not offend the event planners.

4) CATs Route Schedules on Google Maps

Rood reported that CATs route schedules are now available on Google Maps. She explained that you can go to Google Maps and search just as you would for driving directions but select transit and it will give you step-by-step directions to the nearest bus stop, which route to take to get to your destination, what time the bus arrives and departs, etc. She added that you can go to the Grand Forks City website and there is a built in trip planner you can use as well. She stated that this is the first system in North Dakota to make this available.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 12TH,
2015, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:42 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 9th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Planning (via conference call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineering; Nels Christianson, BNSF; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit .

Guest(s) present were: Erin Perdu, WSB; Antonio Rosell, WSB; Kelsey Fogt, WSB; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because there are some guests present today he would ask that everyone please state their name and the entity they represent.

Haugen reported that we do have an added agenda item under Other Business. He said that he hopes everyone received an e-mail with information on this item yesterday. He explained that the City of Grand Forks asked to be able to give a brief presentation on the Columbia Road project they are doing.

Haugen commented that the MPO staff has two additional meetings later this afternoon, one of them is for the 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan that Ms. Perdu is the Project Manager for, so he promised that at 2:15, regardless of whether or not we are close to that agenda item, we would stop and let her make her presentation so she can go and set up for that meeting on the Grand Forks side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 12TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 12TH,
2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen asked if anyone had any updates on either the Kennedy or Sorlie Bridge projects.

Sorlie Bridge

Noehre reported that half of the Sorlie Bridge has been painted, and it looks very nice. Haugen asked if the lights on the bridge are permanent. Noehre responded that the permanent conduit and wiring are in, but the lights currently there are the old lights. He added that he hasn't heard anything further on Bob Christianson setting up the meeting to coordinate the new lighting plan.

Haugen asked if there was any further information concerning when the temporary fixes to the approaches on either side of the bridge would occur. Yavarow responded that he hasn't, but they won't know anything until the bridge work is completed on the Grand Forks side.

West asked if the bridge would still be closed when the sugar beet season begins. Noehre responded that the completion date was scheduled for early October, but now there will probably be some time added to it just because of the condition of the bridge, and them having to remove more material, which he learned has to be taken off in order for the paint to adhere to the steel, and getting it off has been challenging, so that will take some extra time, and possibly some extra funding.

Haugen asked if there had been any indication from MNDOT that they will still be doing the repair to the approach on the Minnesota side this year. Bail responded that as far as he knows it is still planned to occur this year.

West asked if there had been any thought to recommending to American Crystal that they route their beet trucks up to U.S. #2, and just skip DeMers. Noehre responded that they haven't done that, but added that it was always intended for the bridge work to be going on into the main campaign, just not quite as far into it as it most likely will.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen asked if there was any update on the Kennedy Bridge process. Yavarow responded that they talked to Mr. Hille a week ago, and he said that nothing new has happened with the design process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Grasser commented that the Chairman of the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee wants to have a discussion on the safety concerns with the proposed design, specifically with the “fairly narrow” lanes on the bridge. He said that they have had discussions about it for a while, going back and forth with Mr. Hille, but now their chairman wants to have further discussion about it, specifically his thought that there should actually be a separate pedestrian bridge. He explained that this isn’t coming from the technical side, it is all political, but there is going to be some sort of discussion and they will present a report for information only, so it will then be up to the chairman as to where he wants to go with it. He added that he thinks Mr. Hille will be present for that discussion.

Noehre asked where the determination of “unsafe” is coming from, based on what. Grasser responded that he thinks the discussion, some of it actually was initiated, he thinks, at the Executive Committee, and it caught some of their politicians’ ears, but in any event staff looks at those 11-foot lanes, with head-to-head with trucks without a median, and they are pretty tight, and yet there is like a four-foot space between the outside railings. He said they had this discussion before, and that somehow it led to; that it seemed like if we can’t get wider lanes, including the pedestrian facility because of the gap and spacings, the discussion led to the question of whether we should have a separate pedestrian bridge. He added that what ultimately initiated this thought was that they had a group of individuals going to other communities, for a totally different purpose having to do with water treatment, and they saw in some of these larger communities how similar situations functioned because of their having a separate pedestrian bridge, and that vision somehow took hold on that trip and it became their thought that it should be our long term vision. He said that he wouldn’t characterize it entirely as a safety issue, but part of it is a vision. Haugen added that, the long term vision, it is one separate bridge closer to the Sorlie Bridge in the current plan, a non-motorized connected bridge across the river downtown. Noehre stated that they have never said that the cities can’t build a pedestrian bridge. Grasser responded that the unspoken issue is federal funding access. He added that, in any event there will be a discussion held on this, he just doesn’t know where it will go, and how much support it will have.

MATTER OF MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

Haugen reported that Self-Certification is tied into the MPO’s annual adoption of a new T.I.P. document. He stated that, although last month we adopted a Minnesota side final T.I.P., we did not do the annual certification; and now, because North Dakota is our lead agency, we have done the annual certification with the North Dakota side T.I.P.

Haugen commented that in the past Federal Highway asked us to have it as a separate distinct agenda item versus being only in the appendix of a T.I.P., where it is also located. He explained that Self-Certification is basically the MPO telling the feds that you give us lots of rules and regulations and we believe that we are following and adhering to all of your requirements. Kuharenko referred to the second page of the document, under Planning Requirements – B-3: “Liaison, coordination...one member from the Chamber of Commerce”, and asked who that member is. Haugen responded that it would be Barry Wilfahrt. Haugen explained that the term “direct membership” doesn’t imply the same meaning as the membership of people who sit on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

the Technical Advisory Committee and make motions and decisions; the membership is as a basic advisor member. He added that there are several advisory members, UND is another example, as is the Chamber, as well as some others.

Kuharenko said that the other comment he has is he ended up taking a quick look at 49 United States Code 1607, and he thinks that has actually changed and been revised and is now in Chapter 53, which is referenced under Planning Requirements – A, second line. He said he believes that has been revised, so you may want to update that as well. Haugen responded that he would defer to his State and Federal Partners to let him know if this is correct and needs updating.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2015 SELF-CERTIFICATION SUBJECT TO ANY POSSIBLE CHANGE TO THE CFR REFERENCE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2016-2019 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that they advertised that a public hearing would be taking place at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday, and that comments would be received until 11:30 a.m.

Haugen commented that last month, as he already mentioned, we approved the Minnesota side T.I.P., and included in your packet is the full document. He added that we also discussed the Draft North Dakota S.T.I.P. last month as well, and we did receive some comments from the City of Grand Forks, which are included as well. He said that they are trying to work with local government to make sure we have a reconciled T.I.P./S.T.I.P. project listings and documents.

Haugen stated that there are some minor issues with the listings that Mr. Johnson highlighted for him. He referred to the document and went over the issues briefly.

Haugen pointed out that Project #17 has dollar values shown, but they should be blank as well. He said that Project #12 was discussed last month, with the S.T.I.P. having a very low total value – but he believes the total shown is correct. He added that the federal amount stayed the same because that is the maximum allowed.

Haugen commented that on the Transit side there were two prior funding requests made, and Transit Projects #4 and #5 were awarded funds in July so they have to be shown in the T.I.P. He stated that Project #3 is for a fixed route bus replacement and is an anticipated request as the application has just been opened for the North Dakota 5339 Program. He added that the two capital items have been awarded funds, so they are now showing up in this document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Haugen stated that, if he recalls correctly, the only other project you had questions about was the very last one, Project #36, which is an HSIP, or safety project on 32nd Avenue South. He said that the S.T.I.P. showed this being done this year, with these amounts, but the City indicated that this wasn't really their request, and one of the comments Mr. Johnson made was that maybe the City isn't going to want to do this project in 2019. Johnson responded that he doesn't know where they are at with the e-mail responses for this project, but the last he heard from Sean was that the project was not being funded. Grasser commented that it seemed like the discussion changed. He said that originally the State was going to move it back to 2019, and without getting into all the details about the ensuing discussions, the last determination was that it was too big of a dollar amount, and they were going to take it out altogether, however, the City isn't agreeable to that. He added that it is a little hard to figure out exactly where their targets are supposed to be for dollar amounts because they are actually making a request that; originally they were just going to extend the turn lanes, and then they amended it to include the turn lanes and also aligning them head-to-head, and they are hopeful that there is still some consideration in there for actually going back to the less costly smaller project, which would be to extend the turning lanes. Haugen pointed out that the dollar amount shown in the T.I.P. is for the smaller project.

Johnson asked if this is for just two intersections. Grasser responded that that would be correct. Kuharenko added that there had been a total of four intersections, but it was reduced to two. Haugen commented that this project is currently programmed in both the T.I.P. and the S.T.I.P., it is just being shifted in years. Kuharenko explained that in the S.T.I.P., currently, it was for 31st and 34th, and that was for realigning the turn lanes, and their request for this past cycle was to realign as well as to extend the turn lanes per the design manual. Johnson stated that NDDOT's response from programming was that nothing would be funded, and now the City is trying to get back to this project. Haugen said that the good thing is that it is showing up in the T.I.P., as there would be a much bigger battle if you had to go back and do public participation again if it weren't. He added that when it is time to recommend approval, whether we keep it in or take it out would be the question for this body.

Noehre referred to Project #25, and commented that the way the project description is written, that part is already done, but in looking at the year and dollar amounts, he thinks that description is incorrect as he would guess that it is actually for the surface treatments. Johnson stated that he thinks this is the follow up micro-seal project. Noehre agreed, adding that this project was originally scheduled for 2016, but it was done a year early.

Noehre referred to Project #27, and said that, although he can't give the correct amounts, he can tell you that they aren't correct, and in-fact, should be much smaller. Johnson commented that he thinks that what they have done in the past was to take the total project miles and figure out what percentage is actually located in the study area and figure the costs from that amount.

Noehre referred to Project #33, and pointed out it is the reconstruction of DeMers Avenue, and they will have to decide, relatively soon, on what direction to take on this one, because it is showing in 2019 and it will have a long project development process so we would have to make a decision and get started soon. Grasser stated that they will take this to a committee at some

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

point in time to get some feedback from them. Noehre said that he doesn't know if it is critical, at least from his point of view, for this particular one, but certainly right after, and before the next one gets started.

Kuharenko referred to Project #20, and pointed out that the amounts should actually be \$129, \$116.1, \$6.45, and \$6.45.

Haugen stated that the T.I.P. document also identifies the relationship of these projects in our EJ areas. He said that there are three projects that are inside, or that just touch the EJ area: North 42nd Street is the one that goes through an EJ population; the TAP project on DeMers is on the edge of an EJ population; and the DeMers Avenue downtown project is on the edge of an identified EJ population area. He commented that they do suggest these projects will be a great benefit to those neighborhoods.

Haugen referred to a map illustrating the distribution of all the projects by their symbolized years. He pointed out that projects are well distributed throughout the study area, there is no concentration of any one particular area at the detriment to another identified area.

Haugen reported that we continue to carry over the Illustrative project, but he isn't 100% sure why, as there isn't any federal action to fund this that he is aware of, but it's there.

Haugen stated that they have to do an annual listing of all of our obligations, and also a status of projects. He said that they did note that several projects from the State had significant increases or modified T.I.P. values without any documentation to the MPO of modifications being done, and some projects were completed earlier than what was programmed in the T.I.P. He added that progress is being done on all the projects, and things are still on schedule to be done, so we are just noting that the increase in costs was substantial versus what was programmed, and, again there was no modification of the T.I.P. document to reflect those changes.

Haugen reported that we already took care of Self-Certification, but noted that it is included in the T.I.P. as well. He added that the Study area map is also included and shows the urban area as well, as an extended area outside the urbanized area.

Haugen stated that public participation is documented on how we engaged them in the T.I.P. process. He said that there are statements included that we didn't receive any comments, which may be a little presumptuous, but most likely we won't receive any and we had to fill it in with something. He pointed out that because we didn't do a Draft T.I.P. there is only a notice for the Final T.I.P. included.

Haugen said that he believes that of the changes we made to-date, none are substantial enough that they would require we do another public involvement process; the two main issues are to reduce the U.S. #2 project from 69th out west to just within the study area values, and the other is to decide what to do with the HSIP program in 2019 for 32nd Avenue, so until we hear otherwise, it is in the draft document and it can be forwarded with the HSIP project as it is, or you can recommend removal now, but it will still be there when the Executive Policy Board sees it, they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

would just have a motion from us with our recommendation. He added that he believes this project is listed like this in the Draft S.T.I.P. Johnson responded that that is why he is leaning on leaving it in because it matches the S.T.I.P. right now. Grasser commented that if that is all they can keep then they want to keep at least that much in; he sees no reason to take it out.

Grasser asked if there was some guidance as to the dollar amount limits they should be looking at under the HSIP Program, because he is still a little troubled as he thinks the right thing to do is the larger request. Johnson responded that it isn't his Division's program so he only knows some of the details on the funding side, but it is a change in philosophy that they have been trying to implement the past couple of years to go with more broader based, low cost, systemic improvements because although we did get more money with MAP-21, there are still so many needs out there that it spread pretty thin, especially now that we went with cutting the program essentially in half between locals and the state, so that even provides less money for some of those projects. He added that another thing, historically he has been involved with two of them for sure, where we had similar projects as this one, where you're changing multiple turn lanes and it gets a little bit beefier under the safety program with that limited scope and a narrow budget, so an idea of what safety means is to make sure that if your spending safety dollars there is a safety benefit and not just thinking that since we're here why not do this too, it is really difficult. He stated that if you just want to do it purely just to fix these crashes, then that is the project, there's nothing else, so if you want to do anything else to it, it typically can't be funded with these funds because there isn't necessarily a safety benefit tied to it, there may be eventually, or you've had issues elsewhere, but if you don't have a measured safety benefit tied to those other tangible items, that is where they get hung up. Haugen added that they don't like to co-mingle funds, so if you have safety money and you want to use other funds to do the rest of it they would probably pull the safety monies, they want stand-alone safety projects.

Haugen commented that the Kennedy Bridge still shows up in 2016 on the North Dakota side, but, if you recall it shows up in 2017 on the Minnesota side, and they also have a pay-back in 2018 for their federal funds so there is a project listing on the North Dakota side showing that Minnesota is paying back roughly 7.2 million of their federal funds in 2018 for that project.

Johnson said that he was asked the other day if the Illustrative Project (42nd Avenue Grade Separation) should stay in the S.T.I.P., and he wanted to bring it to this group for discussion. Haugen commented that he raised the question last year, and the decision was to keep it. Johnson stated that he thinks that back then the thought was that legislation is coming up, and the idea was to ask for money, but he thinks the desire at their end now is to remove it, however they will leave it in if that is the decision. Haugen added that having it in isn't a fatal flaw to the T.I.P. document. Johnson agreed, but said that it still may or may not be left in the S.T.I.P.

Grasser stated that the City would like to carry this project on as much as they can; adding that they have completed the document and just have to find a mechanism that takes up the environmental document, so, again they would like to keep as many doors open and carry it along as far as they can because they would hate to drop it off and then have an opportunity come up, and they have to go back because they didn't carry it on, so, again, if they can get the State or some other entities to help cover the funding, then he thinks they would have an

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

opportunity to move that project forward, and they wouldn't have to go back and redo Steps 2, 3, and 4, by dropping it off, so whether this works or not they are just trying to keep as many options open as long as they can. Johnson responded that he understands, but it just kind of keeps it in this document, but either way if tomorrow you got money you would have to come back to the MPO and do a T.I.P. amendment, even with it in here, so an amendment would need to be done no matter what and you would have to go back through that process, and at this point it is basically just a visual tag/flag for the document.

Grasser commented that it wouldn't be unforeseen, on his part, though that the State could do some legislation, and they could talk about funding things in the S.T.I.P. Johnson agreed that that could happen. Grasser said, then, that technically this isn't funded, but it is in the document so should funding open up they would like to keep it in as they are just trying to keep as many doors open as they can. Johnson stated that that is fine, we will leave it alone and he will take this request back.

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY NOEHRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE 2016-2019 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES DISCUSSED, AND ANY PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that we need to suspend the agenda in order to allow for our guests from WSB to give a presentation on the 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet were some press releases, notices, and other items for review and discussion.

Erin Perdu, WSB, was present for a presentation on the 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Perdu commented that she wants to give the Technical Advisory Committee an update on where they are at with this project, as well as where they are going with the public participation as they have several activities planned for this week. She then introduced the staff that will be working on the project.

Presentation ensued.

Purdu reported that, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, they have a public kick-off later this evening over at the Grand Forks City Hall. She explained that they will start things off by trying to explain to people what this work is about. She referred to a slide, and pointed out that it shows

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

the residents, and participants that what they are trying to do is start with ideas from the people and develop a common vision for Grand Forks and the entire planning region. She stated that they will use this information to look at industry, growth in general, recreation, and livability, then they will focus their discussion and research on specific land use and transportation issues, adding that there are a slew of transportation issues that they will be looking at linking with the land use components. She commented that when they get to the end of the process they will be looking at specific strategies for how we go from the planning framework to your day-to-day implementation; including some ordinance changes and measures to check your progress.

Grasser said that he isn't seeing a piece in there that references, basically, the overall infrastructure system, you talk about just the transportation piece, but there are a lot of other components that go into creating a community and services. Purdu agreed, and explained that for the purpose of simple communication she didn't go into that detail, but yes, if you look at the next slide where we talk about our approach, and getting into looking at the growth tiers and livability/sustainability, pieces of this we are definitely looking at the balance between land use and growth and impacts on infrastructure, including transportation and other infrastructure such as water, sewer, utilities, etc., in sort of an iterative fashion.

Purdu gave an overview of their approach, pointing out that they show public engagement as really the foundation of everything they are doing for this Land Use Plan Update. She stated that in the Technical Memorandum you will see some draft goals and objectives that they are using as a starting point for discussion, and based on the public input they hope to get this week, and in the near future, they will be revising those.

Purdu stated that they are just finishing up the first task and are moving into looking at the growth tiers, where land use change will be occurring, and then tying that in to infrastructure and transportation. She said that they will also get into the ladders of opportunity and sustainability topics, really looking at not just where growth will occur and what types of growth will occur, but also what the character is of that growth; are we creating livable areas, is the City sustainable, etc., and then they will get into implementation.

Purdu then went over the timeline of the project; explaining that, again, we are currently in the midst of our public kick-off, and will be doing some pop-up workshops this week, as well as doing some visioning and looking at goals and general topics for the plan. She said that after this task they will then move to doing some listening sessions and focusing more on livability topics, and some specific pilot areas in the City, January through March. She stated that their target date for having a draft plan complete is May of 2016, so there will be a lot of work going on behind the scenes, but these are kind of the major dates that they will have public outreach efforts, so May of 2016 they will have a draft plan ready and will hold public hearings at which time you will be presented with some ordinance changes as well. She said that the target date for the overall approval of the plan is September/October of next year.

Grasser asked what kind of ordinance changes have they typically run into. Purdu responded that they may be recommending all sorts of ordinance changes; specifically, their scope-of-work for this effort is to look at the corridor overlay districts in the City and suggest some changes to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

those. She stated that staff has specifically pulled out landscaping standards as something they wanted to work on, but she imagines that going through this process and looking at land use and infrastructure, they will probably be recommending some changes to the actual zoning districts, and maybe some changes to density and techniques for mixing uses, which was one of the City's goals from the last update.

Purdu reported that Technical Memorandum Number 1 was just distributed so she won't go into a lot of detail about what their findings were; but just to give you some perspective on the types of data and information that you will see in there, they have updated demographics and housing information from the last Land Use Plan so you will see that information in the memorandum. She referred to an example of one of the things they drew some conclusions from; age distribution of the residents of the City of Grand Forks, and how those populations have changed since the last planning period, and went over it briefly.

Purdu commented that they also took an in-depth look at housing data; and referred to a graph indicating the types of housing that has been constructed since 2000. She stated that in looking at this information you can determine what is in demand, the supply available; and, teaming this information with the market research they are doing as well, they will be making recommendations on how much area needs to be planned for residential use, and at what densities, etc.

West asked what caused the huge spike in 2013. Purdu responded that they do explain this in the report, but as her colleague wrote this section she can't definitively say exactly what that explanation is right now, however she thinks there were a couple of developments that may have caused it. Gengler added that they get asked that question a lot, and it is just one of those events where they can't really point their finger at just one industry, but he thinks one theory was that it was just a healthy increase overall in a lot of the different markets and industries at that time. Grasser said that he thinks there was some late demand there too that did some catching up. Purdu commented that part of their task in looking at that housing information is to figure out, if there was a lot of building in the apartment and rental sector, is there still pent up demand, or have we kind of satisfied that demand and now will there be a shift and need for some other type of housing, that is the kinds of things they will be looking into.

Purdu reported that there is some information in the memo about disadvantaged populations; specifically, both their location (shown on the environmental justice maps that you were looking at earlier), and some statistical data about income, people with disabilities, people speaking English as a second language, that will be explored in more depth when they get to the sustainability and ladders of opportunity tasks in this process.

Purdu stated that they also did some work on population projections, and looking at the various options for projecting population, which is obviously a big part of the land use planning process. She referred to a graph, and explained that there are several methodologies for projecting population that you will see, and went over the information shown briefly. She pointed out that the red line is the MPO's growth projection, while the blue line is growth based on trends and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

building permits, and they feel that those are the most realistic projections to move forward with, which puts us at roughly a 2% to 2.5% growth rate.

Purdu commented that another thing they looked at in the memo is existing land use data, trends in land use, and also the previous future land use map from the 2040 plan. She said that in general there were a lot of areas on the fringe of the City that were planned for industrial development, residential development, but if you look at the statistics between 2010 and 2015, most of the residential development actually occurred within the City limits, closer in to the urban core, which is consistent with some of the strategies from the last land use plan.

Purdu stated that this leads us to ask questions like; well, maybe the City was successful at encouraging more compact development as was part of the strategy last time the plan was updated, and is it still appropriate to allocate so much land to future residential use on the outer edges of the city, maybe – maybe not, do we need to look at what kinds of density we are planning for.

Purdu said that they are looking at these same types of questions when it comes to industrial development; and also looking at where the infrastructure is available or where the City is willing to provide or offer infrastructure services, transportation services, and we are pairing that with their market research, so talking to some of the major employers to figure out what kinds of industrial lands are going to be in demand is something we need to plan for.

Purdu commented that, finally, in the tech memo one of their tasks was to go through and suggest some preliminary goals and objectives, so you will find at the end they started with the previous 2040 Land Use Plan's goals and objectives, and with the help of the MPO, city staff and the City's Planning and Zoning Subcommittee, they went through them and held some discussion as to what is still relevant, what is no longer relevant, what needs to be changed, so you will see some preliminary goals, which are just a starting point for these public discussions they are going to have to determine what the vision is from the people.

Purdu reported that as far as public engagement is concerned, this week is really their public kick-off, so as soon as the project started in June they have been working mostly behind the scenes doing research, gathering data, reviewing other plans and policies, and are now looking at going out and talking to people. She said that some of their goals for public participation was to create an effective process to build, not only participation, but ownership and support of this plan to help ensure it is actually implemented.

Purdu then went over what will be occurring this week with the public kick-off, as well as what kinds of information will be available. She commented that they do have a project website where people can participate and give input on these same questions they are asking in person, it can be found at: www.grandforks2045.org

Grasser asked if the tech memo is complete, or is it still a work in progress. Haugen responded that it is going through the subcommittee tomorrow, then it will be released. Purdu added that it is 99% complete, depending on what they hear from the subcommittee tomorrow.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Grasser stated that they have one city council member that is very fiscally conservative, and some of the questions he has posed in the past in situations like this one, where you are getting public input, and how do we connect a want to a financial willingness to participate; is there a way of somehow bringing that in, such as would you be willing to pay more fees, do you want to increase sales tax, increase property tax, to accommodate whatever may be. Purdu responded that that is a good question, and that is usually something that, in past efforts that she has been involved with, we start with this sort of broad discussion, and then we come back with a wish list, then we start talking about those and try to figure out what is really possible, and what might not be. Antonio agreed, adding that you start broad, then you can begin to show trade-offs, you can have this but then you have less money so you maybe can't have that. He said that another thing they do in the initial stages of a project is, if you give people a list of ten wonderful things and say you can have all ten they will take all ten, but if you ask them for just their top two or three, that can help to determine what things are most important so we can develop priorities, and ultimately if they are accomplishable.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN
UPDATE**

Haugen commented that the 2045 East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update is a little further ahead than the 2045 Grand Fork Land Use Plan Update.

Kouba reported that one of the things they did for the 2045 East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update was to do a survey that actually asked people what they would be willing to pay for in terms of what they would like to see done.

Kouba commented that, as Mr. Haugen stated, they are a little further along, and they did hold their first public meeting and visioning process in June. She added that they have also have been doing behind the scenes things such as determining where population is going to be at in the future, getting an idea of where that population is going to be located, and where do we see areas of growth going on. She stated that they are also looking at their employment sectors as well; where are we looking at, where are we hearing future growth is going to happen. She said that they heard from the school district, as well as bringing in their water and light department, engineering, and the public works departments to get their input as to what they are facing and what they have to get done when any kind of growth ends up happening.

Kouba stated that they are concentrating on compact growth because of the infrastructure issues. She said that they looked at what kind of population growth they are going to have to look at, and was pointing out how there's different levels, and what level you're trying to project that population growth to be at. She commented that they kind of looked at that already in their process, and they have already kind of pinpointed what kind of growth they are looking at, what percentage of growth they are going to be looking at already, which is 0.9%, which is less than Grand Forks, but that is still pretty significant for the size of East Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Kouba commented that they are identifying East Grand Forks as kind of a bedroom community to Grand Forks, but they still have their own industries, their industrial sector, their commercial sector, that will support the City itself, as well as having more areas of growth inside the City.

Kouba said that they have already projected kind of where their phasing is going to happen, so they are concentrating on the earlier timeframes of inside city limits, areas that they've already got some plats and things like that already in process, and then as we get further out into the time span of this land use plan we are going to be looking a little more on the fringes of the City, outside the City limits, but still within range of where we would probably see the growth happening.

Kouba reported there are a few concept areas they are going to be looking at so they can present where, they want to be able to present at least the idea of how they can mix these different land uses up, and how they kind of gradually grow into each other, or grow out of each other. She said that they are looking at an area that already has at least one plat out there, as well as other areas where there is a more focused commercial/industrial area, and at another area in the south end of town where people are wanting something specific, and showing them how that that can mix with their residential area that is highly focused, especially in the south end of town.

Kouba stated that they have also been looking at the goals and policies, basically making them focus in on what is really usable for the City of East Grand Forks. She explained that they have focused in these goals and policies to specific types of uses, and portioned them out so it is a little easier for people to pinpoint, okay, I need to look at the residential goals, the commercial goals, but also allow for them to point out the growth management of the objectives of the City, as well as just general land uses so that people understand as they go through their process of plats and building, and such.

Kouba commented that they also want to be able to tell people about how they want the natural resources, how we want to do stormwater and things of that nature, also parks and open spaces as well as some goals and objectives for the City Administration and their planning function as well.

Kouba reported that they have done a lot, but are still looking for more input, and are planning a public meeting on September 16th, where they are hoping to be able to get more information from the public as to what they are seeing about what we are presenting to them.

Grasser asked if they get input from specific developers, as far as what their visions are for the land that they own. Kouba responded that they have done a market analysis, which is, our consultants have actually talked to some of the developers around the City, as well as some developers that are mostly focused in Grand Forks, but have shown an interest in doing something in East Grand Forks. She said that the East Grand Forks City Planner, who is also the City's Building Inspector, does hear a lot from the specific land owners, who have a bit more land, and who have been thinking about dividing it up and doing some developing, so her input brings their input in as well as does the market analysis. She stated that they are trying to make

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

this a more open and more easily understood process for developers to come in and develop property.

Haugen reported that the .9% population growth is actually less than the current land use plan, or transportation plan assumed for growth. He explained that they showed a 1.2% growth rate, but from 2010 to 2015 building permits issued have not been at all what Grand Forks has seen for housing, so that is why they have trimmed it back from 1.2% to .9%, and the most recent trend indicates it still won't get to 1.2%.

West asked if any of these plans consider a future by-pass route around the City, and how that would affect future land use if it were built. Kouba responded that for East Grand Forks she doesn't see something that far south as making much of an impact on land use, the only thing that would affect the land use would be a 32nd Avenue bridge, as you would see more commercial along that route in the south end of the City, but that is why one of their pilot areas is in the south end of town.

West asked what mechanisms are or aren't there along that corridor as it develops to reserve right-of-way. Grasser responded that he thinks, from the Grand Forks side, if there was any development going on they would try to capture a fairly wide swiipe of right-of-way.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that they held their first open house, as well as the first Steering Committee meetings in early July, and he included the information presented in the packet.

Haugen stated that the consultants are scheduled to be in town next Tuesday. He added that the Steering Committee will meet at 2:00 p.m. Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101; and the a Public Open house will be held from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Skalicky Center on UND Campus.

Haugen referred to the information in the packet, and pointed out that it is the summary they received from the community at the open house in early July. He said that they had a fair turnout, a dozen to a dozen and a half people, coming to the Grand Forks City Hall for that open house.

Haugen said that the agenda for the Steering Committee meeting is also included in the packet, and pointed out that a lot of it will be the same materials and information provided at the public meeting later that day. He added that a copy of the meeting notice was also included in the packet.

Haugen stated that, just a glimpse of what the consultants have found out to-date, basically all of the businesses on the Mill Spur that communicated back to us indicated a willingness to have train service come from the north, and they didn't insist it only come from the south on the current line. He added that another point is that the North Dakota State Mill still has a strong desire for this, however they are still in deep negotiations with BNSF on rates, so that isn't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

progressing as fast as was hoped, and they have also been working with some of the other interests to help identify future train traffic, but that information is still being massaged and hasn't been released yet, but hopefully we will get some of that information soon so the Steering Committee can digest and review it next Tuesday.

Noehre asked if they are still exploring crossing U.S. Business 81. Haugen responded that it is still in the scope-of-work, but currently the North Dakota Mill is not very close to telling them where that spot would be on 81, because they are still trying to figure out if they will ever reach agreement with BNSF to land a unit train. He added that a couple of months ago we were concerned with them opening up 30% more capacity before having these other facilities to receive it, and you asked the City for an impact study as part of the permit, but that is outside the scope we are doing, so there will be a disruption of traffic, and there will be more train traffic on the mill spur as there will be more grain delivered and more product produced, and that is the only way for it to come in and out. Christianson commented that there will be more cars, but added that that doesn't necessarily mean more movements, but more cars on the average as part of the expansion.

Noehre stated that part of agreeing to do the study is to look at crossing somewhere else, but he knows that that hasn't been a popular option, and it would probably be a tough sell if it were chosen. Haugen commented that he isn't sure that the mechanisms of just laying down track connecting Glasston over to the Mill on the north side of town is warranted as the mechanism to make that connection was the Unit Train Landing Facility the mill was trying to build, but absent of the Mill building such a facility he isn't sure there is a mechanism, but there might be some railroad funds the DOT controls that could be a possibility. West responded that he thinks those funds are spoken for for a while. Christianson added that it is a huge investment without something to drive it, like the Mill's expansion.

Haugen closed by saying that if you are on the Steering Committee look for a packet tomorrow, if not look for one early Friday, and he will at least see everyone at 5:30 at Skalicky Hall, UND Campus.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

Viafara reported that you received a brief summary report on the activities that so far have been undertaken by MPO staff to advance the Vital Metrics Dashboard Report.

Viafara referred to the staff report and commented that the second point discusses how we are going to approach this task; Points A and B will be done immediately after the review, and Points C and D are the ones that may require analogies and forecastings, so that will hopefully satisfy forecast needs.

Viafara pointed out that we have provided you with some examples to give you a view of how this will work. He explained that the way they are doing this is rather simple; and if we compare it with the other two examples we are presenting, they are rather different because in our opinion

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

these agencies have been using software that provides educated guesses, so we will continue with our own design.

Viafara referred to the information in the packet, and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that there is going to be these “quick glance” type things in the front of the document, and then a more thorough write-up of each, as well as some additional information that didn’t make the front cut of the report, but this is the Performance Report required by MAP-21.

Viafara said that for the engineers, he would like to point out that the condition and performance of the transportation system really unveils a rather poor analysis of our street and highway element, the pedestrian and bicycle element and facilities, transit system (they are working on this), and the overall goals established in the plan for current movement around the planning area.

OTHER BUSINESS

1) Bygland Road Study Open House – Wednesday, September 23, 2015

Kouba reported that there will be an open house on Wednesday, September 23, 2015 at the Senior Center in East Grand Forks, from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m.

Kouba commented that the information being presented is available at:
www.theforksmmpo.org/Pages/EGF2045LUP.html.

2) 2015 Annual Work Program Project Update

Viafara reported that this is a continuation of a request to keep everybody updated on the status of our 2015 Work Program Activities.

Viafara commented that this request is sound, in the sense that it is very difficult sometimes to keep track of all those projects at the same time, so by providing you with this update we can tell you where things are at the moment, however, it is not to be equated with a final report or a technical memo because those would be done by the different project managers, but at least we can glance at this and get a quick update on where things are at the moment.

Viafara referred to the report and went over the information briefly; pointing out that there was a presentation given for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update, a presentation given for the Bygland Road Study, a presentation given for the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update, and he is currently working on the Safe Routes To School project and will hold a Steering Committee meeting on Monday as part of the report they are preparing.

Haugen pointed out that he just highlighted the 32nd Avenue project and stated that the RFP is now out. He explained that we are now underneath the new NDDOT Qualified Base Selection,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

adding that the due date did not change, but the official advertisement date was moved back because the NDDOT was not quite ready to start advertising, so September 25th we will get the responses back and hopefully have someone on board in October.

West asked what these new requirements mean, or do, and will they affect county projects. Johnson responded that if you are using federal aid dollars for engineering it will affect county projects, but if you're using local dollars it won't.

Grasser asked what the requirements are. Johnson responded that you have to advertise your RFP through the NDDOT, on their website. He explained that you will develop your RFP, provide it to the NDDOT, and they will publish it on their website. He said that there is also a laundry list, A-K, of what needs to be provided back to the DOT after you have done your interviews and selected a consultant that range from interview questions, to your selection committee, to the scoring sheets, to how you scored them, to the RFP, to the contract, etc.

West asked if they would still advertise in the local papers as well. Johnson responded that that is one question he hasn't gotten an official answer on yet. He added that the official publication that goes along with federal aid would be the DOT's on the website, but he doesn't believe they would be stopping the local from advertising it as well, just as long as you don't use different dates then what is on their website, which would be the official dates.

Johnson explained that this came about because of a finding in their consultant selection process during either a federal or state audit, but basically there was a finding that they wanted all federal services to follow the same process regardless of the entity requesting those services. He said that this may also pertain to transit if they do any architecture and engineering selections they will have to do this as well.

Grasser asked if this was a new State law or just a DOT requirement. Johnson responded that it is a new DOT process. He said that the new CASS Manual was just updated on-line and it has all this information in it.

3) Columbia Road Project

Grasser referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Grasser reported that the City is doing a project on Columbia Road. He explained that there are certain ordinances and procedures that they have in place regarding building sidewalks and such when they do road extensions, but what has happened over the years is that they have had their City Council take different actions on different projects, a lot of time due to financial reasons.

Grasser stated that, using Columbia Road as an example, 36th to 40th Avenue South was 100% funded by the City, and that is basically a strategy to avoid putting a project at risk for special assessments because their special assessment component is extremely small, thus the City is putting that street in at 100% City cost, but to offset some of those costs they are going back and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

basically special assessing sidewalks and bikepaths that go with that street. He explained that part of that strategy is that they are still looking to fulfill the need and the goal for bikepaths and pedestrian facilities, but sometimes it is just a matter of exactly when they do it, so they went to the Service Safety Committee a couple of weeks ago to get some input from them, as they have gotten input from some different groups as to how to strategize bikepaths and sidewalks along Columbia Road, and they wanted their opinion as well.

Grasser referred to a slide illustrating the location of the project, and explained that it runs from 40th Avenue South to 47th Avenue South. He pointed out that this also illustrates the lack of development adjacent to the road, which is one of the issues with this project.

Grasser commented that in terms of the project timeline, they are looking at bidding it in 2017. He added that early in the process they did get public input during a public meeting on August 27th.

Grasser referred to a slide illustrating what is currently at this location, and explained that it is a rural section, and they are planning on building a continuation of the roadway to the north. He said that one of the questions they wanted input on was on bikepaths and pedestrian access. He commented that they have three alternatives: 1) do nothing; 2) put in an aggregate path; and 3) put in a hard surface path.

Grasser pointed out that the next slide shows how the roadway will look. He explained that a lot of the land adjacent to this now is undeveloped, they do have some concepts as to where roads will go, but those concepts can change over time with re-platting of the property; and this includes the west side of the road as well.

Grasser stated that the only thing they are really taking action on, at least what they are anticipating taking action on at this level, is at 43rd Avenue South. He explained that the reason for this is because that is the one that ties back toward the school, and they have a fair level of certainty that things are going to move ahead on that and they are starting to install some of the underground infrastructure in that area.

West asked if they know what kind of right-of-way they are getting at this location. Grasser responded that they are getting an awful lot of right-of-way, but he doesn't know the exact dimensions. He stated that they did have to go back and get some more for the power line there. Yavarow commented that there is 97 feet on the west side plus there are easements on top of that.

Grasser referred to the intersection at 47th, and pointed out that they are tying into what are now rural roads to the east, and to the west they are gravel, and then to the south they have a rural section. He said that they are currently contemplating that they will be building out the whole intersection for long-term future and are setting it up at this point for three lane sections east and west, and plan for an intersection there, but that can certainly change. He stated that they are working on 47th as a separate item.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Grasser referred to a slide illustrating the planned detour routes as they will have to close the roadway during construction.

Grasser stated that in the City's current CIP, some of the road networks that they are envisioning are going to happen in the future are shown out to 2019. He said that they are doing a piece of 47th on the east side of the school, and in 2019 they are thinking of tying in to the west side of the school. He added, however, that when they were doing the CIP they were expecting more growth in this area from the developer, so they are showing this 47th Avenue South in 2017, which may or may not happen now as a lot of those types of things are growth dependent, but again they are showing how the connecting networks are going to tie in with the Columbia Road project in 2017.

Grasser referred to a slide illustrating a depiction of most of the trail system, but as Mr. Haugen pointed out there are a couple of pieces that are missing, and some are unofficial. He said that right now you can see that they did put in a trail when they built South 34th Street, but the key thing is that at the intersection of 47th, they don't really have anything connecting to it right now and that is one of the big things that the committee was focusing on as they were getting their input.

Grasser reported that what the Service Safety Committee basically said when we asked what is an expectation that they should be doing for pedestrian and bicycle access along Columbia, and staff had actually, in their report, said that maybe we should, as a compromise, look at putting in an aggregate trail, but the committee said they didn't think they should be doing anything at this time, at least as part of this project. He said that what they wanted to do was to fall back on what is starting to become a policy based on past actions, and that is to build the trail system similarly to growth. He explained that it isn't tied directly to growth, but in a case like this they recognize that if bikepaths and sidewalks go in, particularly sidewalks on the east side, they will be vulnerable to development, so when the developer comes in and develops a commercial property, more than likely those sidewalks would just be taken out and redone. He added that, similarly with bikepaths on the west side, we don't know exactly where most of those roadway connects are, or the grades at which we would have to connect to, so we would build it flat and then have to go back and tear them out to make the roadway connections, so part of this is ensuring efficient use of private and public dollars.

Grasser commented that, again, the plan would be to come back in and build those facilities, and basically special assess them. He reiterated that the roadway is being provided without special assessments so adjacent property owners are get a good deal, but financially, for the City to help continue to provide that, we would be looking at trying to special assess some of those pedestrian facilities.

Grasser stated that when he says that the City's plan actually is not financially viable, they do go broke in just a couple of years based on their current policies, that is why there is some question as to whether they can keep doing this and that is why they are struggling so hard to save a few dollars when they are providing those roads.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Grasser said that, ultimately, what the committee said is that it makes sense that when they start connecting some of these other roadways, either on 43rd Avenue South or 47th Avenue South, they will be adding the facilities along those roadways so they have a place to connect. He added that they recognize that if they built something today, and dropped them off at the intersection of 47th and Columbia, they are basically putting them on a two-lane road, and with the traffic volumes they have out there there is quite a bit of concern about safety.

Grasser commented that he wanted to share this information. He added that his crystal ball would tell him that most likely by 2017 they will probably be putting the bikepath in, at minimum on the west side of the road on 40th and 43rd, because he is pretty sure by that time they will have some sort of connection that they will be able to make to 43rd Avenue South, and hence back to the school. He said that, again, their policy or procedure would be to not wait for every single business to develop along the way, they aren't going to be that business dependent, but as the road connections and things get finalized, and some development beings to occur, they will come in there and push a project. He added that sidewalks are not protestable, so even though there may be some gaps in the system where a business may not want a sidewalk yet, the City has the propensity to force them.

Grasser reported that this is the plan, and they have shared this with different individuals; shared it at the open house; talked to people on the bikeway and trails, official users, and they seem to be understanding of the financial implications here, and it seems to be acceptable at this point in time to pretty much everybody they have talked to.

Haugen suggested it be explained why this is probably being discussed; the federal aid involvement presumption is that bike and ped facilities, that accommodation of all modes would happen with federal aid involvement, and the plan identifies that bike and ped facilities would be done with these urbanizations of the roadways, so the City is contemplating going a different route than what is in the plan, so as they proceed forward and make final decisions, it might come back to the MPO as to how this is still consistent with our planning documents. He said that, just like we had with the Land Use Plans, the city drafts ordinances, and the expectation is that you follow them, but there is an out-clause whereby the City has to provide documentation justifying why they aren't building the facilities, and give a rationale and reasonable assurance that it will be done in the near future and so on. He added that he would assume, if we keep going down this path, that is something that perhaps the MPO would be facing in the future as well. Grasser responded that most likely this kind of issue wouldn't happen very often because if the only money they have is for maintenance activities they probably aren't going to be dealing with an extension like this in the foreseeable future, but it is a technical point. He added that, again, a lot of times the City has traditionally been in arrears when building roads like this, as it relates to growth, and so most of the time what they have done in the past, if it absolutely makes sense to put in the sidewalks and the bikepaths along with it because they already have the service area and things like that. He stated that this is one of the few times that they are going to be a little bit ahead of it, although by 2017 he isn't sure how far ahead they will still be.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 9th, 2015**

Haugen commented that they are thinking that the Ulland Park Complex and the King's Walk Complex is a prudent place to terminate a bike/ped facility in the short term. Grasser stated that in conjunction with the Park District, they have essentially provided an unofficial trail that isn't a City sponsored trail per-say, or bikepath, but it is a connection to get back to the Middle School, so, to Mr. Haugen's point we need to also now recognize we need to get to the Discovery School. He said that if asphalt weren't so darn expensive, there are a lot of things they could do, but they keep running into financial challenges.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:35 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 14th, 2015, 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: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineering; Nels Christianson, BNSF; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Darren Laesch, MNDOT-Bemidji.

Guest(s) present were: Jon Markusen, KLJ and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Jay Sandeen, GF/EGF MPO Intern; David Wiosna; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Roll Call Voting

Haugen reported that he sent everyone an email about roll call voting. He explained that all items except for approval of minutes and adjournment will now need a roll call vote, so we need to know who the voting member will be for those entities having more than one member listed.

Kuharenko stated that he would be the voting member for the Engineering Department for the City of Grand Forks. Bergman stated that he would be the voting member for the Cities Area Transit.

West asked what spurred this change. Haugen responded that the Bismarck/Mandan MPO had correspondence with the Attorney General, and the result was the MPOs being notified that they will now have to use a roll call voting procedure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

b. November Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Date

Haugen reported that our November Technical Advisory Committee meeting falls on Wednesday, November 11th, which is Veteran's Day; and most people will not be at work that day so we are wondering if you'd like to come here anyway, or if you would like to try to schedule the meeting the Tuesday before, November 10th, or Thursday, November 11th, which is more problematic but could be done.

Haugen stated that noting there are more people nodding yes for Tuesday, November 10th, we will reschedule the meeting for that day.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE
SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS
SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that most of the project has been completed. He said that, as he understands it, the only thing left is lighting. Noehre responded that the normal roadway lighting is installed, they just have the decorative lighting left. He added that the painting has been completed, and he thinks they are doing the striping today. Haugen asked if the approaches got temporarily patched, or was a permanent fix. Yavarow responded that it is permanent until it is replaced. He added that the roadway lighting is actually going in today, and tomorrow.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen commented that last month Mr. Grasser gave us a heads-up that some discussion would be taking place regarding the proposed changes to the Kennedy Bridge. He said that that discussion led to the letter that is attached in the packet being sent out. He explained that the MPO Executive Policy Board wishes to engage in communication about trying to locate a bike/ped only bridge.

Haugen reported that part of the Board's justification for asking to look into a possible separate bike/ped facility, as the letter states, is that in doing so we could accommodate back to more standard widths on the Kennedy Bridge itself as the space being currently being dedicated to bike/ped use would no longer need to be dedicated. He said that the other is financial, in that they feel that MnDOT/NDDOT saved millions of dollars by going with rehab and repainting jobs, so they asked that he write a letter to start trying to have conversations about an additional

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

bike/ped bridge across the Red River. He added that in addition to that, other parts of the letter kind of just identify that there is a history of trying to locate three bike/ped bridges across the Red River, ultimately two have been built through the Corps of Engineers' Flood Protection Project. He stated that the third bridge was also a part of the original project, but was not built.

Haugen commented that he doesn't believe that the MPO Board, in the statements they made, were saying they wanted to delay or cause substantial change to the current Kennedy project, but they do want to have discussion on how we can achieve that third bike/ped bridge over the river.

Laesch asked if it is recommended that MnDOT respond in writing to the letter, or do they wish for a face-to-face meeting to discuss the issue. Haugen responded that he thinks the answer is yes to all the above. He stated that a written response indicating that you received their letter would be good, and then a face-to-face meeting with the Board would also be welcome. Laesch said that he doesn't think he would be able to make the meeting next week, but would be willing to attend the November meeting, but added that he will respond in writing to the letter.

Laesch reported that on the funding end, Joe McKinnon asked him to put something together on it. He explained that they are using Chapter 152 Dollars that were dedicated after the 35W Bridge collapsed in Minneapolis, to try to look at all bridges that are fracture critical, and have significant deficiencies, and to try to get them corrected, thus the purpose of those dollars is to deal, statewide, with all the bridges having deficiencies.

Laesch commented that there was legislation passed in 2010, that said that all those bridges being addressed need to ensure that there is bike/ped facilities on them, and that is why they are going the extra mile on the Kennedy, but he thinks it would be hard for them to use those dollars to fund a separate bike/ped facility. He said that there is definitely more to the conversation, and they will work on a response and bring it to the November MPO Executive Policy Board meeting and talk more about it.

Bergman reported that Monday night, when he crossed the Kennedy Bridge, he had to follow a tractor pulling a cultivator, and if you are going to put those lanes as close as you plan to, you're going to hear that farmer complaining about it because his cultivator shovels were hanging over into the center lane, so if you get them that close he is going to take something out, or someone, so you might have a problem there as that is the type of equipment that is going across that bridge. Laesch asked if he was hanging over the median. Bergman responded that he was.

Noehre commented that the driver technically should probably have had an over-the-limit permit to move that equipment. Bergman agreed, but added that that isn't something a farmer will worry about, they just want to move their equipment. Noehre said, though, that what he is saying is that it was more than likely an illegal movement, and he doesn't know that we are going to build to accommodate illegal activities, per say. Bergman responded that nobody builds for illegal activities, but he is just pointing out that this kind of thing is going to occur in farming communities like ours. He added that if he hits the bridge, he has a problem, and he is going to have to suffer the consequences, but he is still going to move equipment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

Noehre stated that he isn't a funding expert, but he would have to wonder how the NDDOT would fund half of a pedestrian bridge with federal aid, or state aid, outside of Federal TAP dollars. Haugen responded that there are possibilities. He explained that STP dollars are eligible to fund it, NHS dollars could be eligible, CMAC dollars could be eligible, HSIP dollars could be eligible, so there are other possibilities.

Haugen reiterated that the MPO Executive Policy Board is the one that asked that the letter be written, the Board is the one that asked that it include the savings discussion, but he isn't sure, from their point of view, they are seeing this as trying to identify the funding sources, but are seeing it as identifying that the original programmed dollars have been cut in half, so they are looking at the other half that went somewhere other than here, and can they recapture some of those dollars to accomplish a bike/ped facility, that may have been accomplished if the big projects had been followed through on.

Laesch reported that in terms of an update on the Kennedy Bridge project itself, they received comments back from Federal Highway on the Purpose and Need; and it looks like they are pretty close to getting the Purpose and Need approved for the project, and they are working on the 30% design package to submit to SHPO. He added that one thing they are looking into is what do they do with the trail underneath the bridge during construction, so they are looking into some strategies to keep that trail open. He explained that Mr. McKinnon is planning on setting up some sort of meeting with Grand Forks because on the Grand Forks side they are looking at bringing the trail up and across, but in East Grand Forks they are trying to find a way to get it open under the bridge during construction, so they will be setting up that meeting soon to get some input on how to do this.

MATTER OF PROPOSED NORTH DAKOTA SIDE 2016-2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen reminded the committee that we just approved the 2016-2019 T.I.P. last month, but since then there are two items that have been brought to our attention that need to be amended into our T.I.P. to reflect some action the State of North Dakota did.

Haugen referred to the packet, and explained that the first item is for some old SAFETEA-LU monies. He said that, if you remember, under the SAFETEA-LU Program the Safe Routes To School was a separate funding silo, and within that silo there were dollars reserved for infrastructure and dollars that could only be spent on non-infrastructure items. He explained that North Dakota spent their infrastructure dollars, but did not obligate dollars for non-infrastructure projects and those monies are about to expire so North Dakota has decided to spend the \$500,000 to do a statewide effort on Safe Routes To School projects, however it is more geared to general bike/ped education and enforcement and encouragement, so there are three components to it and they will all be run at a statewide level, likely some of those funds will be spent in the MPO area so therefore we have to show it in our T.I.P. document as well.

Haugen reported that there is no match to SAFETEA-LU Safe Routes To School dollars, it is 100% federally funded, so you see no match in the T.I.P. Amendment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

Haugen stated that the second project is a project that came up after our T.I.P. was approved. He explained that North Dakota did a look-see on the University Avenue Overpass on I-29, and determined that there needs to be a deck overlay, and that was not included in our approved T.I.P., but does show up in the North Dakota S.T.I.P., so therefore we have to come back and add it to our T.I.P. as well. He said that it shows \$250,000 in federal funding, and the match being provided by the State, so there will be no City match for that project.

Williams pointed out that Mr. Haugen had referenced that the City has a Public Art Plan. She asked what element we are going to add to that as public art on this project since it is just a minor deck overlay. Haugen responded that the only thing he is aware of is that in talking with Meredith Richards, and he hopes Mr. Gengler can speak on this further, it appears that the City is trying to look at every project that is going through the C.I.P. to see if it is an opportunity to do some public art. He stated that he knows that the consultants, when the first came to town, had viewed that overpass as a great opportunity to announce the University of North Dakota, so that would be a type of lighting that is being suggested in the T.I.P.

Williams commented, though, that this project isn't in the C.I.P. Haugen responded that that is because it just came up at the last minute, he didn't know about it until just a month ago. Williams stated that they were just wondering what kind of art you could add to a minor rehab on the deck. Haugen responded that the communication he had during discussions with local government staff, their response was that they would cross that bridge with the project development, and they will have to see where art might be able to fall in with the project.

Williams said that another question that came up is that if that is the aim, why isn't it listed under all the projects then, that we will be looking at every project to try to do something. Haugen responded that it was listed on this one because it is a new project coming into the T.I.P., it's a new day, but he would think that if the City continues to pursue the addition of public art, those other projects will have that consideration added to it. Gengler commented that they are still in the process of finalizing this policy, he would say that they are mid-stream right now in terms of putting the whole plan together with the consultants. He said that they just brought this issue up in discussion in terms of maybe they should do it. He asked if Minnesota has public art as part of public projects. Laesch responded that they have aesthetics as part of some of the new bridge projects. Noehre commented that they went through this when they were doing the Sorlie and Kennedy Bridge projects, where they have an enhancement policy they had to consider, and he is pretty sure that preventative maintenance projects will fall within the policy.

Haugen stated that this is why it is included in the project description, because it was brought up as an opportunity to enhance, or implement the City's Public Arts Initiative.

Williams asked then if it would be limited to new construction, so where would that enhancement fall so we don't muddle this and put it under the incorrect categories. Noehre responded that they will track down the policy and read it again, but he is confident that he recalls that there are no enhancement dollars authorized from them for preventive maintenance, but they made an exception on the Sorlie, a one-time exception, not an exception to the policy. Williams asked, then, if it would be appropriate to leave this remark in here or should it be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

moved to someplace else in the description, that this is what we are considering in future projects, would it be better to do something like that as she doesn't want this become a snag somewhere down the line, where someone looks at it and asks where is this element, and what is going on, and it gets hung up somewhere. Haugen responded that this is kind of the same as, it's a remark that says "may seek", it doesn't say "will" and it doesn't require it to happen, it is sort of bringing to the forefront that it is an initiative the City is asking for, it doesn't imply the funding source mechanism of it, it is not included in the cost of the project, it is just informing people of a potential request from the City. He added that there really isn't another place in the T.I.P. document to put it, if you want to take it out it is out, there isn't another place to put it in.

Haugen reported that in the course of adding this into the T.I.P. there were a series of questions that were asked of the NDDOT, and the last question asked was that the City is considering this Public Art Policy on projects, and the answer was, as he explained, that as project development continues on it, the answer isn't an automatic "no", it is we will see how it plays out with the project development process.

Haugen said that he was just trying to be informative that there is an effort that might add to the project as it currently is.

Haugen pointed out that it is noted in the staff report a public hearing is scheduled to occur at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday at noon, so whatever motion this body approves will be subject to further public comment.

MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE 2016-2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS AS PRESENTED, SUBJECT TO FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENT.

VOTING IN FAVOR: NOEHRE, ELLIS, GENGLER, CHRISTIANSON, LAESCH, KUHARENKO, BERGMAN, AND WEST

VOTING AGAINST: NONE

ABSENT: BOPPRE, JOHNSON, MAGNUSON, SANDERS, AND CRYSTAL.

MOTION CARRIED.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION FOR 2017-2020 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that we now start the next round of T.I.P. development. He pointed out that included in the packets is a copy of a power point that he would like to go over briefly.

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

Haugen commented that he would remind everyone that it isn't just City Limits that govern what goes into our T.I.P. document, but our study area as well. He stated that there are three basic types of projects: 1) Projects that involve a decision from FHWA or FTA; 2) Any federally funded (regardless of funding source) projects that impact transportation; and 3) Any regionally significant projects regardless of funding source.

Haugen reported that there are still some "unknowns". He explained that MAP-21 is still being implemented and is up for reauthorization at the end of the month. He said that performance measures are still unknown so what we do today, what we did yesterday, what we do tomorrow, what we do for the next few months are still subject to change.

Haugen pointed out that under year of expenditure it shows that federal revenue is 1.5% per year annual growth; North Dakota expenditure is 4% and Minnesota expenditure is 5%.

Haugen commented that for the individual programs; on the North Dakota side you will notice these slides show that Minnesota's and North Dakota's schedules are not always the same. He went over the project solicitation schedule for each program briefly.

Haugen stated that this is all, of course, assuming that there will be a MAP-21 Reauthorization at the end of the month, that there will be a federal program appropriated for next year, so we are doing our part to start the next T.I.P. cycle.

Laesch reported that he would like to say that if you are looking at a Safe Routes to School project, feel free to submit it to both the local TAP and the statewide solicitation. He said that, while it won't get funded by both sources, you will give yourselves the best opportunity to get some sort of funding by submitting to both. Haugen commented that if he remembers correctly, they are awarding one program first, and then will let the other program know what was awarded so they don't end up awarding the same project. Laesch agreed, adding that he thinks the statewide solicitation will be awarded first.

MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT

Viafara reported that for the last two month they have been advancing all of the activities pertaining to the elaboration of the Vital Metrics Dashboard for the MPO. He said that what they have been doing lately is to collect data, organizing it, doing the analyses, and, for the first time they are able to submit, for your consideration, this draft report that contains three sections.

Viafara referred to the document, and pointed out that the three sections include all the demographics, all the community indicators, and livability indicators as well as maps that indicate where the minority and low income populations are located within the planning area.

Viafara stated that, as he indicated, this is just a draft, and they are hoping for input on the document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

Viafara said that MPO staff is grateful for assistance from the Cities Area Transit staff, who provided not only data, but also guidance on the interpretation of some of the values you see in the report.

Viafara referred to slides of maps staff has been working on that show where the minority populations are located in Grand Forks, within the planning area; and also the location of the low income populations within the planning area.

Viafara summarized that they have, to-date, advanced in producing at least four areas of the completed work. He explained that for the livability area, they got the data from the AARP site, which is the largest livability data base for the United States, at least as a matter of information. He stated that the purpose of the areas that they are working on at the moment is just to provide the background from which all those later dates and objectives that are coming from MAP-21 will be analyzed, so the next time we submit something to this body for consideration will be an analysis of all the monitoring activities to illustrate MAP-21 objectives.

Haugen said he would like to make two comments: 1) The communities in the livability section that you see here, why they are here is because they are also the Transit Peer Communities in our transit region; and 2) The reason we are using the AARP data, as Jairo highlighted, is because there really isn't a great data base, national data base, that addresses the issue. He stated that they went to the federal transportation website and they referred us to the AARP data site.

Viafara commented that most of the consideration you will see in the complete report includes the comparison with those peer cities, and this tells us that we are not alone, and we can compare ourselves to one that more or less has the same demographics, size, and economic development traits will give us a better idea of where we stand at the moment.

Viafara reported that we are currently working on updating some of those tables and making them more readable, and more visible. He stated that the information is the same, but they are advancing on getting things ready for the final.

Williams said that she has a general question. She said that, going back to the AARP items, she went to the website and under "transportation" it says that we don't have any buses, we have no bus routes, we have nothing. She asked if we are going to go through and vet all this material that is in there, because she doesn't know, it said it came from the EPA Smart Location Data Base, but she doesn't know how you get into that data base so that we can report that we do have some of these because our score is artificially low. She stated that that was just the first item she looked at. Haugen responded that there are issues, yet it is the only national data base that sort of tries to report on livability, so if there are issues that we know of in our community, there are probably issues that the other communities have in this data base. He said that it is a data base, it does have issues, but it does give us some sense of relativity with where we are at versus our peers, so until there is a better national data base, and the feds are working on a better one.

Williams reported that she looked up the crash rates also from this, and it is for the entire County of Grand Forks, it is not for the Metropolitan area, so are we going to separate out metropolitan

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

stuff from the entire county, or what, and then the other one was, in this transportation group, was speed limits, as far as they went through and figured out the speed limits on the roads and this and that and everything else, but we have no control over that because the Century Code dictates how we do speed zones, and city; so she could go through and put 30 mph on every street but that isn't going change the operating characteristics of the street, so she isn't sure how some of these items that AARP is looking at, and quite frankly she thinks they have their own agenda on some of this stuff, but in any event she doesn't see how that is relevant, or a measure of anything like walkability or mobility or anything else, so her question is how are we going to check and make sure that the data is correct, and who is going to go through and figure out which one of these items are actually going to be used. Haugen responded that, we, as the MPO Partnership, will work out and figure out which one of these we will use. He explained that the MPO is tasked to reporting these performance measures, and livability is one of them, and this is the site the feds set us up for now as they work in implementing better data sets. He stated that one of the reasons why you don't see all those details of what they are reporting is because we understood there were issues with those details, and if we were going to try to correct it for Grand Forks we would be messaging the numbers for Grand Forks, but we wouldn't be able to relate them to other ones, so we just left it as they reported it, and reported it to you as they reported it. He said that it gives you some sense, based on their methodology, of where Grand Forks/East Grand Forks sit as communities with these other communities.

Kuharanko stated that if we are relying on information from AARP, which is then relying on information from EPA; in your executive summary you end up saying that the purpose of this, the objective of this is to provide critical and timely information, but if we are already removed from this so many steps, can we really provide timely data. Viafara responded that the information is for you, we are your assistants, the information is for you. He added that they have put in good information for your consideration, based on your criteria, which is a professional criteria that we highly regard and respect, you tell us what you really want in this area so that we can refine a project to include this area in the report, you tell us what to do and then we will go back to the drawing board.

Viafara commented that, if the livability seems to be very difficult for us to really follow through, we would follow up to see what EPA has, or what the Federal Highway Transportation has. He added that, as a matter of fact, the Federal Highway Transportation, in terms of livability, only have two items; one is how much is your transportation costing you in your particular area, we have that information, we can include it, but they don't have any more information, and most of the livability data bases we found are vendor sourced so, because of the commercial interest the costs and detail information are not ready to give it to you.

Williams asked if Mr. Viafara could forward, or send an e-mail out the maps that are included in this report because they aren't readable. She stated that she knows this is from the Long Range Transportation Plan, and she had the same problem with that report, but they are so small they aren't readable, they aren't full-page, they have been scaled down to fit onto the page so that makes them even smaller. Viafara responded that he will make them more readable and send them to her. Kuharenko commented that, just to follow up with Ms. Williams' request, he would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

ask that the graphs and the figures be enlarged as well as the descriptions, and the axes are very very difficult to read.

Williams asked if there was going to be a sub-committee to deal with this, or will it be run back through the whole committee. Haugen responded that it will be run back through the whole committee as it is fleshed out. He stated that it is still in draft form, it still has kinks in it, it still has some missing data that they are crunching out, but each month we give you an update of where we are. Viafara commented that, for instance, there is information from ATAC Traffic Analysis Tool that we have available that we will introduce later, once everything is more balanced out.

Haugen reported that some of the additional difficulty we have is due to the timeliness of the data. He explained that to have our information, we can have the most up-to-date information, but to use it as we are somewhat using it, as comparison to where we sit with peers and others, we don't have ready access to up-to-date data so we, like with the transit data, we are using 2013 data, when we are already half way into 2015 with the performance of our transit system, but we don't know what they are for the other transit systems.

Williams stated she has one more questions concerning the street and highway system. She said that we have traffic volumes, and you have one day from each year. Haugen responded that that is as far as they got with this information. Williams asked, then, if they were going to do like a month, like say the month of October and say "this whole month compared to another whole month" so that it will be based on... Haugen responded that they would. He explained that this is just giving you some idea of the types of graphs in the document, and the format that it will be coming out in.

Haugen reported that they also just received, partially, the 2015 traffic counts NDDOT did so they will have that information in addition to the camera captures that we have as well. Williams said that the problem she has with just doing just a single day, the one they have over there on Washington that the NDDOT is just continuous, that probably gives us a better idea, but if you just capture one day a year it's not really, all it takes is to have a crash at an intersection and people start driving different ways, and it can really effect the counts and that sort of thing, so a one day snapshot out of a year... Haugen agreed, and stated that they don't intend to leave it at just one day.

Viafara stated that staff is inviting this body to provide your comments by October 20th, in order for staff to start working on incorporating them into the next phase of the report.

Haugen commented that this is our first performance report, based on MAP-21, so we have a very steep learning curve to maneuver through. Viafara stated that part of doing this report is to document all the sources where the information is coming from, so they will also submit, for your consideration, the source book so that you can actually go to the source if you have any questions or want to see what else can be extracted from it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 14th, 2015**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2015 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen asked if this was available on the MPO website. McNelis responded that it is not yet available, but added that she will put it on following the meeting.

Haugen reported that the only big update is that Alliant Engineering was selected to do the 32nd Avenue Signal Coordination Update. He stated that they hope to get approval to enter into contract with Alliant at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday. He explained that there is a tight timeline, however Alliant feels that they will be able to get the work done by the end of the year, and possibly have new timing plans implemented by the first of December.

b. MnDOT PLANNING NEWS

Haugen reported that he did send everyone a lot of MnDOT Planning news earlier, and he would defer to Mr. Laesch for further information.

Laesch stated that MnDOT is updating their MnSHIP and their 20-Year Transportation Plan. He added that they will also be doing a number of outreach events, hopefully some will be held here in East Grand Forks, possibly piggy-backing onto some other public events to try to get input. He said that they will also be doing some surveys as well. Haugen commented that people can go to the minnesotago.org website and do a survey. He added that just this morning he sent out the Draft Bike Plan for comment as well.

c. MAP-21 UPDATE

Haugen reported that, just to let you know where MAP-21 is at in Congress, this morning the House Committee announced that next Thursday they will do a mark-up of the Reauthorization, but they still don't have funding identified, nor do they have a Speaker. He said that they most likely will just punt it down the road as they do have enough money in the trust fund to punt it down several months.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY WEST, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 14TH,
2015, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:30 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 10th, 2015, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Erickson (Proxy For Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Bobbi Retzlaff (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MnDOT-Office of Transportation System Management; and Becky Hanson (Proxy For Mike Johnson), NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference phone).

Guest(s) present were: Kim Greendahl, Grand Forks Greenway Specialist; and Josh Pearson, MnDOT-Office of Transportation System Management.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; David Wiosna; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, for the benefit of our guests here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that, because we have some members that need to leave early, if there are no objections he would like to address Agenda Items 6, 7, 8, and 9.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

MATTER OF ND FTA #5339 CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that North Dakota has solicited for projects for their #5339 funds, starting back in September, and we requested that all projects in the MPO area be submitted to us by November 1st. She stated that we received only one application from Cities Area Transit. Kouba pointed out that their first priority is vehicle replacement, and their second is an update for their maintenance software. She stated that staff has determined that there is no concern with the vehicle replacement request, however the software request isn't explicitly listed in our TDP, but it does fall under Preventative Maintenance Projects; but for it to be explicitly listed we would have to update our TDP.

Williams asked if this was asset management software. Bergman responded that it is not. He added that he isn't sure where people are getting the idea that it is an asset management software. He explained that it is vehicle maintenance software that is designed to keep track of vehicles, dollars being put into fuels, and things of that nature. He added that the City of Grand Forks has one right now that is called Fleet Mate, that cost \$5,000.00; and they got exactly what they paid for. He said that they cannot even keep inventory records properly and aren't able to keep track of fuels, in-fact the IT Department is working on trying to keep track of fuels and as of yesterday they are 20,000 gallons off – 15,000 on the diesel and 5,000 on gas.

Bergman explained that the program that they are looking at is one from RTA. He stated that they actually make another one called Faster, which is what the City of Fargo is using, but it is a lot more expensive, and is much more difficult to use. He said that the one we would like to purchase is about \$61,000; and will work with the current fueling system we have. He added that this is a recommended item from the fueling company.

Williams asked if there was an asset module that could be added to it. Bergman responded there is. He added that this also does building maintenance as well. He said that the FTA is requiring them to keep track of building maintenance and stuff we do with them, and this will fall in and work with what the DOT is doing with their asset management system as well, so we don't have to recreate the same reports that they are already doing.

Kouba reported that staff is recommending approval of the application in the priority order given.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CITIES AREA TRANSIT APPLICATION FOR FTA #5339 FUNDING, IN THE PRIORITY ORDER GIVEN.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Noehre, Ellis, Erickson, Retzlaff, Hanson, Williams (Voting for Kuharenko), and Hanson.

Voting No: None

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

Abstain: None
Absent: Boppre, Christianson, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Crystal.

MATTER OF DRAFT FINAL BYGLAND ROAD STUDY REPORT

Kouba reported that, basically this is the final document of our Bygland Road Study. She stated that there haven't been many changes from the original presentation of projects and recommendations for the study. She said that they did flesh out the document itself, and gave details on what exactly they did to come up with their recommendations, including public participation and looking at future traffic volumes that were happening in the area.

Kouba said that, basically, the only major thing that came up was how we were listing our near-term projects, they listed them all together from 2016 out to 2020; and from there on everything else is pretty much the same. She stated that the recommendation order is still the same, but there was some input from the State, as well, and through their comments they addressed those comments as well, so, other than that they are looking to adopt the plan.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL BYGLAND ROAD STUDY REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Noehre, Ellis, Erickson, Retzlaff, Hanson, Williams (Voting for Kuharenko), and Hanson.

Voting No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Boppre, Christianson, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Crystal.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE FY2016 UPWP

Haugen reported that this proposed amendment is just carrying over projects. He explained that when we contracted with consultants we had a schedule to carry them over to 2016, so in the document you will see either the addition of 2016, or an amendment with a new completion date. He added that the one unique one will be the Traffic Counting Program, and in-fact, on the next agenda item we will be approving Phase III-b of that program. He explained that the reason for Phase III-b being carried over into 2016 is because we had the Master Agreement renewed with ATAC and the other two MPOs and NDDOT, and the renewal happened in October so now we can do Phase III-b.

Haugen commented that right now we are just suggesting that it is just a program amendment to carry over these projects into the next year, however there is a possibility that our 2016 Work Program could have further amendments made to it, but this one is necessary now so that we have all the paperwork complete so that come January 1st there isn't any delay in these projects

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

that are currently under contract, and we don't have to stop them to do a formal amendment. He added that they are just time extensions to three studies that are currently underway.

Williams stated that she has a question on the Land Use Plans; she understands doing East Grand Forks because the date is so close, but do we need to also do Grand Forks as this time. She said that they talked about this this morning and they prefer, they would like to know how this is going to affect everything because if you are bumping it that means transportation is going to get bumped, and they want to know how it will affect the rest of the plan. Haugen responded that the East Grand Forks one is, again, just a time extension, there isn't any financial impact; and the way it was previously done was just as blanket Land Use Plans, so now by separating East Grand Forks out into its own date, it doesn't impact anything else, it just identifies that the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan will be now completed by March 31st instead of December 31st.

Williams pointed out, though that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan was to be completed by August 31st, that is what is on the update, and their concern, which they brought up at the very beginning of this process, is that things that come due during the fall of the year they don't have the staff available to review it because they are too busy doing the HSIP and all the other items at that time. Haugen commented that the November 30th date is the contractual end date of the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update. Williams asked, then, if they will still be getting the study to review in August. Haugen responded that you will get materials by the end of April, which is the current schedule, and then there is the re-election and transition of council, so June is a lost month, and so you will be getting a draft by the date he suggested and then after the first draft is digested there will be a formal preliminary draft the end of August for Planning Commission review, and then in October the final draft will be available for review, and November will be the closing date, so that is the process we had scheduled in the contract with WSB.

Williams asked how all of this affects the transportation part of the study. Haugen responded that it doesn't affect it. Williams asked if it moves any of those dates at all. Haugen responded it doesn't. Haugen pointed out that they have August 2016 as a completion date in the original, but it is now better reflected as November, it shifts it back a couple of months. Williams asked if they have to change the Grand Forks date this time, or can we do it next time once they have seen the timeline and everything. Haugen responded that this is the date in the contract, and it would be best to reflect what is in the contract now for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, AS PRESENTED.

Williams commented that she would still like to see a timeline on all of these, as far as how it is going to lay out because this is not what they looked at; and once again, if you are going to give them a final draft to look at in October, they don't have the necessary staff to go over all of this, and that is why they requested these things not come due during that period of the year, so she would still like to see, and she understands the need to move these on contractually, but she would still like to have a timeline of how this is all going to work out, when the due dates are,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

when their review dates are and how long they will have to review them, and that sort of thing. Haugen responded that that information was distributed to the Planning Commission last month, with those dates and when things will be presented as drafts. Williams asked if it was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded that it wasn't. Williams said that she is requesting that it is presented to the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded that he would send it out by the end of the day.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Noehre, Ellis, Erickson, Retzlaff, Hanson, Williams (Voting for Kuharenko), and Hanson.

Voting No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Boppre, Christianson, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Crystal.

MATTER OF DRAFT PHASE III-B OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTING STUDY

Haugen said that he already mentioned the Master Agreement was just renewed, and why Phase III was divided into two phases; because some work they could get work done under the old contract timeline, and now with the new Master Agreement in place they believe they now have the ability to address the 16 intersections and bring them into the counting program.

Haugen reported that this is pretty much the same scope-of-work setting up the intersections, etc., to get the video cameras to start doing the counting for us at these 16 additional intersections. He added that these should be the last intersections we will be bringing up-to-date in order to have Grand Forks completed, until they start adding more signalized intersections.

Williams commented that not all of these intersections currently have video, and they will not until some of these projects are done. She added that the June 30th, 2016 is flexible is it not. Haugen responded that it is. Williams stated that, just with the understanding that the consultants will not be able to do some of this until the cameras are installed. She asked if the contract is for a specific number of intersections. Haugen responded it is. Williams said, then, that they may need to swap out a couple of intersections because they do have some new intersections that were built after this was discussed.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD APPROVE THE SCEOP OF WORK FOR PHASE III-B OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTING STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Noehre, Ellis, Erickson, Retzlaff, Hanson, Williams (Voting for Kuharenko), and Hanson.

Voting No: None

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

Abstain: None

Absent: Boppre, Christianson, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Crystal.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 14TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER
14TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS
SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen asked if there was an update on the aesthetic lighting for the Sorlie Bridge. Yavarow responded that the aesthetic lighting is currently being put on the bridge, and should be completed in two weeks.

Haugen asked if there would be another ceremony to show the capabilities of the lighting once installed. Noehre responded that there may be an unofficial ceremony. Haugen said that they would wait for the announcement then. Noehre joked that it may be Kelly Green for a while, they might lose the key.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reminded the committee that last month they discussed the letter the MPO Executive Policy Board asked be sent regarding a separate bike/ped crossing, and the reply from MnDOT-District 2.

Haugen referred to MnDOT's response letter, and pointed out that if he interprets correctly, it states that the cross section we have seen on the Kennedy Bridge that includes the bike/ped accommodation is the cross section that will be implemented. He added that they do indicate that further assistance is available to the MPO as we try to locate that third bike/ped structure. He said that the MPO had thought that perhaps that there were savings of monies available, but the reply was that there is no savings, the money has been spent, and there isn't a pool of monies sitting somewhere waiting to be spent.

Williams asked if this item was put on by the Technical Advisory Committee or the MPO Executive Policy Board. Haugen responded that it was put on by the MPO Executive Policy Board. Williams said that she thinks we have reached a point where, unless there is something significant, it can be removed. Haugen commented that he does believe that at the MPO

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

Executive Policy Board meeting, either Mr. Laesch, or another MnDOT staff person will be presenting this to the Board, so there will probably be a lot more discussion at that level.

**MATTER OF MNDOT UPDATE ON MINNESOTA STATEWIDE MULTIMODAL
PLAN AND STATEWIDE HIGHWAY INVESTMENT PLAN**

Haugen introduced Bobbi Retzlaff and Josh Pearson, MnDOT, who are here today to give a brief presentation on MnDOT's Update of their Minnesota Statewide Multimodal Plan. He explained that, included in the packet was a one page sheet on both of these documents, plus you are invited to visit their website: www.minnesotago.org

Retzlaff reported that she is part of the team that is working on updating their Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan, so today she is going to give a brief overview of that plan, and then following her, Josh Pearson will give a brief overview of the Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan Update.

Retzlaff distributed handouts, and reported that she has a brief slide presentation she would like to give today. She explained that they are going around the State of Minnesota right now, and are updating two of MnDOT's bigger statewide plans. She explained that they want to get a wide variety of input to help them to determine what the priority should be as they update these plans.

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

Pearson reported that in conjunction with the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan they are also updating the Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan, again, with a completion date of January 2017. He explained that he will briefly touch on why they are here, and to talk about MNSHIP and what it is and what the process is they are going through to update this plan. He added that he will also talk about their investment categories for this plan, and the different ways they are investing their dollars in their State Highway System.

Pearson explained that they would like to get input via a worksheet he is passing out, to determine what your priorities are for the State Highway System, and how you would like to see dollars invested in that system.

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

Haugen asked if the \$16 billion dollar gap is after everything shown here is factored in, or is it in addition to the \$16 billion dollars. Pearson responded that the numbers for each investment category and their needs are inflated, so they are one-to-one, and the gap is not on top, it is accounting for the inflation as they move forward so that when they show their second twenty-years, on average things will cost more than the first ten years, so it accounts for that.

Haugen stated that as part of the participation yesterday, you show \$4 billion that is debt repayment of your revenue, so really you have only \$16 billion on revenue for addressing these asset things. Pearson responded that when they were showing the \$16.6 billion, they are holding

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

the S.T.I.P. harmless so there is about \$3.2 billion in the S.T.I.P. that is already programmed for projects, so the \$16 billion is actually the 16 years outside of the S.T.I.P. that they have an adjustment on. He added that that service is actually taken out before they determine their revenue, so that has already been taken out before they get to the 20 billion number.

Pearson distributed copies of the approach folios for discussion, and also a worksheet he would ask that everyone fill out and return at the end of today's meeting.

Presentation continued.

Pearson summarized by explaining that with the input they hope to receive from the public, they will work on setting their investment direction for Minnesota State Highways, and then once they have the plan adopted in January 2017, they will work towards implementing the plan. He added that this will include starting to draft an updated Capital Highway Investments Plan, which is a ten-year project selection process, and to see what changes may need to happen with the investment direction and how they select projects.

Pearson commented that you can keep in touch with this project as it moves forward, and see how other groups are selecting scenarios on which things they are prioritizing. He said that they will be updating the website – www.minnesotago.org with this information. He added that on the website you can also request a presentation of this information with the SMTP and MnSHIP if you have other groups that would like to hear this, and then also follow them with social media and e-mail updates as well.

Haugen asked, in the current Highway Investment Plan, which shows the first ten years, and then there are the latter ten years, those scenarios are they supposed to cover all twenty years, or do you envision having a ten year/ten year split. Pearson responded that it covers all twenty years for discussion of their public outreach. He added, though, that this could potentially be on the table again as they are discussing their investment direction, but that is something that they will determine once they see what requirements they need to meet, and how their different stakeholders feel they should be meeting, certain requirements. He stated then, that while it isn't off the table, right now they are looking at the full twenty years of the investment direction.

Pearson reported that also with MnSHIP they also have, similar to the worksheet, an on-line version through their Metro Quest Survey, so if there are other people in your organizations that would like to comment, they can complete the same questions we are asking here, just on-line, and provide their input that way.

MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT

Viafara reported that this is a new version of what you have seen before. He explained that he would like to thank everyone for their comments, most of which were regarding the issue of livability. He stated that because of these comments they went back and improved on the explanations on metrics and the policies related to livability, so you may have seen kind of different take on livability.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

Viafara stated that in cooperation with Cities Area Transit staff they also expanded on the metrics and policies related to transit, and they have the ability to improve on the discourse currently being experienced with transit.

Viafara said that in cooperation with the NDDOT and with Minnesota Public Safety, they attained the data for them to basically do the crash analyses, which they have done, and for the next report you will see the locations where the majority of the crashes are occurring, and those are related to the tables that are being shown in the report and the numbers that they obtained from those two DOTs.

Viafara stated that they will review all of the building permits for East Grand Forks and Grand Forks to address some of the policy concerns that were coming from the livability tables. He said that one of them is the need to accommodate manufactured homes, and the other is to improve on what multi-family buildings.

Viafara commented that they analyzed five years of average annual daily traffic on a number of intersections to determine their volumes; these intersections are listed in the report. He said that there is a map included as well that tells us how intersections, in terms of traffic volumes, have been behaving the last five years. He explained that the purpose was to locate areas where there could be the perception of congestion, and how it is managed.

Viafara stated that MPO staff produced the pavement review, and some of the numbers are included in the report. He added that staff also reviewed the roadway classification for the planning area for 2015.

Viafara reported that, with all of this in mind, the report is more or less 70% to 80% completed, and staff is working on finalizing the sections that are indicated in the Table of Contents as “coming next”, so we are expecting that by the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting you will have a more finalized document for review. He asked that if anyone has any further comments or questions, please submit them by November 20th so that they can be incorporated quickly and we can continue to advance the report.

Williams said that she has the same comments she did at the last meeting; that the font used for the report is too small for her to read; and the graphs are so small she can't even see what some of the information shown is at all. Viafara stated that he will produce a version with a more readable font for Ms. Williams to look at, then, based on her opinion, he may reformat the entire document using that font.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2015 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly activity report was available on the website, and everything is underway and some things will start ending now as we are getting to the end of the year. He said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 10th, 2015**

that the 32nd Avenue Plan contract was authorized at the last MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, and Alliant is already analyzing the conditions of 32nd Avenue.

b. Reauthorization Bill

Haugen reported that both chambers passed a Reauthorization Bill, which should be going to the conference committee. He explained that the Senate side only funds three years, while the House side funds all six years of its House Bill. He added that only five years of the Senate's bill are funded with the House funding revenue, so we may have a five year bill, a six year bill, or a three year bill, and we could conceivably even have a two year bill just to get it past the election.

ADJOURNMENT

***HAUGEN ADJOURNED THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE AT 3:05 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 9th, 2015, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Mike Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck.

Guest(s) present were: Mike Bittner, KLJ and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Jay Sandeen, GF/EGF MPO Intern; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that the aesthetic lighting has now been installed, and showed a photo illustrating what the bridge looks like when the lights are on. Lang added that they are doing

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

something else with lights today. Haugen asked if they are testing the colors. Yavarow responded that they are adjusting the walkway lighting.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the 106 Report was submitted and reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on the Grand Forks side. He pointed out that copies of the draft minutes, and the motion made by the Commission regarding the 106 Report were included in the packet.

Haugen stated that MnDOT did not attend the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting as was expected, however they are scheduled to attend the January 2016 MPO Executive Policy Board meeting to discuss the additional bike/ped issue.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that a copy of a power point presentation was included. He referred to the presentation and went over the information briefly, pointing out that this T.I.P. covers the years 2017 through 2020.

Haugen commented that this recaps our responsibilities to make sure projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and to prioritize the projects within the program. He said that there are two study areas to be aware of; the MPO Study Area (shown in brown) and the Federal Aid Adjusted Urbanized Area (shown in gray). Haugen explained that certain programs only apply to the Federal Urban Aid area, however for the T.I.P. purposes any project receiving federal funds on the transportation system, whether in the gray or the brown areas need to be included in the T.I.P.

Haugen stated that this is a twelve month process; which we normally start it in early September, ending in August, and then starting again, with stops in-between, but as many of you are aware there is a new Authorization Bill called "FAST" that has some new twists and turns that aren't accounted for in this solicitation, and since it covers the years that are being programmed, what we are doing is subject to change, however there is still a strong emphasis on state of good repairs, and a strong emphasis of the National Highway System, and there are some new programs that FAST is funding now that weren't sourced in the report.

Haugen commented that there is also some difference in the revenue. He explained that they haven't quite adjusted it to see if there is a need, so this solicitation is maintaining the previous 1.2% per year revenue growth rate; and on the North Dakota side there is a 4% per year expenditure growth rate as well.

Haugen referred to the presentation and briefly went over the projects up for discussion. He pointed out that Recreational Trails, however, is due at the end of December; adding that this year it was delayed a month, but last year it was all done at the same time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Kuharenko commented that he doesn't remember seeing a solicitation for the Recreation Trails projects. He asked what the program includes, what is the cost split on it. Haugen responded that the solicitation is formally done by the North Dakota Game and Parks, and has a standard 80/20 cost split. He added that the use is for similar trails to what the TAP program will fund. Williams asked if they had a target project cost range or is it just wide open. Haugen responded that he believes that there is no minimum.

Haugen explained that the Recreational Trail Program doesn't follow the exact same requirements, from a Federal Highway perspective, for project development, etc., as the TAP Program so some of the paper work isn't quite as onerous, but he would defer you to the Park and Rec website for additional information.

Haugen stated that there is a committee that reviews the applications just like the TAP committee, and then gives a recommendation as to what to award. He added that it is his understanding that they might also be funding some motorized vehicle trails out of the Recreation Trails Program. Johnson responded that he believes that is an eligible item in Rec Trails that is different from the TAP program. He added that the City should have been informed of all of this. Williams asked if this program is for new construction or is it for rehabilitation of existing construction, or did they specify. Haugen responded that he thinks it is for both.

Haugen reported that the first program is the TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program) Program, adding that it actually isn't called this under "FAST", it is now not named and instead is a set-aside of the Surface Transportation Program, but it follows almost everything that the MAP-21 TAP did.

Haugen stated that this solicitation was already underway, but one of the changes that "FAST" did was to allow non-profit organizations to apply again. He explained that under SAFETEA-LU, particularly with the Safe Routes To School Program, non-profits were able to apply directly for those, and "FAST" reopens that door, so that will be a twist coming in the future, but since this was already done, he is sure they won't go back and implement this now.

Williams asked if the TAP Program requires City Participation, or is it 100% federal funding; the one that is being opened up under "FAST". Haugen responded that it is an 80/20 basic split, so someone has to come up with the 20%. Williams said, then, that if the school district applies for something it would be the school district that would have to come up with the match. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko asked of the non-profit entities need to go through their respective city or directly to the MPO. Haugen responded that that is yet to be determined.

Haugen commented that, going back to the Recreational Trails Program, the Rec Trails can be eliminated and all the funds can be rolled into the TAP Program, or now the set-aside, so annually the State of North Dakota can make a determination of what they want to do with these funds, although they have always offered to set-aside the Rec Trail Program as a separate Program, but it can be all rolled together.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Haugen referred to a slide and stated that they did receive one application, from the City of Grand Forks, and it was for a shared use path along North 55th Street between University and DeMers Avenue. He explained that it is shown in solid red on the slide, and that it ties into the existing trail system, and is planned to be constructed next summer, at a total estimated cost of \$262,000, with \$204,000 being federally funded.

Haugen commented that there were three HSIP projects submitted by the City of Grand Forks, with priority ranking as follows: 1) Non-regional signalized intersection installation of back-plates with retro-reflective borders at a total cost of \$87,000, with \$78,300 being federally funded; 2) Columbia Road Corridor leading pedestrian timing at a total cost of \$38,000, with \$37,700 being federally funded; and 3) 42nd Street Corridor leading pedestrian timing at a total cost of \$22,000, with \$19,800 being federally funded.

Haugen stated that these projects come under the Local Safety Road Program, primarily; and in that they went through and identified that red light running is a priority. He said that in the document itself, confirmation lights was the priority solution, but the City is applying for an alternative solution to that, and that is back-plates with reflective tape, which is a Federal Highway proven safety counter measure.

Haugen reported that these three HSIP projects are addressing the priority items, it is just that the first priority is using a different solution than what is identified in the Local Road Safety Program. He added that it isn't a replacement, as he understands the plan is to do these plates, and then at a later time possibly do the confirmation lights. Williams commented that the City of Grand Forks' submittal last year had the confirmation lights on Gateway, and that was based on when installed the police would see how effective they were before doing additional ones, so that we don't spend money on something that isn't effective for our particular area. Haugen asked if confirmation lights are not now part of the standard traffic signal installation since he sees it on the newest lights being installed. Williams confirmed that they are installing them on the new traffic signals.

Haugen reported that for the Urban Road Program there is one change; switching out the location of a traffic signal, with no cost change in 2017.

Haugen commented that on the Regional side there are a couple of changes, adding things that previously weren't identified. He stated that the first are adding traffic signals at two new locations, Gateway Drive and North 55th Street and DeMers and West Columbia Ramp or 30th Street.

Haugen stated that also in 2017 the District is submitting ramp detection for two northbound off ramps, one at 32nd and one at Gateway.

Johnson referred to the DeMers and West Columbia Ramp or 30th Street project and asked if the intent of that project would be to do a study on both intersections to see which one is the better fit, or how is that decision going to be made. Grasser responded that they may end up trying to do some of that internally. He explained that City Staff had a discussion with Mr. Noehre about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

how they determine which location is best, and some of that may depend on an updated Master Plan being done by Altru, and it is unclear how 30th Street will figure in that plan, so that is a task to do in a very short window.

Haugen reported that the New T.I.P. Year is 2020, and the project that the City is forwarding is a project that they submitted last year, but that was not funded in 2019, and that is the Mill and Overlay of University Avenue between State Street and North 3rd Street. He added that the cost was adjusted for the year of expenditure increases.

Haugen commented that on the Regional side, it seems like every plus one year of our T.I.P. solicitation has the Washington Street Underpass project, and has for the last several years, so maybe this time, as it is the end of the year in the cycle, we will get the \$18,000,000 to finally rebuild the underpass. He stated that in addition to that work there is some pavement work going on on North Washington, north of the underpass area as well.

Haugen said that the staff recommendation is to approve that all candidate projects be forwarded as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and in the priority order provided.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2017-2020 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Ellis, Gengler, Kuharenko, Lang, Johnson, Bergman, and West.

Voting No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Boppre, Christianson, Magnuson, Sanders, Laesch, and Crystal.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON 32ND AVENUE SIGNAL COORDINATION STUDY

Haugen commented that Mike Anderson, Alliant, was planning on attending today's meeting, however, he is currently in the field making sure all the timing plans are in each and every cabinet along 32nd Avenue, so he is not able to be here to give a presentation.

Haugen reported that there will be an open house tonight at the Holiday Inn Express starting at 5:30 p.m. He said that what he is presenting is what will be on the boards that will be available for the public at tonight's open house.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen commented that, if you drove the corridor this week you will have noticed Dynamic Message signs announcing that the Signal Timing Plan Update will be occurring this week, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

hopefully by the end of the week it will have been fine-tuned and are working as we hope and expect them to.

Haugen stated that, just to give a recap, the corridor is 32nd Avenue. He pointed out which signals we have Alliant under contract to work on. He explained that Alliant is under contract by the City of Grand Forks to do some work on the Columbia Road Corridor as well, so it has been beneficial to have the same consultant updating the timing plans at the same time.

Haugen reported that with the video detection count program we instituted about a year ago we are able to capture significant traffic flow data. He referred to two graphs, and explained that what the timing plans are trying to accommodate are the 85th percentile, and then the second one shows the day of the week. He added that, basically the one year period that we were able to capture counts at most of these intersections, this shows what the daily traffic flow is like, and again we are trying to meet the needs of 85% of that volume.

Haugen referred to a graph illustrating the existing level of service analysis, and pointed out that the top row is prior to the new timing plan, the bottom row is after the timing plan was implemented.

Haugen summarized that these are the timing plans that have been developed, and their corresponding time. He added that, again, it is utilizing that weekday 85% profile.

Haugen referred to a chart and commented that it shows the work being done on Columbia Road as well; that is what the call-out boxes are doing, showing the green time splits for the different timing plans.

Haugen stated that this is a summary. He added that they worked on 32nd Avenue, this will be the fourth time; the first was in 2008, and we got 25% and 29% travel time improvement because it was the first one done, and each subsequent time we did this we have been able to get additional benefits, but it has not been to the extent we got with the first one, so this time around we are expecting to get about a 5% improvement in travel time during the morning rush and 13% during the evening rush.

Haugen reported that the benefit/cost ratio is still quite significant. He explained that it was a little more costly in 2008 because we didn't have proper equipment in a lot of the traffic signals, so this time, even though the benefits might be reduced a bit, the cost is reduced considerably as well, so in 2008 we got a 31/1 ratio and in 2015 we are still at a 29/1 ratio, so it is still a very low cost/high benefit solution to improve traffic along the corridor.

Grasser asked if, when you do the benefit ratio, are the calculations included in the appendix someplace in the report. Haugen responded they are included in the report. He added that it involves a number of stops, the time delay, and also some of the environmental benefits such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions, primarily.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the scope of work also identified some of the future improvements that could be done along the corridor to help traffic flow better, as well as some safety improvements. He pointed out that a lot of them have been identified previously, such as adding dual left turn lanes at Columbia Road and 32nd Avenue for the northbound/westbound turning movements and the westbound/southbound turning movements. He stated that a lot of these intersections need to have their left turn bays lengthened and they also need to have them realigned to allow better sight distance for opposing traffic. He said that the one new one is video detection for backage of traffic on the ramp, and if that video detection does detect there is a queue occurring on the off-ramp it switches the timing to dump all of that ramp traffic as a priority to prevent the I-29 through traffic being impeded by off-ramp traffic, and that is something that wasn't identified, that he is aware of, in any other document.

Haugen reported that Mike Anderson, Alliant, is in the field today installing, and will be in the field the next several days adjusting and fine tuning the timing plans, as the traffic flow requires so we aren't just getting what a computer model simulates traffic to be, it will be in response to real traffic by the time he is done this week. He added that Mr. Anderson will be back up next week to report to the Service Safety Committee on Tuesday, and to the MPO Executive Policy Board on Friday.

Williams asked when the final comments are needed on the Study. Haugen responded that they would like them sooner than later. Williams asked if next Friday would be sufficient. Haugen responded that would be fine.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING MITIGATION STUDY

Haugen reported that they did have an open house on November 17th. He stated that prior to the open house the Steering Committee met as well, and included in the packet are the summary of minutes from those meetings.

Haugen gave a brief overview of an experience he has had, several times in-fact, with train traffic on the Glasston Subdivision, specifically how far back traffic is backed up behind the I-29 Bridges. He added, however, that you will see that the dual left turn lanes are kept open, so it is nice that U.S. #2 traffic isn't completely clogging up the area so people that want to go west bound are able to do so fairly smoothly.

Haugen commented that the information they shared with the public at the open house initiated a lot of comments on the trains only happening at the P.M. Peak time; so, again, utilizing the preempt data from the signals, you will see that the majority of the time the signals are being preempted during non-peak traffic time.

Haugen stated that the only other big pieces of information that this body has not previously seen is; for Gateway Drive it seems like the only viable alternative is to do a grade separation the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

railroad from Gateway Drive, and then because the most likely way to go down we would also drop down 42nd Street as well, so both Gateway Drive and 42nd Street would be depressed to go underneath the railroad. He added that the cost of this is in the \$25,000,000 range.

Haugen commented that as part of the recommended, or suggested improvements the University of North Dakota really wanted to see fencing along both sides of the railroad, between the mainline and 6th Avenue North. Williams stated that in the past BNSF has said they don't want fencing along the railroad because they are afraid their workers could get trapped, so has the policy or practice changed. Haugen responded that that is still their preference, but we faced that with the multi-use trail that was built many years ago to the downtown, it has a fence along one side of it. Kuharenko added that the area of 6th Avenue North and down by the University, isn't there already existing fencing on the east side of the tracks separating the properties that are there. Haugen responded that there could be.

West asked what the reason was for eliminating the option of having the railroad going over U.S. 2. Haugen responded that he doesn't think there is sufficient distance for the grade to get them up because they have to go higher, thus the distance between the ground and the bottom of the bridge height is higher than it is to go down into the ground. He added that there is a 28-foot separation between for the trains to go over the top, and an underpass is 22-feet, so you have less distance to grade that out to back that out of. Johnson explained that if U.S. 2 goes under the railroad you only need 16 ½ foot clearance, if you go over a railroad they want it high enough so that they can double up the unit trains so you have to go to that 23 foot mark. West commented that he was thinking of taking the railroad tracks up and over and leaving U.S. 2 alone. Johnson responded that that would be probably even worse, because they can't have such a sharp curve.

Grasser asked if cost estimates could be broken down and included in the appendix of these reports, so a person can see a little more detail. Haugen responded that that detail is in the report itself, in the 100-page document that was distributed to the Steering Committee when they met on November 17th. He stated that in that document there was a detailed cost estimate, and they went over it at the committee meeting, to some extent. Grasser said, then that that information will be included in the final product. Haugen responded it would. He added that, as part of the work, Olsson Associates were to do a benefit/cost, to replicate what it would be like if they were to apply for a TIGER Grant, so they included the criteria you would need to submit for a TIGER Grant to show benefit/cost, and their analysis showed that the estimate would be a 1.1/1 ratio benefit cost for the two improvements, primarily that you see here, the fencing cost plus the grade separation cost. He said that the benefits would also be assigned to the assumption that the North Dakota Mill will build its grain unloading facility and allow the daily train traffic off the Mill Spur to be relocated, so the cost includes those three elements.

Williams said that the 43rd Intersection is not the same configuration that was in the Highway 2 Access Study, so she is wondering if there a note or something in there that explains this difference. Haugen responded that there is, adding that this document will be revised to reflect what is in the U.S. 2 Study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

West asked how the business at the corner access 42nd, then if they are restricted at 43rd. Haugen responded that it will be shifted over, as shown in the U.S. 2 study there will be a right-in/right-out, and they will still have access from further north. West said then, that the gas station and McDonalds will be right-in/right-out only, they wouldn't any sort of other access unless they cut through the parking lot. Haugen responded that under this concept that would be correct. He added that someone at the public meeting pointed out another way to access back to those properties if people need to come off 42nd Street, to get access to those other businesses. Haugen added that, even though the U.S. 2 Study didn't show a need to buy-out McDonalds, it could still be a possibility that that may need to occur.

Haugen commented that if the Mill Spur was abandoned, the study identified that a potential use would be a linear trail system. He said that there is, on the Mill Spur, basically north of 8th Avenue North, parallel to Washington Street, a lot of property, and that is where this concept was coming from. He stated that south of 8th Avenue it is more of an alley, with properties on either side of it, so there might be a different use potential.

Haugen said that this is a railroad right-of-way so it could either be land-banked, which means that the railroad reserves the right to reuse it as a railroad in the future if they so wish, or it could be purchased from the railroad for other purposes. He stated that he told the committee that Crookston just recently purchased railroad right-of-way along County Road 9, which runs past the MnDOT office. He explained that the City of Crookston got some TAP monies that they are using to build a multi-use trail on top of the former railroad, and they purchased the property from BNSF.

Williams commented that in November there was an article in the paper that stated that BNSF said they were not going to give that right-of-way up, that they weren't going to abandon it. She asked if that has changed. Haugen responded that there have been comments made by BNSF officials favoring abandoning it, but there have also been comments made by them saying they should hold on to it, so no decision has been made at this time.

Grasser asked if the report is going to identify the costs of removal and/or land banking and/or purchase, of those alternatives. Haugen responded that there is cost for removal of the track and for the installation of the trail, but he isn't sure about the cost of the land bank verses purchase. Grasser asked if that would be in a table someplace so you can actually pick those numbers out. Haugen responded it would. He added that, obviously there would be more cost if you purchase the property, he isn't sure about the cost if you just do land banking.

Haugen reported that the status of the North Dakota State Mill, and their negotiations with BNSF, are still unknown as he hasn't talked with the Mill since prior to the Thanksgiving Holiday, but they are still negotiating the rates to bring in a unit train to unload grain. He said that perhaps they are marginally closer than they were when we started this process, but it doesn't appear that anytime soon they will be building an unloading facility to assist them, however they are expanding and that construction is taking place, with a 30% increase in capacity. He added that now there will be a delay between when they start their 30% additional operation with the grain unloading facility being built, that the Mill Spur will have more cars

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

attached to two trains a day that are going on it; one up and one down a day, so the delay on the Mill Spur crossings will be greater than it currently is, and it will probably be a year before they can get the unloading facility on line, so traffic will be impacted for a minimum of a year time.

Grasser commented that at the last meeting we talked about having the consultants take another look at maybe doing pedestrian crossings at University Avenue and 42nd Street, for, if nothing else, to validate challenges. Haugen responded that the consultants are doing that work. He said that a follow-up from UND pointed out that they do have their sky-way in place, and that they wouldn't mind seeing more use of their sky-way system so they sort of sent a message that they already have a facility in place, so there probably isn't a great need, in their perspective, to try to build another, or to see if another fits to the north side or south side of the intersection of University Avenue and 42nd. He added that they are also still going to conceptualize something, and determine if it is feasible, but he just wanted to let you know that UND has said that they already have something in place that should be used. Grasser responded, however, that in his opinion we know that when those delays occur, there will be someone coming to the City asking what we are going to do about it, and he would rather be able to define what we can or can't do about it, with this comprehensive study; or we say UND is opening their skyway to the public and whoever wants to use it to cross can, but he has a little trouble envisioning that. Haugen said that that is what we will try to work out by the end of the study.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION STUDY

Haugen stated that Mike Bittner, the project manager on the I-29 Traffic Operation Study is here today. He said that Mr. Bittner met with the Steering Committee met last Wednesday and had a much longer discussion on the status of the study, however Mr. Bittner has shortened and put together a more concise version to go over a few key points.

Bittner reported that they had their first meeting, just to identify the issues that we see today, and to kind of do a literature view as well, as there has been a lot of the planning done along the I-29 Corridor, and they wanted to use that to improve and identify the issues we are going to see as they move along with this project.

Bittner referred to a power point slide presentation, explaining that the first step in the study is existing conditions, and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Bittner stated that, just to give you an idea of what their scope is for the project; they have Mainline I-29, from County Road 11 to County Road 6 (Merrifield Road); then on the Cross-streets they have our ramp intersections, that are two large intersections (an example would be U.S. 2 with a ramp to the east to 42nd Street and to the west to 48th Street, which are the two truck stops).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Bittner commented that as they looked at crashes, they had about 90 crashes per year, specifically isolating main-line crashes, 29% were on main-line, but the majority of them were single vehicle crashes, weather related, or speeding related, so as they look at future conditions, congestion will increase, speeding will decrease, and weather is one of those hard to engineer problems but they will look at it as they move forward as well.

Bittner stated that infrastructure is in good condition, and they also looked at pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. He said that there is an almost two mile gap from University south to 32nd, adding that DeMers will fill it in a little bit, but there is industrial to the west so we need that connectivity.

Bittner reported that they looked at County Road 11, which is an extension of North Washington Street; and, just to focus on the key issues here, really the design is dictated by the fact that we have the railroad line, the Glasston line, and we are on the curve of I-29, so we have some unique skewing of intersections, with a very unique one at 54th Avenue/Glasston/County Road 18. He said that there are also a lot of access points in this section, so they will try to reduce that as part of the project, and then they will look at just operational issues like turn lanes and traffic control.

Bittner stated that for Gateway Drive and U.S. #2, they don't really get deep into this in the corridor study, but they don't want to throw that analysis away, but they are looking at a lot of new traffic forecasting scenarios, so they are going to make sure this still is the best solution moving forward as they see a lot of great opportunity linking planning to NEPA on this particular project because maybe they can kick this out the door, and maybe have a project that is connected with this corridor study if there is funding available in the next five years or so.

Bittner commented that there is also a variety of other issues, and most of them they talked about them during the corridor study so he isn't going to dive into them right now. Grasser asked, if they do an improvement, will it compliment or conflict with the potential grade separated crossing there. Bittner responded that they want to consider that, so they have actually looked at it with and without in the future because at \$25 or \$28 million dollars for that improvement, will it be built in the next twenty-five years, they have their questions, so they will look at both but he does see some potential issues, why are they worried about McDonalds, why do they fit this loop in there if McDonalds won't have access with the combination of the underpass and access control, because there are a lot of safety and operational issues at 43rd, so they will be asking some of those more difficult questions. Grasser commented that that is probably a death knoll from a fast food owner perspective, but it doesn't mean they will sell it cheap.

Bittner summarized that he thinks, as we look at this alternative, they will need some refinements, certainly, as you include that underpass as one of the problems, and it does show major issues to the interstate main-line, so they do want to consider it. Grasser agreed, adding that, if nothing else, under the design we should figure out how to retain as much as we can that can serve both configurations.

Bittner stated that DeMers Avenue is a very unique interchange in the fact that it has a lot of different types of traffic using it; you have major industrial to the west, the Alerus Center and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

UND to the east, you have not just daily traffic but also event traffic, you have train traffic at 42nd and DeMers, so you see a lot of uniqueness to this interchange, unlike U.S. #2 which you can kind of predict day to day what is going to happen other than when a train event occurs. He said that because of this uniqueness they are going to look at a lot of different factors as they look at alternatives. He added that they have had discussions on how they incorporate event traffic, but they aren't quite sure to what level of extent they will look at it at this point, or what level of discussion they will have, and also incorporating, similar to U.S. #2s 42nd/DeMers Overpass, and looking at it with and without, depending on the funding scenarios, to see how it impacts the interchange.

Grasser commented that something they should be aware of, although he isn't sure how terribly official it is yet, but recent discussion with BN regarding the bike path on the north side of DeMers weren't particularly encouraging; and in a nutshell they said that we have to show that nothing else works before they'll consider anything, but, again, how do they define that, so in his mind we are maybe 50/50 on whether we will be on the north side or the south side of DeMers right now. He said that they are going to take a good hard look at both alternatives in their concept report, but the north side isn't a slam dunk, so in the back of your mind he doesn't know how that might impact, obviously pedestrians to the ramps, it might change things. Bittner asked if there is anything they can do in the corridor study to help facilitate that issue. He said that clearly you have one option where they aren't going to have these free flow movements onto the ramp, no conflicts; and on the other side you are going to have all four of your ramps conflicting with your pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and obviously from everyone in this room's standpoint that is probably bad. Grasser commented that, probably from anyone but BNSF that would be a clear sign that nothing else works, and thank you for the offer. He added that Mr. Kuharenko is heading this up and if they run into some things they will be in contact.

Bittner said that the next step is 17th Avenue, and this has been discussed time and again as an overpass. He commented that in the most recent Long Range Transportation Plan they found that it wouldn't have as great of a benefit as previously thought, and that is mostly because the land use has really shifted south to 32nd and 47th areas, so they are going to reanalyze to see if we need this, when do we need this, is it within our twenty-five year horizon or exactly what is the purpose, do we still hold the land for that 17th Avenue Overpass.

Bittner commented that 32nd Avenue is where we see a tremendous amount of growth. He stated that they evaluated the travel demand model, and they found that within one mile of 32nd Avenue 50% of your household growth, and 50% of your employment growth has occurred, so we see a tremendous amount of congestion and new traffic at this interchange by 2040, which creates a lot of new problems, and leads to the question of whether we can fix 32nd or do we have to add new infrastructure to relieve the problems. He added that they will start to delve into what improvements could be looked at, specifically with the interchange; or whether an additional connect to 42nd Street is still something that we want to look at or discuss as they get to the alternatives.

Bittner stated that in drilling down into a micro-level of detail we have not just operations, but we also have some safety issues along the corridor such as negatively off-set left turn lanes that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

are creating a lot of problems at 38th, as well as some other safety issues at the ramps that they are going to try to resolve as they move through this project.

Bittner reported that really one of the biggest questions here is 47th Avenue. He said that one question they get a lot is, what is the cost for 32nd versus 47th, and as part of their project they are going to look at benefit/cost analysis of all of their different infrastructure improvements, so that to justify a 47th Avenue Interchange, which has been discussed a lot in previous Long Range Transportation Plans, do they have that to show that it will work, as well as any other alternatives, 17th Avenue for example, but as they look at 47th they aren't just going to determine if it is needed, but they are also going to determine what it will look like. He stated that there has been a lot of discussion about whether we need a one-mile spacing, and they did have some resolution at their meeting last Thursday with the DOT, in that if you look at one-mile spacing you start to run into issues with the school, golf course, and park; or how would that look if it was on 47th, or just slightly south, what impacts the campground, so they are going to answer all those detailed questions of, if, and then how, what this would look in the future, and so the previous study that Cindy working on completing found that there is about a 40% reduction in traffic from 32nd to 47th, so they are going to reanalyze that with their new traffic forecast to justify that data.

Bittner stated that the last location is Merrifield Road, County Road 6. He explained that this location has been discussed several times about an interchange here, and really this revolves around whether or not we are going to have a southside by-pass, so they had discussion at their meeting, can this exist without a by-pass, as just an interchange, it isn't anything they will answer with their study, as they move forward.

Bittner commented that they also had a discussion as to how realistic a by-pass is, you have \$9 million dollars to do an interchange, and then you have to improve all the roads that would be the by-pass, and you have \$20+ million dollars for a river crossing, and then they counted up the truck traffic and it was less than 2,000 crossing any of the bridges, so this was met with skepticism from the group, but at the same time it is something, sometimes these studies are just as valuable proving something won't work as it is that it will work, so they will go through the analysis to determine if it will work or won't work, and can it operate as an interchange without it having to be a by-pass, will trucks still use it.

Bittner stated that this wraps up their existing portion of the study, and added that their next step is working with Mr. Haugen and ATAC to develop traffic projections. He said that, as he says all the time, you can spend a thousand extra dollars on traffic projections today and save several million dollars on infrastructure later if you do it right, so that's what they are really going to drill very deep with traffic projects, look at nine different scenarios to present to the group at the next meeting, to determine what is the best way to move forward, are there two that we feel confident in, is there one that we feel really good about, they want to refine this a little bit more, especially because the purpose of the next memo is to determine what the future holds for us.

Grasser asked if they are using the 2040 or the 2045 when you're looking ahead. Bittner responded that that is actually why it is taking a while for people to see him on this project

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

because they waited about three months to let the Land Use Plan marinate a little bit to see what they were coming up with. He explained that they also held a couple of meetings with the Land Use Plan consultants, and they found that there aren't a lot of changes, and they found that they didn't need to go through extra months of developing a new model and calibrating it, they can use the 2040 model with confidence to do their analysis.

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the full existing conditions report that was distributed. He said that the committee has until next Friday to get their comments in.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Haugen reported that the last time we had an update on this plan WSB was present and talked about some population projections, primarily, and also went through some goals and objectives statements from those projections with the sub-committee of the City's Planning and Zoning Commission.

Haugen commented that they zeroed in on an annual growth rate of 0.9% per year. He said that, as Mr. Bittner already described, the 2040 Land Use Plan used a 1.2% per year growth, the City did not achieve that 1.2% during the 2000 to 2010 decade, so our 2040 population, using 1.2% is about level now with a 2045 population using a 0.9% annual growth rate, so a lot of the allocation of land should be similar.

Haugen stated that, included in the packet was the second technical memorandum that WSB presented to the Planning Commission at their last meeting. He pointed out that in this one they do start to identify some of the different land use scenarios.

Haugen referred to the second memo, and explained that this is the tool that is provided to show you the consumption of the different type of land categories. He stated that they did use difference scenarios; to the far right you will see the methodology that is used in the 2040 Land Use Plan, the acreages that came up with that versus some of your different growths, types of consumption rates that could be done.

Haugen commented that part of the scope of work was to look at the growth tiers. He explained that, if you are familiar with the Grand Forks Land Use Plan, they try to manage growth by identifying three tiers of growth; with Tier One being the optimal location for growth to occur, which is basically contiguous with the City's current corporate boundary. He stated that Tier Two is an area generally defined as a location that is not optimal for growth to occur, but if it has to occur there it should be occurring in an urban sized environment, so that when growth does encompass it, it is more readily absorbed by the City. He added that the largest tier is Tier Three. He explained that the primary purpose of Tier Three is to preserve agricultural production.

Haugen stated that one of the tasks WSB was to do, in working with this Land Use Subcommittee, was to see if there are adjustments necessary for the growth boundaries. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

explained that they developed a map; included in the packet, that shows corresponding land use based on those tier boundaries. He stated that a lot of the land use is sort of carrying on what the 2040 plan had under this scenario; however a few more areas were identified for Tier One growth, with a lot of it down south of 62nd, and some of it on the west side of the City. He added that WSB was also asked to look at the growth potential; if there is not an interchange at 47th Avenue, and since the study that we just finished discussion may conclude that there are better options, or there are reasons why we can't do a 47th Avenue Interchange, so what they have done with this land use scenario was to shift a lot of the growth from the southwest area up to the west, with a little to the north of the City.

Grasser referred to the graphics, the stuff on the very southeasterly area of the City, and commented that some of that is outside the flood protection boundary, so from an infrastructure planning standpoint they have identified that that will maintain, essentially, a rural type character, and he is wondering if there is some way they can identify that so it is more readily apparent on the map that it isn't the same as what they would expect the rest of the City growth to be. Haugen responded that he thinks that in the addendum, if he captured it right, it is already been changed

Haugen said that, again, they identified that, if there wasn't an interchange at 47th, how might the City growth change, and also, then, they would change how the tier layout would be, and you will notice the change primarily shifting the Tier One growth from one area to another area.

Haugen commented that, as a result of feedback from the Land Use Subcommittee, and others, there is now what is called the "Hybrid", it is an addendum to the Tech Memo toward the back, and it sort of says that even if there isn't going to be a 47th Avenue Interchange, the City is still investing in a lot of infrastructure, and growth will be occurring, so it isn't entirely contingent on an interchange being there for this growth to occur, whereas in the previous plan it states that with no interchange there will be no growth, so they are adjusting the growth tier boundaries in reaction to some of those things.

Haugen reiterated that we saw two maps that now created this third map, which is going to lead to a fourth map as we move along with the study, so some areas will be further adjusted.

Haugen reported that land uses are also being updated and iterated to reflect this movement of the tier boundaries and the land uses.

Grasser commented that, maybe for Mr. Haugen and Mr. Gengler; when the Tier One, the southwest corner, he is going to suggest that when this gets to the committee level, that we eliminate that corner because that drawing represents the need for two brand new lift stations and service areas, if we eliminate that corner it may eliminate one lift station and the associated sets of infrastructure for that corner. Haugen stated that that is part of the process, they are trying to schedule a meeting with a little more understanding of the infrastructure, with the consumption of land and how it will fit together, there is also probably not as much growth in Tier One, possibly over where the new Water Treatment Plan is to be constructed, so that might be scaled back as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Haugen stated that a part of their scope of work is to look at three pilot sites. He explained that the intention of the pilot sites is to say that the Land Use Plan is looking at sort of a different approach than the traditional development pattern in Grand Forks, so help us by identifying real Grand Forks locations where we might see this difference built out conceptually. He said that the three sites that have been selected, and are out for final approval, are shown on the map. He referred to the map and pointed out where the three sites are located.

Haugen said that, also, as part of their scope of work they were asked to help us understand the traffic impacts of these growth scenarios; one with an interchange and one without an interchange, and whether or not we can avoid some major transportation investments if we had to shift land uses elsewhere. He pointed out that in your packet are several tables that go through and exercise using the national standards for capacity by lane, Nelson Nygaard goes through an analysis using ITE as we have so many acres devoted to residential, and we can assume they will be generating an “x” amount of trips to the network, assigning traffic to the more basic arterial roadways, so it comes up with total trips. He said that because there is a focus on multi-modalism, there are different ways those trips can be addressed, so part of this looks at the bike/ped trips being able to be transit trips, but in the end we see that, as we know, there is congestions that will occur on the arterial system with the interchange; there is congestion that will occur without the interchange, so shifting our land use really isn’t preventing us from having to add capacity on our roadway systems.

Haugen commented that hopefully before the end of the year we will have the next iteration of the Land Use Maps, and the Tier Growth Maps; and with that then they can start more earnestly on the Pilot Site areas and some of the other zoning ordinances they are part of.

Gengler referred to the note on the training facility for rail/train safety and commented that he talked to Chief O’Neill and he is still relatively optimistic, he is even more optimistic that even if they can’t seal the deal with the folks out of Fargo, there is still a strong possibility that the City will buy the land anyway, so that is what kind of keeps that in limbo. Haugen referred to a map and asked where this property is. Gengler responded that it is the existing Minnkota property just south of the water treatment plant, four acres. Haugen agreed that it has been one of those chicken and the egg kinds of thing. He said that if there wasn’t the training facility proposal then you could look at this one way from a land use perspective, but with the training proposal being a possibility, you look at a different type of land use in this area.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen knows whether the consultant has looked at, or mentioned anything about any multimodal transportation studies in regards to usage in northern tier states compared to usage in more moderate climate areas; and then it also ties into the aging of America as far as, the older people are the less reluctant they are going to be to get out and walk around, they will use their vehicles or call a cab or something. Haugen responded that he doesn’t know the answer to that. He asked that Ms. Williams send him an e-mail to that effect he will forward it on to the consultant. He added that Nelson Nygaard is their one transportation consultant, and Nelson Nygaard is a national transit planning firm.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Williams commented that you mentioned ITE and ITE uses nationwide averages and such, but then they also do documents that if you have localized information that should be used instead of the national averages, she doesn't think that our vehicle trips are any different than the national average, from what they have seen from trip generation it is pretty close, but the pedestrian mode, bicycle mode, and the transit mode she thinks are going to be different from the national averages. Haugen referred to a slide and asked if it shows the numbers that Ms. Williams is questioning. Williams responded that it was. She added that they have capacity, but what's existing usage compared to what is there, and how are we going to fill the capacity, basically. She stated that we could offer free bus service and she doesn't think ridership would go up tremendously in certain populations. Haugen agreed, adding, again, that he would ask that Ms. Williams send him an e-mail to that effect, about that question. Grasser stated that that is part of what they wanted to cover in the conference call they are trying to set up. He said that he would have Ms. Williams sit in on it, as part of trying to understand what was going on with traffic signals. Haugen responded that he thinks it's, including what we probably all knew is that the growth is creating more than our roadways can handle, and now we are just trying to determine whether it is 1,000 cars too much, or 2,000 cars more.

Rood reported that, if you remember, for that transit section she did provide a comment back, presumably it is for the WSB feed, but assuming that a single bus can carry fifty passengers, she sent details on which types of buses we have, and the fact that some of them only accommodate twenty passengers. Gengler responded that he thinks Stephanie Erickson passed that on to them.

Lang referred to a map, and pointed out that there are two dashed red lines, and one solid red line, and he is wondering what the significance is, or what it trying to be indicated, if anything by the dashed line versus the solid line. Haugen responded that the areas being shown on the map are the EJ areas, so they identifying where our pilot sites are in relationship to our EJ population, so the EJ population at the top part of the map, around the campus neighborhood, and also on South Washington there is a huge area that has EJ populations that have been identified. Lang asked, though, if that means the solid red line at the upper right, in the downtown area, is not. Haugen responded that he believes that is a low income area, and that it is just a line error, it should be a dashed line instead of a solid line.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT

Viafara pointed out that included in the packet is the latest version of the Draft Vital Metrics Dashboard Report. He stated that there are two elements for discussion today – Freight and Street/Highways.

Viafara reported that in order to do the analyses of those two elements, they considered three MAP-21 goals: Economic Vitality, System Preservation, and Safety.

Viafara referred to the report and went over the two additional elements; adding that the information shown comes from the data bases of MnDOT and NDDOT. Williams asked if this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

information also includes I-29, anything within the MPO area. Viafara responded that that is correct.

Viafara commented that they are currently working on freight, specifically trying to incorporate rail, and also discussing a little more about freight volumes and train crashes around some of the intersections or grade crossings within the planning area. He said that this information will be produced in the next report.

Viafara referred to Pages 61, 62, and 63 of the report, and pointed out that it discusses pavement conditions. He went over the information briefly.

Viafara then referred to two tables that give us an idea of where the locations, based on the two data bases, are of urban crashes for East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, with the highest number of crashes. He pointed out that there are also three maps that show us all locations for the major crashes in the region.

Viafara commented that he would like to thank everyone for their comments, adding that he thinks he was able to address most of them, and hopes that they were addressed satisfactorily.

Viafara stated that he contacted the Director of AARP, and he basically explained how they go about collecting their data, and how reliable that data is, so he feels that this provided some level of certainty that what we are using is appropriate. He added that he also reviewed, based on your recommendation, the manual; but found that the manual happens to be mainly directed to consultants, nevertheless, he found that some of the methodologies are still very valid, so we are implementing them into the report.

Williams commented that she still has concerns on the third bullet point of what they sent, as far as where the information is coming from. She said that she knows where it is coming from and she can go in there and click on it and everything like you told her, but her question is have we looked at it at a local level to verify that the information they have is correct, because we know; right off the bat that transit isn't right. Viafara responded that that transit was a review with transit, that is why they used it, and in the report there is a note that the note from transit has been, basically, reviewed with their own corporation. Williams asked, though, if we have looked at all the other ones. Viafara responded that that is what they are doing. He added that he talked to Nancy Ellis concerning some of the issues dealing with livability and some of the policies, and there is also an agreement. Williams stated that if it is fine than that is good, she just doesn't want, as a region, to hang our hat on information that we are getting from someone else and then find out later on that that information isn't correct. Viafara responded that you need to keep in mind that we are only using the pre-indicator from that livability; one of them is transit, which has been reviewed and assessed by the Transit Authority, and the second one is also livability for one of the regions, which he brought to the attention of the Planning Department, and they concur with some of the findings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Viafara stated that the points that you are bring up are important because of the magnitude of the data basis, and it is really importation to focus specifically in our region, so every time that we have the opportunity we will go and try to determine if the information is correct for our area.

Williams referred to the slide that shows the examples of “fair” pavement condition; and pointed out that the area of Columbia and 13th Avenue South is rated “fair”, which is the same as 32nd Avenue near 48th. She said that Columbia near 13th Avenue South is literally falling apart, and she is wondering where this index came from, how do they figure those two areas are the same. Kouba responded that it is taken from our pavement management system software. Kuharenko agreed, adding that part of what is happening, when you go through a new PCI analysis, is that you don’t end up looking at 100% of the road, you end up looking at little snapshots and get examples; so sometimes when you do that, when you get those snapshots, the snapshots you get sometimes end up indication that the pavement is in better condition than it actually is, that is one of the downsides of a pavement condition index. Williams asked if this is noted in the report somewhere. Viafara responded that there is a note about it in the report.

Kuharenko commented that, all-in-all PCI, the analysis that is done is beneficial from a recognizant level, but then you really need to get in and take a more detailed look at it before we look at a project. He stated that in this case, this is one of the prime examples that we have where it good at a general recognizant level, but it’s not exceptionally detailed so we can’t always hang our hat on the data shown.

Viafara asked, again, that everyone please review the report and get any comments to him by January 12th.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2015 Annual Work Program Project Update

Viafara reported that there really isn’t much to report on the 2015 Annual Work Program Projects. He said that some of the projects have been completed, and, in-fact, there are only four projects underway right now.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 9TH, 2015, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:20 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 9th, 2015, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Mike Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck.

Guest(s) present were: Mike Bittner, KLJ and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Jay Sandeen, GF/EGF MPO Intern; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that the aesthetic lighting has now been installed, and showed a photo illustrating what the bridge looks like when the lights are on. Lang added that they are doing

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

something else with lights today. Haugen asked if they are testing the colors. Yavarow responded that they are adjusting the walkway lighting.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the 106 Report was submitted and reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on the Grand Forks side. He pointed out that copies of the draft minutes, and the motion made by the Commission regarding the 106 Report were included in the packet.

Haugen stated that MnDOT did not attend the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting as was expected, however they are scheduled to attend the January 2016 MPO Executive Policy Board meeting to discuss the additional bike/ped issue.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that a copy of a power point presentation was included. He referred to the presentation and went over the information briefly, pointing out that this T.I.P. covers the years 2017 through 2020.

Haugen commented that this recaps our responsibilities to make sure projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and to prioritize the projects within the program. He said that there are two study areas to be aware of; the MPO Study Area (shown in brown) and the Federal Aid Adjusted Urbanized Area (shown in gray). Haugen explained that certain programs only apply to the Federal Urban Aid area, however for the T.I.P. purposes any project receiving federal funds on the transportation system, whether in the gray or the brown areas need to be included in the T.I.P.

Haugen stated that this is a twelve month process; which we normally start it in early September, ending in August, and then starting again, with stops in-between, but as many of you are aware there is a new Authorization Bill called "FAST" that has some new twists and turns that aren't accounted for in this solicitation, and since it covers the years that are being programmed, what we are doing is subject to change, however there is still a strong emphasis on state of good repairs, and a strong emphasis of the National Highway System, and there are some new programs that FAST is funding now that weren't sourced in the report.

Haugen commented that there is also some difference in the revenue. He explained that they haven't quite adjusted it to see if there is a need, so this solicitation is maintaining the previous 1.2% per year revenue growth rate; and on the North Dakota side there is a 4% per year expenditure growth rate as well.

Haugen referred to the presentation and briefly went over the projects up for discussion. He pointed out that Recreational Trails, however, is due at the end of December; adding that this year it was delayed a month, but last year it was all done at the same time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Kuharenko commented that he doesn't remember seeing a solicitation for the Recreation Trails projects. He asked what the program includes, what is the cost split on it. Haugen responded that the solicitation is formally done by the North Dakota Game and Parks, and has a standard 80/20 cost split. He added that the use is for similar trails to what the TAP program will fund. Williams asked if they had a target project cost range or is it just wide open. Haugen responded that he believes that there is no minimum.

Haugen explained that the Recreational Trail Program doesn't follow the exact same requirements, from a Federal Highway perspective, for project development, etc., as the TAP Program so some of the paper work isn't quite as onerous, but he would defer you to the Park and Rec website for additional information.

Haugen stated that there is a committee that reviews the applications just like the TAP committee, and then gives a recommendation as to what to award. He added that it is his understanding that they might also be funding some motorized vehicle trails out of the Recreation Trails Program. Johnson responded that he believes that is an eligible item in Rec Trails that is different from the TAP program. He added that the City should have been informed of all of this. Williams asked if this program is for new construction or is it for rehabilitation of existing construction, or did they specify. Haugen responded that he thinks it is for both.

Haugen reported that the first program is the TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program) Program, adding that it actually isn't called this under "FAST", it is now not named and instead is a set-aside of the Surface Transportation Program, but it follows almost everything that the MAP-21 TAP did.

Haugen stated that this solicitation was already underway, but one of the changes that "FAST" did was to allow non-profit organizations to apply again. He explained that under SAFETEA-LU, particularly with the Safe Routes To School Program, non-profits were able to apply directly for those, and "FAST" reopens that door, so that will be a twist coming in the future, but since this was already done, he is sure they won't go back and implement this now.

Williams asked if the TAP Program requires City Participation, or is it 100% federal funding; the one that is being opened up under "FAST". Haugen responded that it is an 80/20 basic split, so someone has to come up with the 20%. Williams said, then, that if the school district applies for something it would be the school district that would have to come up with the match. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko asked of the non-profit entities need to go through their respective city or directly to the MPO. Haugen responded that that is yet to be determined.

Haugen commented that, going back to the Recreational Trails Program, the Rec Trails can be eliminated and all the funds can be rolled into the TAP Program, or now the set-aside, so annually the State of North Dakota can make a determination of what they want to do with these funds, although they have always offered to set-aside the Rec Trail Program as a separate Program, but it can be all rolled together.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Haugen referred to a slide and stated that they did receive one application, from the City of Grand Forks, and it was for a shared use path along North 55th Street between University and DeMers Avenue. He explained that it is shown in solid red on the slide, and that it ties into the existing trail system, and is planned to be constructed next summer, at a total estimated cost of \$262,000, with \$204,000 being federally funded.

Haugen commented that there were three HSIP projects submitted by the City of Grand Forks, with priority ranking as follows: 1) Non-regional signalized intersection installation of back-plates with retro-reflective borders at a total cost of \$87,000, with \$78,300 being federally funded; 2) Columbia Road Corridor leading pedestrian timing at a total cost of \$38,000, with \$37,700 being federally funded; and 3) 42nd Street Corridor leading pedestrian timing at a total cost of \$22,000, with \$19,800 being federally funded.

Haugen stated that these projects come under the Local Safety Road Program, primarily; and in that they went through and identified that red light running is a priority. He said that in the document itself, confirmation lights was the priority solution, but the City is applying for an alternative solution to that, and that is back-plates with reflective tape, which is a Federal Highway proven safety counter measure.

Haugen reported that these three HSIP projects are addressing the priority items, it is just that the first priority is using a different solution than what is identified in the Local Road Safety Program. He added that it isn't a replacement, as he understands the plan is to do these plates, and then at a later time possibly do the confirmation lights. Williams commented that the City of Grand Forks' submittal last year had the confirmation lights on Gateway, and that was based on when installed the police would see how effective they were before doing additional ones, so that we don't spend money on something that isn't effective for our particular area. Haugen asked if confirmation lights are not now part of the standard traffic signal installation since he sees it on the newest lights being installed. Williams confirmed that they are installing them on the new traffic signals.

Haugen reported that for the Urban Road Program there is one change; switching out the location of a traffic signal, with no cost change in 2017.

Haugen commented that on the Regional side there are a couple of changes, adding things that previously weren't identified. He stated that the first are adding traffic signals at two new locations, Gateway Drive and North 55th Street and DeMers and West Columbia Ramp or 30th Street.

Haugen stated that also in 2017 the District is submitting ramp detection for two northbound off ramps, one at 32nd and one at Gateway.

Johnson referred to the DeMers and West Columbia Ramp or 30th Street project and asked if the intent of that project would be to do a study on both intersections to see which one is the better fit, or how is that decision going to be made. Grasser responded that they may end up trying to do some of that internally. He explained that City Staff had a discussion with Mr. Noehre about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

how they determine which location is best, and some of that may depend on an updated Master Plan being done by Altru, and it is unclear how 30th Street will figure in that plan, so that is a task to do in a very short window.

Haugen reported that the New T.I.P. Year is 2020, and the project that the City is forwarding is a project that they submitted last year, but that was not funded in 2019, and that is the Mill and Overlay of University Avenue between State Street and North 3rd Street. He added that the cost was adjusted for the year of expenditure increases.

Haugen commented that on the Regional side, it seems like every plus one year of our T.I.P. solicitation has the Washington Street Underpass project, and has for the last several years, so maybe this time, as it is the end of the year in the cycle, we will get the \$18,000,000 to finally rebuild the underpass. He stated that in addition to that work there is some pavement work going on on North Washington, north of the underpass area as well.

Haugen said that the staff recommendation is to approve that all candidate projects be forwarded as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and in the priority order provided.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2017-2020 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Ellis, Gengler, Kuharenko, Lang, Johnson, Bergman, and West.

Voting No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Boppre, Christianson, Magnuson, Sanders, Laesch, and Crystal.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON 32ND AVENUE SIGNAL COORDINATION STUDY

Haugen commented that Mike Anderson, Alliant, was planning on attending today's meeting, however, he is currently in the field making sure all the timing plans are in each and every cabinet along 32nd Avenue, so he is not able to be here to give a presentation.

Haugen reported that there will be an open house tonight at the Holiday Inn Express starting at 5:30 p.m. He said that what he is presenting is what will be on the boards that will be available for the public at tonight's open house.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen commented that, if you drove the corridor this week you will have noticed Dynamic Message signs announcing that the Signal Timing Plan Update will be occurring this week, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

hopefully by the end of the week it will have been fine-tuned and are working as we hope and expect them to.

Haugen stated that, just to give a recap, the corridor is 32nd Avenue. He pointed out which signals we have Alliant under contract to work on. He explained that Alliant is under contract by the City of Grand Forks to do some work on the Columbia Road Corridor as well, so it has been beneficial to have the same consultant updating the timing plans at the same time.

Haugen reported that with the video detection count program we instituted about a year ago we are able to capture significant traffic flow data. He referred to two graphs, and explained that what the timing plans are trying to accommodate are the 85th percentile, and then the second one shows the day of the week. He added that, basically the one year period that we were able to capture counts at most of these intersections, this shows what the daily traffic flow is like, and again we are trying to meet the needs of 85% of that volume.

Haugen referred to a graph illustrating the existing level of service analysis, and pointed out that the top row is prior to the new timing plan, the bottom row is after the timing plan was implemented.

Haugen summarized that these are the timing plans that have been developed, and their corresponding time. He added that, again, it is utilizing that weekday 85% profile.

Haugen referred to a chart and commented that it shows the work being done on Columbia Road as well; that is what the call-out boxes are doing, showing the green time splits for the different timing plans.

Haugen stated that this is a summary. He added that they worked on 32nd Avenue, this will be the fourth time; the first was in 2008, and we got 25% and 29% travel time improvement because it was the first one done, and each subsequent time we did this we have been able to get additional benefits, but it has not been to the extent we got with the first one, so this time around we are expecting to get about a 5% improvement in travel time during the morning rush and 13% during the evening rush.

Haugen reported that the benefit/cost ratio is still quite significant. He explained that it was a little more costly in 2008 because we didn't have proper equipment in a lot of the traffic signals, so this time, even though the benefits might be reduced a bit, the cost is reduced considerably as well, so in 2008 we got a 31/1 ratio and in 2015 we are still at a 29/1 ratio, so it is still a very low cost/high benefit solution to improve traffic along the corridor.

Grasser asked if, when you do the benefit ratio, are the calculations included in the appendix someplace in the report. Haugen responded they are included in the report. He added that it involves a number of stops, the time delay, and also some of the environmental benefits such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions, primarily.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the scope of work also identified some of the future improvements that could be done along the corridor to help traffic flow better, as well as some safety improvements. He pointed out that a lot of them have been identified previously, such as adding dual left turn lanes at Columbia Road and 32nd Avenue for the northbound/westbound turning movements and the westbound/southbound turning movements. He stated that a lot of these intersections need to have their left turn bays lengthened and they also need to have them realigned to allow better sight distance for opposing traffic. He said that the one new one is video detection for backage of traffic on the ramp, and if that video detection does detect there is a queue occurring on the off-ramp it switches the timing to dump all of that ramp traffic as a priority to prevent the I-29 through traffic being impeded by off-ramp traffic, and that is something that wasn't identified, that he is aware of, in any other document.

Haugen reported that Mike Anderson, Alliant, is in the field today installing, and will be in the field the next several days adjusting and fine tuning the timing plans, as the traffic flow requires so we aren't just getting what a computer model simulates traffic to be, it will be in response to real traffic by the time he is done this week. He added that Mr. Anderson will be back up next week to report to the Service Safety Committee on Tuesday, and to the MPO Executive Policy Board on Friday.

Williams asked when the final comments are needed on the Study. Haugen responded that they would like them sooner than later. Williams asked if next Friday would be sufficient. Haugen responded that would be fine.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING MITIGATION STUDY

Haugen reported that they did have an open house on November 17th. He stated that prior to the open house the Steering Committee met as well, and included in the packet are the summary of minutes from those meetings.

Haugen gave a brief overview of an experience he has had, several times in-fact, with train traffic on the Glasston Subdivision, specifically how far back traffic is backed up behind the I-29 Bridges. He added, however, that you will see that the dual left turn lanes are kept open, so it is nice that U.S. #2 traffic isn't completely clogging up the area so people that want to go west bound are able to do so fairly smoothly.

Haugen commented that the information they shared with the public at the open house initiated a lot of comments on the trains only happening at the P.M. Peak time; so, again, utilizing the preempt data from the signals, you will see that the majority of the time the signals are being preempted during non-peak traffic time.

Haugen stated that the only other big pieces of information that this body has not previously seen is; for Gateway Drive it seems like the only viable alternative is to do a grade separation the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

railroad from Gateway Drive, and then because the most likely way to go down we would also drop down 42nd Street as well, so both Gateway Drive and 42nd Street would be depressed to go underneath the railroad. He added that the cost of this is in the \$25,000,000 range.

Haugen commented that as part of the recommended, or suggested improvements the University of North Dakota really wanted to see fencing along both sides of the railroad, between the mainline and 6th Avenue North. Williams stated that in the past BNSF has said they don't want fencing along the railroad because they are afraid their workers could get trapped, so has the policy or practice changed. Haugen responded that that is still their preference, but we faced that with the multi-use trail that was built many years ago to the downtown, it has a fence along one side of it. Kuharenko added that the area of 6th Avenue North and down by the University, isn't there already existing fencing on the east side of the tracks separating the properties that are there. Haugen responded that there could be.

West asked what the reason was for eliminating the option of having the railroad going over U.S. 2. Haugen responded that he doesn't think there is sufficient distance for the grade to get them up because they have to go higher, thus the distance between the ground and the bottom of the bridge height is higher than it is to go down into the ground. He added that there is a 28-foot separation between for the trains to go over the top, and an underpass is 22-feet, so you have less distance to grade that out to back that out of. Johnson explained that if U.S. 2 goes under the railroad you only need 16 ½ foot clearance, if you go over a railroad they want it high enough so that they can double up the unit trains so you have to go to that 23 foot mark. West commented that he was thinking of taking the railroad tracks up and over and leaving U.S. 2 alone. Johnson responded that that would be probably even worse, because they can't have such a sharp curve.

Grasser asked if cost estimates could be broken down and included in the appendix of these reports, so a person can see a little more detail. Haugen responded that that detail is in the report itself, in the 100-page document that was distributed to the Steering Committee when they met on November 17th. He stated that in that document there was a detailed cost estimate, and they went over it at the committee meeting, to some extent. Grasser said, then that that information will be included in the final product. Haugen responded it would. He added that, as part of the work, Olsson Associates were to do a benefit/cost, to replicate what it would be like if they were to apply for a TIGER Grant, so they included the criteria you would need to submit for a TIGER Grant to show benefit/cost, and their analysis showed that the estimate would be a 1.1/1 ratio benefit cost for the two improvements, primarily that you see here, the fencing cost plus the grade separation cost. He said that the benefits would also be assigned to the assumption that the North Dakota Mill will build its grain unloading facility and allow the daily train traffic off the Mill Spur to be relocated, so the cost includes those three elements.

Williams said that the 43rd Intersection is not the same configuration that was in the Highway 2 Access Study, so she is wondering if there a note or something in there that explains this difference. Haugen responded that there is, adding that this document will be revised to reflect what is in the U.S. 2 Study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

West asked how the business at the corner access 42nd, then if they are restricted at 43rd. Haugen responded that it will be shifted over, as shown in the U.S. 2 study there will be a right-in/right-out, and they will still have access from further north. West said then, that the gas station and McDonalds will be right-in/right-out only, they wouldn't any sort of other access unless they cut through the parking lot. Haugen responded that under this concept that would be correct. He added that someone at the public meeting pointed out another way to access back to those properties if people need to come off 42nd Street, to get access to those other businesses. Haugen added that, even though the U.S. 2 Study didn't show a need to buy-out McDonalds, it could still be a possibility that that may need to occur.

Haugen commented that if the Mill Spur was abandoned, the study identified that a potential use would be a linear trail system. He said that there is, on the Mill Spur, basically north of 8th Avenue North, parallel to Washington Street, a lot of property, and that is where this concept was coming from. He stated that south of 8th Avenue it is more of an alley, with properties on either side of it, so there might be a different use potential.

Haugen said that this is a railroad right-of-way so it could either be land-banked, which means that the railroad reserves the right to reuse it as a railroad in the future if they so wish, or it could be purchased from the railroad for other purposes. He stated that he told the committee that Crookston just recently purchased railroad right-of-way along County Road 9, which runs past the MnDOT office. He explained that the City of Crookston got some TAP monies that they are using to build a multi-use trail on top of the former railroad, and they purchased the property from BNSF.

Williams commented that in November there was an article in the paper that stated that BNSF said they were not going to give that right-of-way up, that they weren't going to abandon it. She asked if that has changed. Haugen responded that there have been comments made by BNSF officials favoring abandoning it, but there have also been comments made by them saying they should hold on to it, so no decision has been made at this time.

Grasser asked if the report is going to identify the costs of removal and/or land banking and/or purchase, of those alternatives. Haugen responded that there is cost for removal of the track and for the installation of the trail, but he isn't sure about the cost of the land bank verses purchase. Grasser asked if that would be in a table someplace so you can actually pick those numbers out. Haugen responded it would. He added that, obviously there would be more cost if you purchase the property, he isn't sure about the cost if you just do land banking.

Haugen reported that the status of the North Dakota State Mill, and their negotiations with BNSF, are still unknown as he hasn't talked with the Mill since prior to the Thanksgiving Holiday, but they are still negotiating the rates to bring in a unit train to unload grain. He said that perhaps they are marginally closer than they were when we started this process, but it doesn't appear that anytime soon they will be building an unloading facility to assist them, however they are expanding and that construction is taking place, with a 30% increase in capacity. He added that now there will be a delay between when they start their 30% additional operation with the grain unloading facility being built, that the Mill Spur will have more cars

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

attached to two trains a day that are going on it; one up and one down a day, so the delay on the Mill Spur crossings will be greater than it currently is, and it will probably be a year before they can get the unloading facility on line, so traffic will be impacted for a minimum of a year time.

Grasser commented that at the last meeting we talked about having the consultants take another look at maybe doing pedestrian crossings at University Avenue and 42nd Street, for, if nothing else, to validate challenges. Haugen responded that the consultants are doing that work. He said that a follow-up from UND pointed out that they do have their sky-way in place, and that they wouldn't mind seeing more use of their sky-way system so they sort of sent a message that they already have a facility in place, so there probably isn't a great need, in their perspective, to try to build another, or to see if another fits to the north side or south side of the intersection of University Avenue and 42nd. He added that they are also still going to conceptualize something, and determine if it is feasible, but he just wanted to let you know that UND has said that they already have something in place that should be used. Grasser responded, however, that in his opinion we know that when those delays occur, there will be someone coming to the City asking what we are going to do about it, and he would rather be able to define what we can or can't do about it, with this comprehensive study; or we say UND is opening their skyway to the public and whoever wants to use it to cross can, but he has a little trouble envisioning that. Haugen said that that is what we will try to work out by the end of the study.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION STUDY

Haugen stated that Mike Bittner, the project manager on the I-29 Traffic Operation Study is here today. He said that Mr. Bittner met with the Steering Committee met last Wednesday and had a much longer discussion on the status of the study, however Mr. Bittner has shortened and put together a more concise version to go over a few key points.

Bittner reported that they had their first meeting, just to identify the issues that we see today, and to kind of do a literature view as well, as there has been a lot of the planning done along the I-29 Corridor, and they wanted to use that to improve and identify the issues we are going to see as they move along with this project.

Bittner referred to a power point slide presentation, explaining that the first step in the study is existing conditions, and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Bittner stated that, just to give you an idea of what their scope is for the project; they have Mainline I-29, from County Road 11 to County Road 6 (Merrifield Road); then on the Cross-streets they have our ramp intersections, that are two large intersections (an example would be U.S. 2 with a ramp to the east to 42nd Street and to the west to 48th Street, which are the two truck stops).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Bittner commented that as they looked at crashes, they had about 90 crashes per year, specifically isolating main-line crashes, 29% were on main-line, but the majority of them were single vehicle crashes, weather related, or speeding related, so as they look at future conditions, congestion will increase, speeding will decrease, and weather is one of those hard to engineer problems but they will look at it as they move forward as well.

Bittner stated that infrastructure is in good condition, and they also looked at pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. He said that there is an almost two mile gap from University south to 32nd, adding that DeMers will fill it in a little bit, but there is industrial to the west so we need that connectivity.

Bittner reported that they looked at County Road 11, which is an extension of North Washington Street; and, just to focus on the key issues here, really the design is dictated by the fact that we have the railroad line, the Glasston line, and we are on the curve of I-29, so we have some unique skewing of intersections, with a very unique one at 54th Avenue/Glasston/County Road 18. He said that there are also a lot of access points in this section, so they will try to reduce that as part of the project, and then they will look at just operational issues like turn lanes and traffic control.

Bittner stated that for Gateway Drive and U.S. #2, they don't really get deep into this in the corridor study, but they don't want to throw that analysis away, but they are looking at a lot of new traffic forecasting scenarios, so they are going to make sure this still is the best solution moving forward as they see a lot of great opportunity linking planning to NEPA on this particular project because maybe they can kick this out the door, and maybe have a project that is connected with this corridor study if there is funding available in the next five years or so.

Bittner commented that there is also a variety of other issues, and most of them they talked about them during the corridor study so he isn't going to dive into them right now. Grasser asked, if they do an improvement, will it compliment or conflict with the potential grade separated crossing there. Bittner responded that they want to consider that, so they have actually looked at it with and without in the future because at \$25 or \$28 million dollars for that improvement, will it be built in the next twenty-five years, they have their questions, so they will look at both but he does see some potential issues, why are they worried about McDonalds, why do they fit this loop in there if McDonalds won't have access with the combination of the underpass and access control, because there are a lot of safety and operational issues at 43rd, so they will be asking some of those more difficult questions. Grasser commented that that is probably a death knoll from a fast food owner perspective, but it doesn't mean they will sell it cheap.

Bittner summarized that he thinks, as we look at this alternative, they will need some refinements, certainly, as you include that underpass as one of the problems, and it does show major issues to the interstate main-line, so they do want to consider it. Grasser agreed, adding that, if nothing else, under the design we should figure out how to retain as much as we can that can serve both configurations.

Bittner stated that DeMers Avenue is a very unique interchange in the fact that it has a lot of different types of traffic using it; you have major industrial to the west, the Alerus Center and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

UND to the east, you have not just daily traffic but also event traffic, you have train traffic at 42nd and DeMers, so you see a lot of uniqueness to this interchange, unlike U.S. #2 which you can kind of predict day to day what is going to happen other than when a train event occurs. He said that because of this uniqueness they are going to look at a lot of different factors as they look at alternatives. He added that they have had discussions on how they incorporate event traffic, but they aren't quite sure to what level of extent they will look at it at this point, or what level of discussion they will have, and also incorporating, similar to U.S. #2s 42nd/DeMers Overpass, and looking at it with and without, depending on the funding scenarios, to see how it impacts the interchange.

Grasser commented that something they should be aware of, although he isn't sure how terribly official it is yet, but recent discussion with BN regarding the bike path on the north side of DeMers weren't particularly encouraging; and in a nutshell they said that we have to show that nothing else works before they'll consider anything, but, again, how do they define that, so in his mind we are maybe 50/50 on whether we will be on the north side or the south side of DeMers right now. He said that they are going to take a good hard look at both alternatives in their concept report, but the north side isn't a slam dunk, so in the back of your mind he doesn't know how that might impact, obviously pedestrians to the ramps, it might change things. Bittner asked if there is anything they can do in the corridor study to help facilitate that issue. He said that clearly you have one option where they aren't going to have these free flow movements onto the ramp, no conflicts; and on the other side you are going to have all four of your ramps conflicting with your pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and obviously from everyone in this room's standpoint that is probably bad. Grasser commented that, probably from anyone but BNSF that would be a clear sign that nothing else works, and thank you for the offer. He added that Mr. Kuharenko is heading this up and if they run into some things they will be in contact.

Bittner said that the next step is 17th Avenue, and this has been discussed time and again as an overpass. He commented that in the most recent Long Range Transportation Plan they found that it wouldn't have as great of a benefit as previously thought, and that is mostly because the land use has really shifted south to 32nd and 47th areas, so they are going to reanalyze to see if we need this, when do we need this, is it within our twenty-five year horizon or exactly what is the purpose, do we still hold the land for that 17th Avenue Overpass.

Bittner commented that 32nd Avenue is where we see a tremendous amount of growth. He stated that they evaluated the travel demand model, and they found that within one mile of 32nd Avenue 50% of your household growth, and 50% of your employment growth has occurred, so we see a tremendous amount of congestion and new traffic at this interchange by 2040, which creates a lot of new problems, and leads to the question of whether we can fix 32nd or do we have to add new infrastructure to relieve the problems. He added that they will start to delve into what improvements could be looked at, specifically with the interchange; or whether an additional connect to 42nd Street is still something that we want to look at or discuss as they get to the alternatives.

Bittner stated that in drilling down into a micro-level of detail we have not just operations, but we also have some safety issues along the corridor such as negatively off-set left turn lanes that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

are creating a lot of problems at 38th, as well as some other safety issues at the ramps that they are going to try to resolve as they move through this project.

Bittner reported that really one of the biggest questions here is 47th Avenue. He said that one question they get a lot is, what is the cost for 32nd versus 47th, and as part of their project they are going to look at benefit/cost analysis of all of their different infrastructure improvements, so that to justify a 47th Avenue Interchange, which has been discussed a lot in previous Long Range Transportation Plans, do they have that to show that it will work, as well as any other alternatives, 17th Avenue for example, but as they look at 47th they aren't just going to determine if it is needed, but they are also going to determine what it will look like. He stated that there has been a lot of discussion about whether we need a one-mile spacing, and they did have some resolution at their meeting last Thursday with the DOT, in that if you look at one-mile spacing you start to run into issues with the school, golf course, and park; or how would that look if it was on 47th, or just slightly south, what impacts the campground, so they are going to answer all those detailed questions of, if, and then how, what this would look in the future, and so the previous study that Cindy working on completing found that there is about a 40% reduction in traffic from 32nd to 47th, so they are going to reanalyze that with their new traffic forecast to justify that data.

Bittner stated that the last location is Merrifield Road, County Road 6. He explained that this location has been discussed several times about an interchange here, and really this revolves around whether or not we are going to have a southside by-pass, so they had discussion at their meeting, can this exist without a by-pass, as just an interchange, it isn't anything they will answer with their study, as they move forward.

Bittner commented that they also had a discussion as to how realistic a by-pass is, you have \$9 million dollars to do an interchange, and then you have to improve all the roads that would be the by-pass, and you have \$20+ million dollars for a river crossing, and then they counted up the truck traffic and it was less than 2,000 crossing any of the bridges, so this was met with skepticism from the group, but at the same time it is something, sometimes these studies are just as valuable proving something won't work as it is that it will work, so they will go through the analysis to determine if it will work or won't work, and can it operate as an interchange without it having to be a by-pass, will trucks still use it.

Bittner stated that this wraps up their existing portion of the study, and added that their next step is working with Mr. Haugen and ATAC to develop traffic projections. He said that, as he says all the time, you can spend a thousand extra dollars on traffic projections today and save several million dollars on infrastructure later if you do it right, so that's what they are really going to drill very deep with traffic projects, look at nine different scenarios to present to the group at the next meeting, to determine what is the best way to move forward, are there two that we feel confident in, is there one that we feel really good about, they want to refine this a little bit more, especially because the purpose of the next memo is to determine what the future holds for us.

Grasser asked if they are using the 2040 or the 2045 when you're looking ahead. Bittner responded that that is actually why it is taking a while for people to see him on this project

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

because they waited about three months to let the Land Use Plan marinate a little bit to see what they were coming up with. He explained that they also held a couple of meetings with the Land Use Plan consultants, and they found that there aren't a lot of changes, and they found that they didn't need to go through extra months of developing a new model and calibrating it, they can use the 2040 model with confidence to do their analysis.

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the full existing conditions report that was distributed. He said that the committee has until next Friday to get their comments in.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Haugen reported that the last time we had an update on this plan WSB was present and talked about some population projections, primarily, and also went through some goals and objectives statements from those projections with the sub-committee of the City's Planning and Zoning Commission.

Haugen commented that they zeroed in on an annual growth rate of 0.9% per year. He said that, as Mr. Bittner already described, the 2040 Land Use Plan used a 1.2% per year growth, the City did not achieve that 1.2% during the 2000 to 2010 decade, so our 2040 population, using 1.2% is about level now with a 2045 population using a 0.9% annual growth rate, so a lot of the allocation of land should be similar.

Haugen stated that, included in the packet was the second technical memorandum that WSB presented to the Planning Commission at their last meeting. He pointed out that in this one they do start to identify some of the different land use scenarios.

Haugen referred to the second memo, and explained that this is the tool that is provided to show you the consumption of the different type of land categories. He stated that they did use difference scenarios; to the far right you will see the methodology that is used in the 2040 Land Use Plan, the acreages that came up with that versus some of your different growths, types of consumption rates that could be done.

Haugen commented that part of the scope of work was to look at the growth tiers. He explained that, if you are familiar with the Grand Forks Land Use Plan, they try to manage growth by identifying three tiers of growth; with Tier One being the optimal location for growth to occur, which is basically contiguous with the City's current corporate boundary. He stated that Tier Two is an area generally defined as a location that is not optimal for growth to occur, but if it has to occur there it should be occurring in an urban sized environment, so that when growth does encompass it, it is more readily absorbed by the City. He added that the largest tier is Tier Three. He explained that the primary purpose of Tier Three is to preserve agricultural production.

Haugen stated that one of the tasks WSB was to do, in working with this Land Use Subcommittee, was to see if there are adjustments necessary for the growth boundaries. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

explained that they developed a map; included in the packet, that shows corresponding land use based on those tier boundaries. He stated that a lot of the land use is sort of carrying on what the 2040 plan had under this scenario; however a few more areas were identified for Tier One growth, with a lot of it down south of 62nd, and some of it on the west side of the City. He added that WSB was also asked to look at the growth potential; if there is not an interchange at 47th Avenue, and since the study that we just finished discussion may conclude that there are better options, or there are reasons why we can't do a 47th Avenue Interchange, so what they have done with this land use scenario was to shift a lot of the growth from the southwest area up to the west, with a little to the north of the City.

Grasser referred to the graphics, the stuff on the very southeasterly area of the City, and commented that some of that is outside the flood protection boundary, so from an infrastructure planning standpoint they have identified that that will maintain, essentially, a rural type character, and he is wondering if there is some way they can identify that so it is more readily apparent on the map that it isn't the same as what they would expect the rest of the City growth to be. Haugen responded that he thinks that in the addendum, if he captured it right, it is already been changed

Haugen said that, again, they identified that, if there wasn't an interchange at 47th, how might the City growth change, and also, then, they would change how the tier layout would be, and you will notice the change primarily shifting the Tier One growth from one area to another area.

Haugen commented that, as a result of feedback from the Land Use Subcommittee, and others, there is now what is called the "Hybrid", it is an addendum to the Tech Memo toward the back, and it sort of says that even if there isn't going to be a 47th Avenue Interchange, the City is still investing in a lot of infrastructure, and growth will be occurring, so it isn't entirely contingent on an interchange being there for this growth to occur, whereas in the previous plan it states that with no interchange there will be no growth, so they are adjusting the growth tier boundaries in reaction to some of those things.

Haugen reiterated that we saw two maps that now created this third map, which is going to lead to a fourth map as we move along with the study, so some areas will be further adjusted.

Haugen reported that land uses are also being updated and iterated to reflect this movement of the tier boundaries and the land uses.

Grasser commented that, maybe for Mr. Haugen and Mr. Gengler; when the Tier One, the southwest corner, he is going to suggest that when this gets to the committee level, that we eliminate that corner because that drawing represents the need for two brand new lift stations and service areas, if we eliminate that corner it may eliminate one lift station and the associated sets of infrastructure for that corner. Haugen stated that that is part of the process, they are trying to schedule a meeting with a little more understanding of the infrastructure, with the consumption of land and how it will fit together, there is also probably not as much growth in Tier One, possibly over where the new Water Treatment Plan is to be constructed, so that might be scaled back as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Haugen stated that a part of their scope of work is to look at three pilot sites. He explained that the intention of the pilot sites is to say that the Land Use Plan is looking at sort of a different approach than the traditional development pattern in Grand Forks, so help us by identifying real Grand Forks locations where we might see this difference built out conceptually. He said that the three sites that have been selected, and are out for final approval, are shown on the map. He referred to the map and pointed out where the three sites are located.

Haugen said that, also, as part of their scope of work they were asked to help us understand the traffic impacts of these growth scenarios; one with an interchange and one without an interchange, and whether or not we can avoid some major transportation investments if we had to shift land uses elsewhere. He pointed out that in your packet are several tables that go through and exercise using the national standards for capacity by lane, Nelson Nygaard goes through an analysis using ITE as we have so many acres devoted to residential, and we can assume they will be generating an “x” amount of trips to the network, assigning traffic to the more basic arterial roadways, so it comes up with total trips. He said that because there is a focus on multi-modalism, there are different ways those trips can be addressed, so part of this looks at the bike/ped trips being able to be transit trips, but in the end we see that, as we know, there is congestions that will occur on the arterial system with the interchange; there is congestion that will occur without the interchange, so shifting our land use really isn’t preventing us from having to add capacity on our roadway systems.

Haugen commented that hopefully before the end of the year we will have the next iteration of the Land Use Maps, and the Tier Growth Maps; and with that then they can start more earnestly on the Pilot Site areas and some of the other zoning ordinances they are part of.

Gengler referred to the note on the training facility for rail/train safety and commented that he talked to Chief O’Neill and he is still relatively optimistic, he is even more optimistic that even if they can’t seal the deal with the folks out of Fargo, there is still a strong possibility that the City will buy the land anyway, so that is what kind of keeps that in limbo. Haugen referred to a map and asked where this property is. Gengler responded that it is the existing Minnkota property just south of the water treatment plant, four acres. Haugen agreed that it has been one of those chicken and the egg kinds of thing. He said that if there wasn’t the training facility proposal then you could look at this one way from a land use perspective, but with the training proposal being a possibility, you look at a different type of land use in this area.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen knows whether the consultant has looked at, or mentioned anything about any multimodal transportation studies in regards to usage in northern tier states compared to usage in more moderate climate areas; and then it also ties into the aging of America as far as, the older people are the less reluctant they are going to be to get out and walk around, they will use their vehicles or call a cab or something. Haugen responded that he doesn’t know the answer to that. He asked that Ms. Williams send him an e-mail to that effect he will forward it on to the consultant. He added that Nelson Nygaard is their one transportation consultant, and Nelson Nygaard is a national transit planning firm.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Williams commented that you mentioned ITE and ITE uses nationwide averages and such, but then they also do documents that if you have localized information that should be used instead of the national averages, she doesn't think that our vehicle trips are any different than the national average, from what they have seen from trip generation it is pretty close, but the pedestrian mode, bicycle mode, and the transit mode she thinks are going to be different from the national averages. Haugen referred to a slide and asked if it shows the numbers that Ms. Williams is questioning. Williams responded that it was. She added that they have capacity, but what's existing usage compared to what is there, and how are we going to fill the capacity, basically. She stated that we could offer free bus service and she doesn't think ridership would go up tremendously in certain populations. Haugen agreed, adding, again, that he would ask that Ms. Williams send him an e-mail to that effect, about that question. Grasser stated that that is part of what they wanted to cover in the conference call they are trying to set up. He said that he would have Ms. Williams sit in on it, as part of trying to understand what was going on with traffic signals. Haugen responded that he thinks it's, including what we probably all knew is that the growth is creating more than our roadways can handle, and now we are just trying to determine whether it is 1,000 cars too much, or 2,000 cars more.

Rood reported that, if you remember, for that transit section she did provide a comment back, presumably it is for the WSB feed, but assuming that a single bus can carry fifty passengers, she sent details on which types of buses we have, and the fact that some of them only accommodate twenty passengers. Gengler responded that he thinks Stephanie Erickson passed that on to them.

Lang referred to a map, and pointed out that there are two dashed red lines, and one solid red line, and he is wondering what the significance is, or what it trying to be indicated, if anything by the dashed line versus the solid line. Haugen responded that the areas being shown on the map are the EJ areas, so they identifying where our pilot sites are in relationship to our EJ population, so the EJ population at the top part of the map, around the campus neighborhood, and also on South Washington there is a huge area that has EJ populations that have been identified. Lang asked, though, if that means the solid red line at the upper right, in the downtown area, is not. Haugen responded that he believes that is a low income area, and that it is just a line error, it should be a dashed line instead of a solid line.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT

Viafara pointed out that included in the packet is the latest version of the Draft Vital Metrics Dashboard Report. He stated that there are two elements for discussion today – Freight and Street/Highways.

Viafara reported that in order to do the analyses of those two elements, they considered three MAP-21 goals: Economic Vitality, System Preservation, and Safety.

Viafara referred to the report and went over the two additional elements; adding that the information shown comes from the data bases of MnDOT and NDDOT. Williams asked if this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

information also includes I-29, anything within the MPO area. Viafara responded that that is correct.

Viafara commented that they are currently working on freight, specifically trying to incorporate rail, and also discussing a little more about freight volumes and train crashes around some of the intersections or grade crossings within the planning area. He said that this information will be produced in the next report.

Viafara referred to Pages 61, 62, and 63 of the report, and pointed out that it discusses pavement conditions. He went over the information briefly.

Viafara then referred to two tables that give us an idea of where the locations, based on the two data bases, are of urban crashes for East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, with the highest number of crashes. He pointed out that there are also three maps that show us all locations for the major crashes in the region.

Viafara commented that he would like to thank everyone for their comments, adding that he thinks he was able to address most of them, and hopes that they were addressed satisfactorily.

Viafara stated that he contacted the Director of AARP, and he basically explained how they go about collecting their data, and how reliable that data is, so he feels that this provided some level of certainty that what we are using is appropriate. He added that he also reviewed, based on your recommendation, the manual; but found that the manual happens to be mainly directed to consultants, nevertheless, he found that some of the methodologies are still very valid, so we are implementing them into the report.

Williams commented that she still has concerns on the third bullet point of what they sent, as far as where the information is coming from. She said that she knows where it is coming from and she can go in there and click on it and everything like you told her, but her question is have we looked at it at a local level to verify that the information they have is correct, because we know; right off the bat that transit isn't right. Viafara responded that that transit was a review with transit, that is why they used it, and in the report there is a note that the note from transit has been, basically, reviewed with their own corporation. Williams asked, though, if we have looked at all the other ones. Viafara responded that that is what they are doing. He added that he talked to Nancy Ellis concerning some of the issues dealing with livability and some of the policies, and there is also an agreement. Williams stated that if it is fine than that is good, she just doesn't want, as a region, to hang our hat on information that we are getting from someone else and then find out later on that that information isn't correct. Viafara responded that you need to keep in mind that we are only using the pre-indicator from that livability; one of them is transit, which has been reviewed and assessed by the Transit Authority, and the second one is also livability for one of the regions, which he brought to the attention of the Planning Department, and they concur with some of the findings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2015**

Viafara stated that the points that you are bring up are important because of the magnitude of the data basis, and it is really importation to focus specifically in our region, so every time that we have the opportunity we will go and try to determine if the information is correct for our area.

Williams referred to the slide that shows the examples of “fair” pavement condition; and pointed out that the area of Columbia and 13th Avenue South is rated “fair”, which is the same as 32nd Avenue near 48th. She said that Columbia near 13th Avenue South is literally falling apart, and she is wondering where this index came from, how do they figure those two areas are the same. Kouba responded that it is taken from our pavement management system software. Kuharenko agreed, adding that part of what is happening, when you go through a new PCI analysis, is that you don’t end up looking at 100% of the road, you end up looking at little snapshots and get examples; so sometimes when you do that, when you get those snapshots, the snapshots you get sometimes end up indication that the pavement is in better condition than it actually is, that is one of the downsides of a pavement condition index. Williams asked if this is noted in the report somewhere. Viafara responded that there is a note about it in the report.

Kuharenko commented that, all-in-all PCI, the analysis that is done is beneficial from a recognizant level, but then you really need to get in and take a more detailed look at it before we look at a project. He stated that in this case, this is one of the prime examples that we have where it good at a general recognizant level, but it’s not exceptionally detailed so we can’t always hang our hat on the data shown.

Viafara asked, again, that everyone please review the report and get any comments to him by January 12th.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2015 Annual Work Program Project Update

Viafara reported that there really isn’t much to report on the 2015 Annual Work Program Projects. He said that some of the projects have been completed, and, in-fact, there are only four projects underway right now.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 9TH, 2015, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:20 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager