

2018 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 10, 2018 Minutes

February 14, 2018 Minutes

March 14, 2018 Minutes

April 11, 2018 Minutes

May 9, 2018 Minutes

June 13, 2018 Minutes

July 14, 2018 Minutes

July 27, 2018 Special Meeting Minutes

August 15, 2018 Minutes

September 12, 2018 Minutes

October 10, 2018 Minutes

November 14, 2018 Minutes

December 12, 2018 Minutes

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 10th, 2018, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Paul Konickson, MnDOT-Bemidji; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit.

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Darren Laesch, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Nancy Ellis, Ryan Riesinger, David Kuharenko, Mike Yavarow, Stacey Hanson, and Rich Sanders.

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

Guests present: Bobbi Retzlaf, MnDOT-St. Paul (Via Conference Call); Stephanie Erickson, Grand Forks Planning; and Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 13TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 13TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Rood reported present.

MATTER OF 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE

Haugen reported that, as noted in the staff report, we did not receive any new projects from MnDOT or Polk County.

Haugen commented that every fourth year East Grand Forks is in line for the City's Sub Target funding, so 2022, which is the last year of this T.I.P. cycle, is the fourth year so East Grand Forks is resubmitting the project they originally had for 2018, and that is the Roundabout at Rhinehart and Bygland Road.

Haugen stated that included in the packet is the 2018 information that was submitted. He explained that they were working with MnDOT on getting what the year of expenditure calculations would or should be so this slide displays that updated information. He pointed out that it now identifies 2022 as the fiscal year and it does have project numbers. He said that the rest of the information is the same as it was before.

Haugen commented that there is an updated financial project cost shown, although the total project cost is very close to what the 2018 cost was as all of the individual components have changed enough to reach a similar 2018 cost/2022 cost.

Haugen stated that the only other newer information is that they have been working on refining the concept, and what this slide is showing is the most recent concept; with the major difference between the one in the packet and this concept is a wider radius, which does necessitate some expansion back to the intersections, so basically the footprint has increased.

Erickson asked why they went with this wider design. Haugen responded that he believes the main factor in going with the larger design to accommodate the larger designed vehicles, larger tractor trailers.

Haugen said that other than this, the standard report just reiterated that MnDOT has a 2021 project out at the U.S. #2/U.S. Business #2 intersection; so with one candidate project that was already programmed once, and that is now being reprogrammed, staff is recommending that it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and is a top priority for the Sub-Target funding.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ERICKSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE, AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Williams, Konickson, Gengler, Lang, West, Johnson, Audette, Bail, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Laesch, Emery, Hanson, Kuharenko, Bergman, Yavarow, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT #2 TO THE ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that as we discussed last year, because of some grant constraints the NDDOT used 2014 monies to pay a lot of our 2017 operational costs so we have those 2017 monies available for us to program work activities with. He added that, also as we discussed last month, with the additional river crossing request that the Board approved, some of those monies would go to that project, and we have since received a request from East Grand Forks to assist them with an ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan.

Haugen commented that this is a requirement under ADA law, and has been a requirement since 1991 or 1992 he believes; however not until MnDOT and Minnesota FHWA placed a strong emphasis on getting this done, and if it isn't they have indicated that they would freeze federal transportation funds to a community that doesn't have an active ADA Transition Plan in place, so East Grand Forks is requesting the MPO to do that activity with them. He said that this has gone through their City Council and a formal request was submitted. He added that they also indicated a willingness to provide the 20% match.

Haugen stated that this request has been added under the Special Studies category, and it will look at all the facilities within the right-of-way including curb ramps, sidewalks, bus stops, possibly parking lots that the City owns. He added that a scope of work will need to be done, which you will see next month, that will define all of the facilities we will be looking at.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out the funding sources and the amounts budgeted. He said that you will notice that with the previous years, 2017 federal funds, we have roughly \$300,000 so far with this amendment, but we will only be budgeting 20% of those funds in activities.

Haugen commented that the East Grand Forks specific item is at \$50,000. He explained that what they are using as a basis for these estimates, and what we will use as an initial scope-of-work draft is from the City of Moorhead, who had FM-COG do similar work for them, so we are basing this off of what their cost was; and they had SRF under contract to do it, so we came up with \$50,000, and set aside \$35,000 for consultant assistance, up to \$35,000.

Haugen summarized that this is proposing to amend our Unified Work Program to fulfill the East Grand Forks request to assist them prepare and update their ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM TO ASSIST THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS IN PREPARING AN ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN, SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.

Voting Aye: Williams, Konickson, Gengler, Lang, West, Johnson, Audette, Bail, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Laesch, Emery, Hanson, Kuharenko, Bergman, Yavarow, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR 2018 AERIAL PHOTOS

Kouba reported that this is an item that the MPO tends to do every three years. She stated that the last time we did it was in 2015, so there are some people that are very excited about getting updated photos.

Kouba stated that this will be done at the same level it was done in 2015, all the specs are pretty much the same, we are just looking at an update, although there was some discussion about getting LiDAR as well, but there wasn't enough interest shown so it is not included in the RFP.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR AERIAL IMAGERY, AS SUBMITTED.

Lang asked if this will include the entire MPO study area. Kouba responded it would. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the current aerial photo, and asked if they would be replicating this exactly. Kouba responded that there are a couple of little areas that are expanded out a bit to match up with some of the other things we have like the TAZs and such, but other than that it will be pretty much the same.

Johnson stated that, just to offer up a comment after reading the staff report, they have been broadening their allowance for the use of LiDAR on these aerial photo projects as long as it is something that is collected while they are also collecting aerial flight; if it is something that they are doing at the same time they have been allowing it to happen so if that is something that you do want to pursue further you can definitely look into it. He said that in the past they weren't as receptive to LiDAR, but they are not looking at allowing it in terms of collecting the static LiDAR topographic data with the aerial flights.

Haugen asked if Ms. Kouba had gotten any further into the cost of LiDAR. Kouba responded that she didn't. Haugen asked if anyone had a sense of the cost. He added that what he heard Mr. Johnson say is that our consolidated planning funds can be used for LiDAR. Johnson responded that that is correct.

Haugen commented that it is his understanding that someone has recent LiDAR available. Kouba said that there was LiDAR done of the Red River Valley a few years ago that is available on the U.S.G.S. site. Bail added that actually part of the study got into Red River basin and you can get all the LiDAR data from that, and the State of Minnesota flies the entire State with LiDAR and there is data available for that that is out there too, but how close you want it or how tight you want it is the question. He said that LiDAR is an amazing thing, you can actually see the leaves and branches on trees.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Erickson asked what LiDAR is, is it just a crisper image, is that the difference. Bail responded that it actually reflects survey data, and they did the whole entire Red River Valley, every four inches, and it is amazing what you can get out of it. Johnson commented that what they have allowed in the past is the collection of data to potentially develop a one-foot contour outlook.

Haugen said that what he is hearing is that LiDAR is already available, that is fairly recent. Bail commented that the data is getting older, and if you don't fly it like everything else, obviously it changes over time as new things are developed, so some of the stuff in the Red River Valley was done about eight or nine years ago.

Haugen asked that Ms. Kouba expand on who was showing interest in LiDAR. Kouba responded that East Grand Forks Water and Light was possibly interested in cost sharing something of that nature, but they left it open. Haugen asked if she was able to ask any other agency if they were at all interested. Kouba responded that she did ask Grand Forks City Engineering if they were interested, but they weren't at the time.

Haugen commented that we have an opportunity with some unallocated, or unbudgeted federal planning dollars, so he thinks we are kind of time crunched to ensure that we get the flights flown before the trees leaf out, but he doesn't think we want to delay the RFP for a month, so if there is interest in LiDAR, or if we are hearing that LiDAR is already available, perhaps we just go with the original recommendation for this go-around and not pursue LiDAR, but keep it in the back of our minds for the next three year cycle.

West stated that the RFP could request that it be an option, at a separate price, and considered at the time when proposals receive as an add-on. Williams agreed that she thinks it would be a good idea to have an alternate in the bid item, to include it to see what it is going to cost.

Haugen said he has one technical question for Mr. Johnson; with us not showing it in our budget, asking for that option, is that a concern. Johnson responded that it isn't ideal; if you ended up wanting to include it before you could move forward with that portion of it you would have to do another work program amendment, so if that would cause any delays, that would be something to keep in mind.

After further discussion the consensus was to not pursue doing LiDAR this go-around, and to look into the possibility of doing it in three years.

Voting Aye: Williams, Konickson, Gengler, Lang, West, Johnson, Audette, Bail, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Laesch, Emery, Hanson, Kuharenko, Bergman, Yavarow, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that he thinks we all thought that we would have five additional river crossings to have traffic analyses done, travel demand forecasting done; at the Technical Advisory

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Committee Meeting that was the recommendation forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board, but at that meeting, after some discussion, the motion approved dropped 17th Avenue from the amended Scope of Work, so now the graphic shows that we are now just getting information for four additional river crossings.

Haugen commented that that was the motion, and that is the scope-of-work that was executed with both Kimely-Horn and A.T.A.C. He added that under Robert Rules of Order this motion can be visited at the next meeting of the MPO Board, so we will find out what happens next Wednesday. He explained that if the Board wants to add 17th Avenue back into the Scope-of-Work we would need to do another amendment and another contract scope, so it may or may not come back, but that is where we are at at this time.

Lang asked when it would be able to be presented. Haugen responded that it should be presented to the Technical Advisory Committee next month. He added that it should be distributed in two weeks for review.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it contains a section of the draft December 20th, MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting minutes whereby Commissioner Malm gave us some information on some supposed direction the Grand Forks County Engineer was given in regard to the Merrifield Bridge. He said that he hopes everyone had the opportunity to read these draft minutes; and he knows that in listening to the tape, and talking with Mr. West, there seems to be a disconnect in what actually took place versus what was provided to the MPO Board.

West explained that about a month ago he attended the first Grand Forks County Commission meeting in December and said that if we took two mills and saved them for twelve to fifteen years we would have enough money to pay for our half of a bridge across the Red River, just think about it; that is literally all it was, because if we would have done that back in 2007 when the County Commission approved a resolution to support a bridge, we would be there now, doing environmental studies, and moving ahead with a bridge. He said that this is all that occurred, just some general discussion, so he isn't sure how Mr. Malm's comments came about, but maybe there is something going on that he doesn't know about, but to his knowledge he was not given directive to do anything with this.

Haugen commented that he thinks the key thing here is if you took three mills and put it aside for eight years would there be enough money. West responded that it would be close, however he never ran the scenarios. He added that he did take our half of the bridge, which was recently updated in the I-29 Study, and applied a simple inflation rate, then took two mills to cover the cost. He explained that where two mills came from was that State law says that County Commissioners can levy two mills for road and bridge funds at their discretion; up to ten mills at their discretion for road and bridge funds, and we have historically been hovering around eight mills for quite a while, so that means there are two mills that the County Commissioners could levy without having to go to the people for a vote; and just pocket it away for a number of years then we can say, look here is the money; and then he applied two different scenarios of mill levy value increases, that's where the twelve to fifteen years came into the equation, when revenue got ahead of cost. He added that he isn't aware if Polk County is on board with anything, and to his knowledge there wasn't a motion made at that meeting directing him to do anything.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Haugen said that there is some confusion, but there also seems to be some willingness to consider a county mill levy increase in the future.

West commented that his point wasn't specifically targeting Merrifield, although that was his thought, but it could be anywhere as long the County Commissioners thought it was worthwhile to spend the county budget on it.

Lang stated that you wouldn't do this without getting Polk County on board first, correct. West responded that that would make the most sense of course, because if it is outside City limits then he wouldn't imagine the City would spend any money on it, therefore it would be up to the County to pay for it.

Bail said that if even if there wasn't a plan they could put aside for two mills, for the time being, and eventually down the road work with whoever they have to to get it done too, so they would just be putting money away. Lang stated that we would want our funds to match up at the same time, you wouldn't want to say you can pay for half a bridge in twelve years when Minnesota can't, because you could be doing something else with those monies in the time being.

Haugen commented that you could either assess the two mills and have the bank account build until you have the necessary funds, or you could assess the two mills, bond it out and you pay the bond on an annual basis and start construction sooner than later.

Williams asked if the S.T.I.P. identifies any tentative date for a bridge. She said that she knows it is in our Long Range Transportation Plan, but is there any discussion at the State level as to when that might come back. Haugen responded that the S.T.I.P. is only out to 2021, and the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. do not have any discussion about additional river crossings between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. West stated that he doesn't know if it ever would, would it. Haugen responded that it would. West said, though, that it isn't a State Road, and there aren't federal dollars involved. Haugen responded that you would still need to have federal approval as it is regionally significant, so yes it would.

Johnson commented that the tie-in that might come is the permitting process you would need across the river will probably require some sort of federal nexus, and that will, even if you are using 100% local funds, that will tie it all back in to some sort of federal nexus that might require it to be in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. in order for it to get a permit approved.

Haugen reported that the next item is Draft Goals/Objectives/Standards. He said that these were distributed out last month, asking for your comments by next week.

Haugen commented that since that meeting, we have been discussing, at various times, about autonomous vehicles and how they might be impacting the future of our transportation system. He added that if you read last month's minutes we state that it is too much of a wild guess, but there are some things that we are going to be doing to consider advances in autonomous vehicles and also connected vehicles; vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to infrastructure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Haugen stated that in 2019 we are going to be updating our ITS Regional Architecture, and at that time we will have to build a framework for the software capabilities of communicating back and forth so we added this language into Goal #6, where our current stuff that relates primarily to ITS Architecture exists. He referred to a slide showing these goals and objectives and went over them briefly, explaining that the reason we aren't keeping this right under the architecture as a standard is because a lot of this advances outside of the architecture itself, so we are trying to keep in mind what autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles can provide.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen could send the document out again that he wants comments on to ensure she has the correct one. Haugen responded he would do that. He added that the only comments that have been received so far are from MnDOT.

Haugen reported that, lastly, they were going to try to take some time to talk about the programming side of target setting, but due to scheduling issues we are not able to do it at this time, but he is still hopeful that prior to our decision in February that we can schedule a special meeting to have that discussion take place. He said that they are also continuing to work with both States on PM2 and PM3 measures which are due in May at the State level.

Haugen said that you should be getting, from the constant contact e-mails, a reminder to do the financial tool that is currently on-line. He pulled up the webpage: theforksstreets2045.org, and asked that everyone please go to the site and participate in the activity. He added that they currently have around 50 responses to this on-line tool, so if you wouldn't mind sharing it, that would be helpful as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program progress report was included for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 10TH,
2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:10 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 14th, 2018, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning.

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Darren Laesch, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, David Kuharenko, Brad Gengler, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, and Rich Sanders.

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

Guests present: Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local District; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; and Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 10TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY RIESINGER, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 10TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFQ FOR EAST GRAND FORKS RIGHT-OF-WAY ADA
TRANSITION PLAN**

Kouba reported that East Grand Forks recently submitted a request for assistance from the MPO to do an ADA Transition Plan for them, and the project was amended into our Annual Unified Work Plan, and are now bringing forward the RFP (Request For Quotes).

Kouba explained that, although the MPO typically uses an RFP (Request For Proposal) process for its projects, it was decided that because of the low budget, we would instead seek quotes from pre-qualified consultants so that we can have at least three options to choose from.

Kouba commented that the scope-of-work for the RFQ is very similar to what it would be for a RFP. She added that we are only looking at City Right-Of-Way, sidewalks, curb-ramps, policy review, and those are the basic scope-of-work points.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE DRAFT RFQ FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION
PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and
Riesinger.***

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette,
Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2018-2021 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this agenda item is the proposed amendment to our T.I.P. on the East Grand Forks side and will affect their current 2018 programmed projects.

Haugen explained that previously East Grand Forks had decided to delay the round-about at Bygland and Rhinehart until perhaps 2022; so they had to fill in some projects to use the federal funds this year so they identified, and we amended into the T.I.P. several projects. He stated that one of those projects was to address a poor pavement segment on Rhinehart, but now that they have done a more conceptual rendering of the round-about, it was determined that it may impact more of Rhinehart, so they want to amend the project scope to affect less length of street reconstruction, resulting in a reduction in cost. He said that they would like to move the roughly \$230,000 in extra funding to 17th Street to do some sidewalk improvements.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet is the more current information on the transition from a mini round-about to a modern round-about, which shows how it may extend more into Rhinehart Drive, and also where they are identifying to shift the roughly \$230,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Haugen stated that they did advertise this as a public hearing so he would open the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Haugen closed the public hearing and added that no written or verbal comments were submitted by noon today either.

Haugen summarized that, again, this is a project that is going to be done this year, utilizing the federal funds that are available to East Grand Forks this year.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF FHWA/MN GUIDANCE ON INCORPORATING PERFORMANCE MEASURES INTO T.I.P.

Haugen reported that by the end of May of this year, if we take any action on our T.I.P., whether it is approving a new T.I.P. or amending the current T.I.P.; that T.I.P. needs to address the requirements of the FAST Act in regards to performance measures. He added that in May the only one that the MPO will have in place would be the safety targets, then any action we do after May on the T.I.P. would require us to have something in the T.I.P. document regarding the safety performance.

Haugen stated that North Dakota is typically our lead agency, and we take guidance from the North Dakota side for both State and Federal, but in this particular instance, because of the delay on the North Dakota side on the development of a T.I.P./S.T.I.P., we had to produce separate documents; a Minnesota side T.I.P. and a North Dakota side T.I.P., so Minnesota Federal Highway has provided guidance, which MnDOT has supported it, that states that we should be proactive and amend our T.I.P. so that if we have to do anything after May it is already taken care of.

Haugen commented that Federal Highway MN provided; and included in your packet were the support presentation and the draft document, which is out for comment; that included in the T.I.P. you would see the four frameworks and introductions to performance measures. He stated that the anticipated affect are investment priorities, and then a conclusion section.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Haugen said that we have not gotten any guidance from the North Dakota side, this is guidance from the Minnesota side and it is “strongly” encouraging the MPOs to do this prior to May, and so one of the questions that he would ask this body is do you feel the need to be proactive to get the Minnesota side T.I.P. into what the Feds and State might consider as good status in case any future action is needed, or, since this is a guidance and not a requirement, do you want to wait until you actually need to do something to a Minnesota T.I.P.

Williams asked if the NDDOT is working on something like this that we will be seeing shortly. Johnson responded that they have been visiting internally about what they need to do to get any documents that need to be updated by May figured out, in terms of which documents it applies to; and also to what level of detail they need to go into. He stated that they are getting close to the point where they are going to have something drafted up to share with the Feds and the MPOs, but they need to figure out a couple of things, like if they will go with full-blown compliance, because there are different deadlines of MAP-21 and FAST for when you are going update documents or authorize project and knowing what is in effect, so they haven’t completely figured it out yet. Williams asked if it would be released in time for the Technical Advisory Committee to take action at our May meeting. Johnson responded that they will have to.

Bergman asked if this is only for highway dollars, or is it for anything. Haugen responded that it would be for anything. He added that the amendment to the T.I.P. is the current issue right now, and he isn’t anticipating, or he isn’t aware of any amendment to the Transportation Plan, and this would be an amendment to our T.I.P.

Haugen commented that he knows that amendments to our T.I.P. are more common and frequent than planned, and we know that typically, come fall, when we adopt a new T.I.P., and in fact we are talking about the new T.I.P. today, and have the last several months, so at some point we will have to address, in some fashion, incorporating performance measures into our T.I.P. He added that right now the uniqueness is that we have a separate Minnesota T.I.P. and North Dakota T.I.P.; and we don’t know if this fall we will have a unified T.I.P., or if we will be in the position to have two separate documents because of scheduling; but since we currently had a separate Minnesota T.I.P. the Minnesota Feds and State are strongly recommending to all their MPOs, which does include us, to take action in May to address these things so there isn’t anything in the way of a possible amendment in June or July, but from a requirement point of view, we really only have to address this after May, so we may not have to address it until we adopt the next cycle of T.I.P. Williams said, then, that it isn’t due in May it just needs to be included in anything that is approved after May. Haugen responded that that is correct, but that we are being highly encouraged, so we have to have a discussion as to how we want to respond as a group, do we want to say that it is good guidance if we want to be proactive, but perhaps we are fairly confident that we won’t have any more amendments on the Minnesota side after the one next month, and therefore we will just say thanks for the guidance but we will just wait.

Haugen commented that it also gives some framework as to what the federal perspective is of what it is to comply with the incorporation into the T.I.P. Bergman stated, though, that it doesn’t list the performance measures that you have to meet. Haugen responded that because in May of 2018 the only performance targets that are in place would be the safety targets, so if we were to draft for the May timeframe, it would only be addressing the safety targets. He said that if we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

are active, the PM2 and PM3 targets, the State has to adopt theirs by the end of May 2018, but the MPO has another 180 days, so that would get us to about October, then we would have to address all of them, but for now, until October, it is only the safety targets.

Haugen stated that, though, that after this year, when we have these two different timing issues, our T.I.P. will be addressing all the performance measures from this point forward as long as they are still required.

Bergman once these targets are in there is it something that we will need to throw additional money in for a project, is this something that we currently don't do that we are going to have to throw more money at or lose out on a project. Haugen responded that we won't, not with what we are talking about here. He explained that this would just be identifying, in our current T.I.P. we have projects, almost every project has a safety component to it, some are funded solely out of the safety program, others are funded with other funds but there is still a safety component to it, so we are talking about the project that are currently in the T.I.P. and even though we may or may not be doing statewide targets, we are also expected to focus on those targets that impact our Metropolitan Planning Area, so we do have to drill a little bit down into how targets are affecting the MPO area.

Haugen reported that he asked, from a T.I.P. point of view, if they were to give guidance on a plan document point of view what that might look at, and they said that this would probably be the framework.

Williams said, though, that at this point we could proceed, but then North Dakota might come in with something a little bit different, would we have to go back and amend it. Haugen responded that we would only be addressing the Minnesota side T.I.P., so in this instance it isn't totally being viewed as solely North Dakota led because we have these two separate documents. He added that he doesn't believe that North Dakota formally vetted through the Minnesota side T.I.P, it was done by Minnesota.

Ellis commented that, from her point of view, being on the Minnesota side, she would say "thank you, and we will keep these in mind for when we have to start doing it in May, but no I'm not going to proactively do it until I'm required to do it". She added that if the State is really looking at things, but they haven't started it, why would we, these are all things to keep in mind so we will be fully prepared for when we have to do that for amendments after May, but thank you for your guidance. Haugen agreed that he isn't looking to do extra work, but we have to discuss and respond to this.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY VIEW THIS AS GUIDANCE, AND THAT IT BE INCORPORATED WHEN NECESSARY AND NOT BEFORE.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2019-2022 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that we are still implementing FAST, and the last agenda item did talk about how things might be impacted by FAST; so as clarification or a qualifier, what we do today might be subject to additional action in the future regarding the outcome of FAST.

Haugen pointed out that there are three specific programs, and each one has a separate staff report. He said that the three grant programs are as follows:

a. Urban Grant (Main Street Initiative)

Haugen stated that we received two applications from the City of Grand Forks, who was also working with the University of North Dakota. He said that both projects are in the Columbia/Coulee area of the UND Campus.

Haugen reported that one project is to address the median that is along that corridor, and make improvements/modifications to possibly reduce the access and turning movements allowed as well as other items. He said that the City and UND are requesting that be funded in 2019.

Haugen stated that the second project is to follow-up in 2020 to install pedestrian ornamental lighting, some bus shelters, and some other receptacles and things along the corridor to create that unique character that is being conceptualized between Columbia to coulee.

Haugen commented that there is a document, a Master Plan, that was done by JLG Architects. He showed some of the graphics from that document, and stated that they give us a conceptual sense of the median, and then the possible construction of the bus shelters.

Haugen reported that when reviewing these applications there were some questions that came up; the first was if Phase 1 isn't done does it preclude Phase 2, and if Phase 2 isn't done does that preclude Phase 1. Williams responded that they are free standing projects, so one would not require the other.

Bergman asked where was CAT brought into this project. He said that he sees they are replacing shelters, which of the five existing shelters in that area are they planning on replacing. Williams responded that they just had to put something in for line items for some dollars, so this is just a very very preliminary concept level thing to get the ball rolling because they had a very short timeframe on it, but there will be many more meetings held and CAT will certainly be included in them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Grasser stated that he would add that the City was reacting to, in a relatively short timeframe, alternatives for the grants program. He explained that UND was in the process of formulating the concepts, and they are still concurrent with this, and actually preceded this and was hiring a consultant so that they could start analyzing traffic counts, alternatives that they might want apply to a street or to the area; so we need to look at these concepts as features that were costed out as potentials in the project, they are not a defined scope saying that we are going to do three shelters, or do one, or which ones we are going to do, but for the grant we had to have some way of coming up with a cost estimate, and, literally they were still getting cost estimates from the consultant that UND hired, the day they were preparing the report, so philosophically the idea was that if UND wanted to pursue some of those things that are going to be more environmentally impactful, which would be moving curbs and doing work on the median, those would precede the mill and overlay project in 2020, and with the idea that some of the other things that might be less impactful, like lighting and such, could probably go either concurrent, or as part of the mill and overlay project so that we don't have any environmental issues associated with it.

Grasser reported that the project that UND is envisioning is actually quite a bit larger than what they are portraying here; what they did, from a strategy standpoint, was to try to target roughly a million dollars or so because their understanding was that the programs would probably be in the \$6 million dollar range, at State, so it would be foolhardy for them to ask for \$3 million dollars on a six million dollar project, so right or wrong with what little information they had to go by they kind of targeted these things around that \$1 million dollar range. He added that this is more a financial concept, and what it is that they are going to do is still being developed by UND, but it is too early in the formative stage, UND literally at this point in time doesn't know exactly what they want to do, so this is a financial concept more so than what is going to be done.

Bergman asked if this is really kind of putting the cart before the horse, so to speak. He said that the reason he is asking is because if you are going to be doing Phase 1 with the road repair, they would be looking at if there is some way of putting a cut-away in there to get those buses off the road and keep traffic flowing. He added that he was kind of stunned looking at what you are going to put in for bus shelters. He said that there is a bus shelter in front of the Student Union that was \$92,000; and then you are looking at \$62,000 for one replacement. He stated that the other question would be what amenities are you going to be looking at because if you start putting signage in there, benches, and heat, which is what they have in there now; to him it is like someone is throwing this project on the plate and saying "I need some money here" and "I need some money there", how soon are we going to start looking at the real cost the project is going to be, that is his only concern.

Grasser responded that they are in the process of starting that, they have hired a consultant, and they will start having some meetings. He added that these cost estimates have not been vetted through the City, there isn't a second set of eyes on these things, they are literally an architect's rendering and thoughts, so bear that in mind; and as we go through the public vetting process those things will be brought to the table and figured out, but right now there are too many unknowns, although what they think they know is that if we are going to do this anywhere in the realm of the mill and overlay project, which is a 2020 project, the UND area has one strike against it because it isn't in the downtown. He said that once we get done with the downtown

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

area in 2019 or 2020, then he thinks we will want, as a community, to focus those dollars back downtown, so if we are going to try to get money into this area, this is probably the one shot; and it is messy and it is sloppy, but otherwise they really don't have any other projects to utilize these monies.

Bergman reported that another thing to note is that they have been contacted by the University to take over their buses, they want out of it by July of 2019, so they are in the process right now to try to figure out the cost of doing that before saying yes or no.

Noehre asked if this would be one potential funding source, or are there multiple sources such as City funds, University funds, or such; this wouldn't be the entire project would it. Grasser responded yes, no and maybe. He explained that the actual project they are envisioning is probably twice what this application is. He said that they have talked about that they have raised some monies internally, and the President has targeted some dollars towards their campus architecture and promotional activities, that is one source of dollars; and they have talked to the City about if they are going to do curb and gutter and the median work, can it be special assessed, so special assessments may come into play, so if the Urban Grant request were to be turned down, UND and the City will have to decide how many of these things do we pursue and do we do it under special assessments or some other locally funded program. He stated that he thinks there is awareness and appreciation, they are trying not to mess with the 2020 mill and overlay project, but again we should recognize that curb and gutter work and some of those things should be done before we do the mill and overlay, so the general idea is targeting 2019 to construct those types of activities that could impact the roadway, and things that wouldn't directly impact the roadway could be pushed back a year to give us more time to develop cost estimates.

Discussion on additional proposed UND projects ensued.

Haugen reported that this may be the time to look at some things Transit has been trying to get along University Avenue. He explained that they would like to see additional and updated shelters. He said that this is where some of these questions have been coming from; the first question was that Transit has been trying to get additional shelters, there are five there now and they would like to have seven; and he thinks the answer is that you are capped at one million.

Haugen stated that the other thing is that there is a need for some clean-up in the application, correcting some inaccurate information. Williams asked if he had received the e-mail stating that there would be some updated pages coming soon.

Haugen commented that this is a brand new program; our typical actions when we get T.I.P. candidate projects is to review them for consistency with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and to prioritize the projects. He said that, since this is a brand new program it wasn't contemplated with our list of projects in our transportation plan so it we did not have the ability to do a really good job of consistency. He stated that our transportation plan is a multi-model plan, and it does address more than one mode and is trying to provide a corridor that provides transportation choices for different types of users, so from that point of view staff agrees that it is

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018

consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and that both projects should receive top priority ranking.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN GRANT CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF FORTHCOMING AMENDED PAGES.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

Haugen commented that this is now a permanent program of the NDDOT, and the anticipation is that it will become an annual solicitation similar to the TAP program, so what we will have to wrestle with is that when we fiscally constrain our transportation plan how do we scope out projects that might be able to make use of these things, and then also do we try to identify which corridors are the candidate corridors, or which areas in town. He pointed out that there is a map that he included in this, so how do we shape this up for our list of projects in our transportation plan.

Williams asked if he anticipates that in the future they are all going to come out at the same times as the HSIP and other programs. Haugen responded that that is the hope.

Grasser reported that the City Council has talked about doing a Downtown Master Plan, hopefully by next year, that will offer, from the City's standpoint, guidance as to what kind of projects we might be looking at. Haugen said that it would help in the short term period, but this is twenty-plus years of trying to scope. Grasser stated that, in any event he thinks one of the guiding documents that the City will go by will be that Downtown Master Plan. Haugen agreed that it can certainly set aside revenue sources separate from the other ones. He added that it is only funding certain things in certain areas; it has a focused area but it also has said it will fund other areas in the community, just won't do roadways in the greenfield areas.

Grasser stated that we don't know yet from a statewide basis if there is \$200,000,000 worth of demand in the core area statewide, and \$20,000,000 in funding; so he doesn't want to spend a lot of time developing projects that are questionable because they happen to be outside the actual regular funding programs. Haugen responded that Mr. Johnson is listening and taking good notes as to how to help us with this conversation the next several months. Noehre added that once the first application process goes through there will be some indication of that; will it be a final answer because everybody will take that as some indication and will make adjustments the next year, so it might take three or four years to really get down to a full answer. Grasser commented that his guess is that we will probably be the one application that is probably outside of the designated area, so we will see.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

b. Urban Local

Haugen commented that, if you will recall, the FY2021 in both the T.I.P. and the S.T.I.P. identified zero programs, but when the NDDOT released the solicitation for the FY2022 year they did identify in that release their tentative program of what FY2021 would be and he included a list of projects for Grand Forks/East Grand Forks in the staff report. He stated that our current FY2021 T.I.P. document has zero projects for the Urban Local Program, but in this tentative list they are showing the project that was requested as our candidate project our last go-around as being tentatively programmed in the year we requested, FY2021, and the dollar values are the same, so our FY2021 request appears to have already been preliminarily chosen for funding.

Haugen pointed out that there were no other changes in the rest of the years so we are only looking at the new year of the T.I.P., FY2022. He stated that the City of Grand Forks is requesting 23 signal locations to be updated/upgraded. He said that one of the challenges we have is that when go back to our reference document we don't see this project showing up in the plan, so as staff, we are struggling with how it competes against those projects that were listed and vetted through the process.

Haugen reported that when you read through the document, this is just getting us signals that are like what we have; there are no statements incorporating the new technology that we do identify in the plan that we want to progress towards as we make major investments in our signal system. So those are the two projects that we have to consider; one is the North Columbia Road reconstruction that we vetted through last year and that looks like it is tentatively programmed for FY2021 as requested, and the second is how do we address the FY2022 request with the fundamental issue of consistency with the plan.

Haugen commented that he couldn't read anything in the document that gives him a sense of whether the new technologies are being incorporated. He said that the document does talk about how many of these signals haven't been touched for tens of years, so this might be the one time we invest in signals for quite a number of years into the future, so how do we, some of this technology is already capable of being done out in our corridors with just a few added components, so that is something for the Technical Advisory Committee to decide.

Williams asked, when you talk about "the plan", in the Long Range Transportation Plan we have ITS and all of that as part of the plan; or are you talking about specific line items in the financial plan. Haugen responded that we have an ITS Regional Architect document that identifies some projects, and if they were done this is the architectural components that have to be in place for them, but that is not a fiscally constrained document. He stated that the one that is fiscally constrained is the one that lists street and highway projects, there is the TDP that is fiscally constrained that lists the transit projects, so, again, when we listed those projects at that time we didn't have any discussion about traffic signals to the magnitude of this upgrade, so we assigned another project to spend the money that this project is not trying to be prioritized, so that is the discussion we are having. He added that we are in the midst of updating our Metropolitan

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Transportation Plan by this fall, through that process we will have identified it's a higher priority than what the other projects were that weren't identified in the place.

Bergman asked if what he is looking for, then, is clarification on the application to upgrade the signals to meet the technology. Haugen responded that he thinks the first one is that there were projects that were identified that were a higher priority at the time than this one, this one wasn't even discussed as he recalls, looking back at the minutes there wasn't anything that showed doing twenty-three traffic signals on the local side, but we did discuss a way, he prioritized projects that would spend the money, and so those ones would be consistent if they came forward and requested monies, this is a project that is not one of those projects that is in the plan, so that is the struggle. Grasser commented that that is a good question because back when we adopted the plan we talked about the new rules that hadn't been invented yet; new standards requiring the flashing yellow lights and all those new regulatory features and new technology that wasn't even envisioned yet, and so philosophically are we trying to be bound by the list or are we looking for plan consistency to be consistent with the goals and objectives of the plan itself because we are trying now to bring the system up to compliance with the new technology and regulations that are out there. He added that he thinks these lists, recognizing that, how do you handle things at the time you got the list, and he struggles with having some of the specificity of a list in the first place, but what is consistency of the plan, to him this would be consistent with the plan, it just isn't consistent with the list.

Noehre commented that the plan is really a state of good repair, and that is what this project is trying to do, it puts the signals in a state of good repair, and if you look at how it fits among all the other available things, would you prioritize it above or below, it should go to achieve that state of good repair, so we amend the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. and all of that, and there are opportunities to amend the plan as well. Grasser asked if this needs to be amended into the plan or would it just be recognizing that it is consistent with the plan. Haugen responded that in the middle of updating the Transportation Plan it seems odd to amend the plan and four months later have a new plan in place, so it is an interpretation of consistency, that is what is before the Technical Advisory Committee. He added that there were projects that were prioritized that this is going to shift, and as projects shift and get delayed, they increase in cost so when there are other projects that get shifted because of less dollars being available, at some point there is a project or two that we previously prioritized that may now not be in the plan. Grasser said that he would disagree with that because if you can bring the system up to speed and get all the newest hardware and software into it, as a general plan, now we don't have to tackle the traffic signals that would otherwise be addressed as part of individual project, so to him it should pretty much work out. He added that in the world of electronics we want to be careful that we don't have over the course of ten or fifteen years three or four generations of computers and those types of things, we want to get all the software and upgrade all the controllers to be compatible, because otherwise those costs are increasing our current projects as we are integrating the ITS and the interconnect and communication within the system. He stated that he doesn't know that he would say definitively that that increases the cost.

Noehre reported that this also suggests that in developing the plan we did the best we could, four or five years ago, to figure out what the future held; and for the most part did very well, but there are still some little bits and pieces that we need to plug into the plan, the reality is that even

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

though we plan we still have to make adjustments because we didn't perceive things, and new technology becomes available, etc.

Haugen commented that when we get to the end of our five year cycle of the plan, and we are programming projects for another four years beyond, what we did five years ago, now we have the odd situation where we are still trying to be consistent with our plan, updating our plan to reflect new things, and program projects that are beyond the short-range of our current plan, so there is this skewism in the system process that we have. Noehre stated that five years from now we are going to be doing the same thing on a similar schedule. Haugen said that he would suggest that maybe we look at a plan amendment in four years to address this issue if these are things that are coming down that, on the regional system we are rescoping projects considerably, in his opinion, that we actually try to get ahead of that question instead of being here at this moment trying to answer that question. Williams said that she thinks we did discuss that though during the last one, that was one of the things that they brought up and discussed; that this is the list right now, but we don't know what safety issues we may have to address next week or a year later. She added that she recalls that we all agreed at that time that there would be amendments to this list, as different things come up, and she sees that this can be consistent with that previous discussion we had. Bergman commented that he doesn't think that we even discussed the safety issues then. Williams agreed that it wasn't even part of it. Bergman said that it came up after. Williams agreed, adding that we have things to comply with now that weren't even there and we did it four or five years ago and it was based on information that was two or three years old.

Ellis stated that she thinks we do our best to try to see what your goals and objectives are, and what the plan is, but every year local government, elected officials, state officials, federal officials see different priorities and that becomes their goal, that priority, and that in fact changes your plans or what you want to do in five years because their priority has changed, so we are trying to address those changes from your board, council, etc. Noehre added that stuff gets older and starts breaking down faster. Ellis agreed, adding that that then becomes a priority. She said that she would love to put together a 20-year plan and then just throw it out at the council and say here you go, this is what we are doing this year, and have them agree to it and give her money, but that just doesn't happen.

Grasser cited an example, in that they adopted the last plan, and then the 35W Bridge collapsed, and that changed how both states repair their bridges, which is why we need a level of flexibility, to allow for changes that might come up.

Haugen commented that there is certainly a process that is in place to address these changes, the governing document is the Long Range Transportation Plan, and the T.I.P. is a short timeframe of programming projects from that transportation plan. He said that, given the documents we were presented, and the information we were presented in a timeframe where a short review had to take place, we probably took the most conservative route and said that it doesn't appear to be consistent, and placed it on the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board to make the decision. Grasser said, then, that the MPO staff is saying that the list, that is what you are basing your inconsistency determination on. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that there are other projects that were identified and deemed in place that were going to use these funds, as these projects that are now being requested replace those projects, that scope

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

out, ideally it wouldn't be at a T.I.P. time where we have to make a decision that we are switching projects, or switching scopes of projects, in his opinion.

Noehre stated that he would then ask for the analysis of your comparison of those, why you would not agree that one is better than the other, or how you are making the determination. He asked if that analysis were available. Haugen responded that it would be the analysis of the minutes and everything else we went through with the Long Range Transportation Plan process to identify the projects that we did, that is what he would have. Noehre said, then, that it is just what Mr. Grasser said; okay it is not on the list, that is the only analysis that was done to come to the determination that it doesn't meet the transportation plan, you'd think the plan would be more than just the list. Haugen responded that those projects were based off the plan, there wasn't just a plan document here, and the list goes here, they are joined; and as we discussed, the scope of projects, and the fiscal constraint issue, we discussed are we going for this type of scope for those projects or to try to squeeze out the fiscal constraint issue and get as much done, then we would go with this scope for the project. Noehre said that we should do a plan amendment then, isn't that the solution. Haugen responded that that is what he is suggesting, that unless you want to find it is consistent, that is fine too.

Noehre reported that he always thought that, philosophically we don't know which project is going to go out beyond, but it seems like it is consistent for state of good repairs to him, keeping the signal system working, our entire transportation system is important. Williams said that there is also safety issues with the Opticon too. Noehre stated that if the signals go down we are in trouble.

Ellis asked which other projects these are replacing. Haugen responded that they are replacing overlays on collectors and things of that nature. He added that he would think that maybe the sales tax increase will take care of those projects.

Bergman commented that he just doesn't think that this project is part of the state of good repair.

Noehre stated that would be how he would look at it, that it would be part of the state of good repair because it is consistent with the plan. Grasser added that it is probably also consistent with the technology as well. He suggested that it is starting to sound to him like at some point we will need executive guidance from MPO Board on how to govern some of these determinations; are we on the list or not on the list. He said that he struggles with trying to identify the cost and which is the best project to be done ten to fifteen years from now; that just isn't possible. Ellis added that it also seems like funding will wholeheartedly going to adjust what our list looks like and what we are going to be able to accomplish and whatnot, and not just from a federal standpoint; if you've adopted a tax, if we are holding firm to a five year plan then nothing better change in those five years, and that isn't the way it works. Bergman commented that we are seeing the federal dollars being cut back and having to shove projects back because of it, how does that affect the plan. He added that a plan is just a guide, we have it in there, but he thinks we need to look at it and update it every year.

Noehre commented that we just talked about the Urban Grant Program, which is affecting dollars that go into the plan. Haugen said that financing the Urban Grant Program causes a negligible

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

effect on the Urban Local program. Noehre added that there wasn't new money from anywhere, it was taken from the entire plan and put into Main Street. Grasser said that the State Legislature may weigh in on that yet as well.

Noehre stated that the board could look at it the opposite way, that would be hamstringing their ability too, because once they approve the plan, its done that way for the next five years. Haugen commented that, again, there is always the mechanism of amending the plan in-between the five year, it isn't a one and done and wait five years and don't react to change, in-fact we are required to act if there is significant change. He cited that if the feds decrease the 5307 Program dramatically we would have to change our plan, we don't just sit with a plan, we have to change.

Noehre said that there is no policy that says that changes cannot be made the last year of the plan either, is there. Haugen responded that there isn't, but within three to four months before the plan expires it wouldn't make sense to make an amendment, it would be way too messy to do so.

Noehre asked if they can find these projects consistent and roll them into the new plan. Haugen responded that they would be rolled into the new plan if they are found consistent with the current plan and programmed.

MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MP EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN LOCAL ROADS CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

c. Urban Regional

Haugen stated that the Urban Regional Program had quite a bit more changes, more projects being impacted. He said that the maybe the easy question would be about the North Washington Street segments that are already programmed for FY2019, but have been submitted for consideration in FY2021 and he is wondering how they are different, are they the same, what is going on, maybe that is the easy one to talk about. Noehre referred to the staff report from the City of Grand Forks, and pointed out that on the spreadsheet there is an asterisk by this project, and that the footnote says that is anticipated to dual fund this project, approximately 1/2 of the federal funds for the structure will be funded outside of the Urban Program. He added that this project was basically requested earlier, with the 2018-2021 S.T.I.P. it is shown for construction in 2020, but they are now requesting this project be delayed and that funding be increased based on change in year of expenditure. Haugen commented that he did not receive that information, so based on what he received it just said "these three segments of North Washington should be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

moved to FY2021”. He said that he asked but did not get a response, but now he hears that it is being delayed. Noehre responded that that is the request.

Noehre commented that he doesn’t understand the table; what is “application answer”. Haugen responded that one of the last questions we have in our application is whether it is consistent with the plan or not, and so how you answer that question is how he is reflecting it in the table. Noehre said then that it is a yes or no on consistency, and what does the MPO staff comment “concurrence or nonconcurrence” mean. Haugen responded that we agree with how the application answered that question. Noehre said, then, that if they check no it doesn’t meet the plan and you agree. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated that, again, consistency with the plan for the South Washington Underpass Reconstruction, we have been trying to finance that for too many years, but it looks like the State now has programmed it as reconstruction in FY2022, using half of the money from the Urban Program and funding the other half from another program in their program of projects. He said that the regional request also has a reconstruction going on, there is a small study request to be done prior to that of \$100,000; and, again, it is unusual for the Urban Regional Program to be funding studies, and he isn’t aware of any other time when we studied something out of the Urban Regional pot.

Grasser commented that, based on our earlier discussion, and taking from the City side the South Washington Underpass Study, consistent with the plan, it probably actually should be answered “yes” as opposed to “no” as the “no” would have said “no it’s not on the list”, but, number one it is still part of the state of good repair and both keep transportation systems open, and number two he would hope that we aren’t trying to program \$100,000 projects necessarily in our Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that we aren’t, but added that we are probably not also trying to program \$100,000 out of the Regional Program.

Noehre said that he would like to go through a little history on this project. He stated that it used to be that in order to do anything with the pavement you had to address the structure, guardrail, everything. He cited the Sorlie Bridge as an example, explaining that they kicked that can down the road a number of times because they wanted to upgrade the bridge rail and fix the bump more than twelve years ago but they couldn’t because they would have to address the bridge and everything along with it, but those rules have since changed and this project came into focus primarily because of the pavement, not because of the bridge, and so now there is the potential of addressing the pavement without addressing the bridge as well. He reported that when the corridor study was done cores were taken, and found ASR in the newest part of the bridge, but it just identified that it was there, it didn’t identify what the rate of deterioration is of the structure, if it will last 6 months or 60 years, so local government has been asking him how long it is going to last, and he can’t answer that, the MPO can’t answer that, so we need to answer that question and before we spend \$18,000,000 on something we probably should know if it is the right time so that is why in their discussions on the regional system it was determined that we maybe should spend a little bit more money and determine how long it is going to last.

Noehre reported that the report that KLJ did last time was good, their technical report on the structure was good, but we didn’t ask the question, and they didn’t answer the question of how

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

long it is going to last, what is the rate of deterioration, and that is what this attempts to do, to look at and answer the question “where is that deterioration of the concrete and how long is it projected to last?”. He said that the answer could lead us down several paths, probably spending the dollars, it might last us another 30, 40, 50 years, maybe it is time to address the pavement only, but if it isn't going to last that long then let us address it all, but without knowing the answer we are just simply spending \$18,000,000.

Haugen said that he would ask a couple more questions; are you going to do a NEPA document, a project development, do nothing is always an outcome that you have to look at; and isn't this core sample outside of doing the project development, wouldn't that be included in this cost that is already priced out here for the actual tentatively programmed project. Noehre responded that he would guess that is an option, it is just the only option.

Grasser stated that he thinks part of the question is how are you affecting your timelines, if you do this as part of your project development work, and you find out you need to replace the bridge, now did you price rehab the bridge or did you not price replace the bridge and the shoe-fly and all of those activities in your project, if you did you are going to have a really high cost project so you are back to the issue of financial constraint. He said that with the bridge, in his opinion, if you wait and discover during the project development, it creates another project then that has to be done five or six or seven years out, and if you're not going to do a bridge project in just a couple of years you are going to need to buy property, you are going to need to do all those things, so part of this is, to the people that are working the projects you need to understand what is a reasonable course of action as opposed to what is in a planning document, because you can do any of those things but you need to understand what the consequences are, and we think that it is better to understand whether this bridge has got a five year life or a fifty year life so you can properly program both that project and any of the other projects, again without turning it into a \$50,000,000 project because we probably can't handle that in the short-term. He said, though, that on the other hand we also don't want to delay it and have a structural failure either, and have the public wonder why we weren't doing our due diligence.

Noehre commented that the only precedent that he may have dealt with, MnDOT was the lead on the Kennedy and they did a study prior to project development. Haugen said it was funded with State dollars. Haugen stated that it could be funded out of the Regional program, but it has never been funded that he knows of out of the Regional Program. Bergman asked, though, if it isn't a regional road. Haugen responded that it is on the State Highway. Noehre asked if the MPO would want to take it on using planning dollars. Haugen responded that we do have unallocated monies, but he doesn't know how much more of an in-depth analysis can be done than what was done. He said that the reason he asks that is because there is an end to where our planning dollars can go, it went as far as it did to get you what got in the current report, and it identified the chemical reaction that is irreversible. Williams said, then, that the rest of the study would come out of the regional dollars. Noehre agreed that that would seem logical.

Williams stated that it would also make sense from a standpoint that the core samples and everything would actually have a date when the first ones were taken and a date when the second ones are taken then they can look at a rate of deterioration because it is very difficult to develop something off of one data plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Noehre said that in the staff report you say that it is looking at 50% of funding from outside sources; so bridge dollars, rural dollars; bridge division has already been asking him for the last couple of years, how long is it going to last before they are really interested in replacing the bridge, and, again, he can't answer without doing something like this, he doesn't know how else to do it but he is open to any suggestions.

Johnson asked about the condition of the planning study of the structures, what year is that being proposed for then what is the plan of the FY2022 project, leave it as is, move it out, he didn't hear that part. Haugen responded that they are asking for regional dollars for FY2018, and that dollar amount is \$100,000 with an 80/20 split; and then the FY2022 project is still being programmed as a reconstruction at the cost that is in the tentative program of projects that was released with the solicitation.

Johnson commented that the one thing he will note is that they have already been working, internally, on the FY2022 project to determine who would take the lead on the project development task, but they haven't gotten the decision back yet from their design and bridge departments, but it was their intent to get that project moving yet this year if at all possible, not only to investigate some of the stuff that Mr. Noehre and Mr. Grasser are bringing up on the structure, but also to get going on their coordination with BNSF. He explained that they have had some real hurdles to cover with the coordination on railroad structures with BNSF, so the sooner they can start the project the better. Noehre responded that he is fine with starting on the project development, as Mr. Haugen said, and we start on it in FY2018, so we can complete the investigation and get an answer to those questions, he is fine with it not being a regional project, but he is not fine with leaving it until FY2020. Grasser added that under the understanding that that process will start in FY2018 we will accomplish the same thing we are trying to accomplish as a separate project, so he is fine with it as well. Johnson stated that that is their goal, and the document, the OPD is up for a decision right now; if they come back and say that they are going to keep it, then they will act accordingly, but if it goes out to a consultant the plan is that they would start working on the RFP and get it going as soon as they can. He said that the one caveat he would throw out there is that they are limited on how much money they have gotten so far this year, they only have their extension and appropriations through March sometime, so we might have to wait until we get a little bit more money so we have enough for the project, but their goal is to get it going so they can start the coordination as soon as possible.

Haugen stated that he doesn't know if you want to pursue the MPO financing part of that or not. He added that we could get started on it sooner than perhaps federal appropriations, continuing resolutions.

Discussion on funding ensued.

MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE MPO ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018

Voting Aye: *Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.*

Voting Nay: *None.*

Abstain: *None.*

Absent: *Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.*

d. 47th Avenue Interchange

Haugen reported that the next item on the table is the 47th Avenue Interchange request. He said that, again, one is starting the NEPA document and the other is, in FY2023, to try to construct the interchange.

Haugen commented that the first request is a \$2,000,000.00 request, 50% would be financed by City funds; so it is a \$1 million dollar request for the Regional Program.

Grasser said that, to be clear, this is to study the traffic issues on 32nd Avenue South. He pointed out they are identifying the interchange, based off of the I-29 report, but it is technically a resolution of the traffic issues on 32nd. Haugen agreed, adding that our Long Range Transportation Plan is revisiting the I-29 study, with the new travel demand model results, to give us some sense of did the new travel demand model provide significant changes to what the I-29 Study used as data. He commented that the first look at this shows that there was a considerable drop in demand; 6,000 to 7,000 ADT on 32nd.

Haugen said that this is all a matter of timing. He explained that, we all remember the document and graph that says that at 30%, 40%, 50% development we start to have issues, well that timing from the current demand model is showing a less steep trend of increase. Grasser stated, then, that instead of major problems on 32nd in 2025 it might be 2028 or 2030 or something like that instead.

Haugen stated that his conversation with Mr. Kuharenko was, you are going to spend money on I-29, this model result shows that the issue isn't as immediately imperative on 32nd right now, you still have your immediate issues at DeMers and at Gateway Drive to address however.

Bergman asked how the future Red River Bridge crossing would figure in with this. Haugen responded that if it comes at all it would be the recommended fiscally constrained project in our next MTP, but we aren't trying to finance it, we are just trying to get it in our programming document right now. Bergman asked how it would affect the interchange and the traffic patterns on 32nd now, wouldn't it affect all of that was well. Haugen responded that, just as the I-29 Study showed, there is weak correlation between additional river crossings and the I-29 Interchange traffic, so if we would place Red River Bridge it is not going to have a huge impact. He added that it is still showing that by 2045 there is a capacity issue on 32nd.

Grasser asked if the models indicate data relative to changes in accidents once we get rid of the left-turn offsets on 32nd, is it saying it will go away, or is it not addressing it, because he perceives that we have an immediate issue, from a traffic demand standpoint, level of service.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

He said that we may have one set of crash data and injury data and fatality data, but he thinks 32nd has a very immediate problem. He said that what he struggles with is, when you do the project in 2019 and align the left turns, how much of that will be solved, and that is an unknown to him; but he would be reluctant to assume it is going to make a huge difference, that why he is wondering if there is data out there that can answer that. Haugen responded that there is data that would suggest what range of reduction might occur with that.

Grasser reported that at some point in time you are going to be balance the level of congestion with injuries and fatalities, and that is going to be a difficult equation to try to balance. Haugen agreed, adding that the I-29 Study did identify, that based on the data it had, that there is going to be an issue at the 32nd Avenue Interchange that can't be solved with small fixes. He said that the current model is saying that because of the City's planning/landuse changes, that that issue won't be as imminent in timing, nor will there be as great an amount of traffic trying to get onto 32nd Avenue, but it is still identifying that two lanes each direction may not be sufficient by 2045.

Noehre commented that we obviously use the I-29 Study to come up with these two projects and now you are using a different model to come up with new data. Haugen responded that I-29 Corridor Study states in there that it is all subject to the transportation plan update process and being fiscally constrained, which we are now doing so it identified how we were going to prioritize these projects from outside the I-29 Study, and that's where we are at.

Grasser said that he is struggling with, how do I move forward in any one project when we are doing the corridor planning and if these models are that divergent, holy cow how do you use a corridor planning level tool to start project level planning. He stated that that was kind of shaking him up quite frankly, and we are going to have unreliable information, and we rely on those things. Noehre said that he is struggling with the same thing, then why did we even look at it, why did we do it, we wasted or time and effort and dollars, seems like. Haugen responded that he can say that we weren't wasting time, effort and dollars, we identified the issues that exist on I-29, but there was a change in land use growth that is occurring in the southwest part of Grand Forks, so that has changed how the model is reacting to the 32nd Avenue Interchange. He added that the model is not reacting too much differently than the other interchanges, so the study is still viable; there isn't enough diversion on the other recommendations to cause him to think that they have to be reexamined, but on 32nd there is enough of a change that it has to be looked at and it seems like the timing is being strung out further than the I-29 Study thought, and it is like the old analogy of the chicken and the egg, there has to be development to generate the demand. Grasser stated that that is concerning to him too; if we are showing that much model sensitivity to what he consider a not terribly big land use changes, then a developer could put something over there that we aren't seeing today that meets our land use planning, and then all of a sudden it has a big impact on the model. Noehre said that he thought we added time to this corridor study to incorporate the new land use plan. Haugen responded that they tried. Noehre added that we added time to it for that specific reason. Haugen stated that our best guess at the time was that it wasn't going to produce this big change in the result.

Noehre commented that ultimately these are models, they are not certain, they are not stiff or infallible. Haugen agreed, adding that the bigger issue is not doing the NEPA study is trying to squeeze \$36 million dollars. Grasser said that he would suggest, just from a strategic strategy

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

stand point that we still submit the request because it will be easier if we somehow get it on the list for all three years as opposed to taking it off the list and then trying to put it back on later. Haugen stated that it is the last year of the list, and the last year of the list is the wish list. Grasser agreed, adding that just because we ask for it doesn't mean they are going to get approval. Haugen stated that we typically, as an MPO, don't take any real action on that last year.

Grasser said that if we started down the path of approval, by the time we get something back next fall or next winter, we will be that much further through the process. He asked when the Long Range Transportation Plan is scheduled to be completed. Haugen responded that it is scheduled to be up for preliminary approval in October. Grasser said, then, that we will have much better information, so he would like to keep this in the pipeline, then the State will know that information too as they program projects by that time, they can do things behind the curtain that we don't see.

Washington Street Mill and Overlay

Haugen reported that the next project is the Washington Street Mill and Overlay. He stated that in our plan this is a reconstruction of the segment between DeMers and Hammerling; and again it is based off of the corridor study and is trying to address a multitude of issues. He said that he thinks this is where Mr. Noehre got the requirement that if we are going to replace concrete then we have to address all the issues in the corridor, because that was the guidance we got when we prepared the transportation plan. Noehre responded that that could be, but he thinks it was even prior to that, but things have changed since then.

Haugen commented that the transportation plan identified a project that is addressing more than just pavement preservation, it addresses other issues along the corridor as well. He said that, as he recalls the discussion we had in identifying it as a reconstruction project, was a lengthy discussion. He added that the issues discussed are just being delayed by the proposed project here today, and again, as we delay a project, the issues don't get cheaper, they get more expensive.

Noehre stated that this project is actually in the mid-term, and that's out to 2030; and the pavement is already, when we requested it, is out to 18-years in 2020, so that means the pavement is 18-years old and we are probably three years late already which means it could have been paved last year, so the question really comes down to, does the MPO want to leave that pavement in the condition it is in until 2030 or beyond before we address just the pavement. He said that he doesn't think that would be a good plan. Haugen responded that he thinks that is why the plan identified it as a mid-term project, and it is listed as one of the earliest mid-term projects to be done, and it addresses not just the pavement condition, but also to address all the other issues that are along that corridor; driveway access, intersection alignment, ADA issues, and some transit issues that were recommended be resolved in that project. He commented that those are all not being addressed with what is being proposed here.

Grasser said that, as he recalls, one of the challenges of these, and correct him if he is wrong, but it was engineering, utility locates, and property acquisition included in those particular estimates.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Haugen responded that there is an assumption of a percentage, yes, which is the norm with all project estimates. Noehre commented that they tried to address the issue of parking in the bus turn-outs, but it can't be done without additional right-of-way, which will cost more and take a lot longer to get done, otherwise we would have done it; but can they delay the mill and overlay, with the north segment might be done historically in the past, you'd be betting that you are going to get \$10.3 million dollars soon in the mid-term, but we already have a lot of high dollar projects already being talked about, so it would be a gamble; not approving it would be a gamble that would require residents to live with it the way it is until you can get \$10.5 million dollars for it to be constructed. He added that his choice would be to address the pavement now. Haugen commented that the MPOs staff choice would be to address the pavement and also do other issues that are identified.

Noehre stated that he thinks this is consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan; and that is how he would evaluate it, and that it should be done with a mill and overlay with the segment to the north. He added that you talk in your staff report about it getting longer and the cost going down, and David did a much more detailed cost analysis estimate than he did. Williams added that, just from a practical standpoint, is that there has been so many repairs along the road that we are getting to the point that we can't repair it anymore, and then it becomes a safety issue.

Haugen said that, it is not in the staff report, what he heard is that this is a 2020 project, and you are looking at a 2025 project to do the reconstruction; or are you saying that you are doing this, addressing this pavement, but you are also looking at a project, soon, maybe not next year, 2030. Noehre commented that it is still in 2030, still that mid-term range; and you have a pretty good track record of implementing every one of them in the short-term range, almost down to the last project, so then we will just start with the mid-term ones and then go over to the new long range transportation plan; so he would answer that with "we had to get some years out of that pavement, but it certainly wouldn't need to be fifteen or eighteen years, it could be seven or ten years", and then plug the reconstruction into the new long range transportation plan.

Haugen stated that they would have to ask, are we comfortable with seven or eight more years of having all those other issues not being addressed; so is the pavement smoothness the top priority verses two years of waiting, and can we get the request in 2020. He said that you are asking for 2020 for this dollar value right now, not the bigger dollar value which would do all projects, so that is the trade-off we also struggling with, because we identify that we wanted to address all those issues, soon as there are a lot of crashes that are taking place along that segment. Noehre commented that he would prioritize it; in working with the City they have determined that the biggest issue is the pavement.

Grasser said that he would agree, adding that if we are going to have this as a 2022 reconstruction project, we should have been starting the project development about two years ago; similar to the discussion we had with the Washington Street Underpass, and if we are starting some of that concept level evaluation here in 2018, for a project that might be done in 2022, he doesn't know, it is a tough question because that would tell him that they need to take Washington Street in its current condition and try to live with it somehow until at least 2022 or 2023, he just doesn't know if the citizenry is going to be accepting that. He added that he isn't disagreeing with the need for all the other improvements, absolutely not, but amongst difficult

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

choices and probabilities, he thinks a mill and overlay might buy us some time; he thinks we should try to get the reconstruction in as early as we can, but he doesn't know what that means, financially, but certainly within the time band that it was originally targeted.

Noehre commented that the pavement underneath the Washington Street Underpass went downhill very fast, and he would bet this is on the cusp of doing that very same thing; it scares him asking for it in 2020, quite frankly, and we should have been asking for it earlier.

Discussion on project and project costs ensued.

Noehre stated that he would say that this is consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and that it be requested for FY2020.

MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REGIONAL ROADS PROGRAM PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND THE REQUEST IS FOR FY2020.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that we have at least two items that we need to take action on; well one needs action and the other is a question.

Haugen said that a review of what we got with our second meeting and with our on-line financial activity is included in the packet, and indicates where the public would place emphasis on spending funding.

a. Goals/Objectives

Haugen stated that all the comments and feedback have been incorporated into the document, and the attached draft indicates the modifications that have been made. He added that he tried to highlight a couple of places in the document so that you can see how those are identified in the document.

Haugen referred to the document and pointed out that what is bolded and italicized is stuff that we received. He pointed out that the last one is stuff that is based on comments, and the one that is shown is the connected vehicles, autonomous vehicle addition.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

b. Safety Targets

Haugen stated that we have to make a recommendation today, and we all know what the choices are; we have the option of doing them all individually or do them all as one and we are either going to adopt ten targets, five for each state, or a minimum of five targets, or a combination between five and ten targets. He said that staff is recommending five targets. Williams asked when this has to be done. Haugen responded that the MPO Board has to make a decision this week.

Haugen commented that on the programming side neither State has been welcoming a discussion on how target setting affects programming. He added that there is still a lot of “black box” on the program side.

Haugen stated that if we ever get back to one single T.I.P., we will have North Dakota guidance as to how we incorporate that language into the T.I.P.; but it is clear that if we adopt both State targets we will have to have double the discussion to talk about how each side of the State is moving toward this; or if we do it as one target, we will have to address how it fits our MPA.

Williams asked if there was a list of each specific target. Haugen responded that each one of them are at the bottom of the sheet; pointing out that for fatalities North Dakota was at 138, Minnesota was at 375. He added that the draft we are recommending is three or fewer. He stated that each one of these sheets has what each state did adopt as well as if there were one MPO one. He added that, again, there are five of them; the minimum we can have as targets is five, and the maximum is 10, or we have the ability to say that we want to adopt a local one for fatalities, but we want to adopt both States’ for the rest, for instance, so we don’t have to be all State or all MPO, we can combine them.

West asked how this really correlates into actual projects; do we set a goal for how many deaths we want to have, of course it’s nice to say the lower the better, but what does it really mean in the end. Haugen responded that for the Highway Safety Program, part of the black box is that we never know what year projects might be funded from, but typically we are programming 2022 to 2023, just as we discussed on the last agenda item; and these targets are for 2018 and so, at the MPO level these targets don’t have any fiscal impact, how we are reporting just to our public ourselves, then the State DOT reports their numbers to the feds, and they have five different check boxes, the Feds do; if they are not showing progress in three of the five then their next T.I.P. cycle they have to spend 100% of the safety dollars.

Williams asked if the target that the MPO has more restrictive or less restrictive than what our State requirements are. Haugen responded that it isn’t more restrictive, but he doesn’t know if it is less, or if there is an answer to that.

Grasser asked if Ms. Williams had showed the research she had that showed increasing accidents with levels of congestion. Williams responded that she did. Grasser commented that he is struggling with the inconsistency that on a general scale the guidance says that we are going to start accepting LOS D on intersections, which in his mind is going to have more accidents, and yet our goal is to decrease accidents, to him those two thoughts go in opposite directions from

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

each other, and he can't reconcile, in his head. He said, though, that if we think that a strategy we are trying to go for is to fail our goals, with the idea that then would generate more dollars, okay he understands that, but if you don't think it is going to generate more dollars, then he isn't sure, his sense is, and he argued this from day one when we had this discussion six months ago, is that he thinks, from an ability to meet targets, he still thinks we are better off adopting at the State level because we amortize all those things over a much larger area; and he still hasn't seen an argument, in his mind, that changes that. Haugen responded that he doesn't think that is the argument being put forward, he thinks the argument he is putting forward is that by having our own targets, as far as programming, it forces them to maybe open up that black box more; does it become 100% transparent, possibly not, but the way it is now it is really a block box, and each State has a different sized black box, and how much is transparent, so what you experience on the North Dakota side isn't necessarily the same experience on the Minnesota side. Grasser said that he knows that that is part of the issue, is he thinks the Minnesota might be more willing to bring money to the table to take care of those issues than North Dakota.

Haugen reported that one thing is that Minnesota has stated that 70% of their safety dollars are for the pro-active, they aren't waiting for injuries, they are trying to prevent them, so failure of this doesn't necessarily automatically bring in more dollars, they are trying to program those dollars before you get to a point where you are failing. He added that on the North Dakota side they went as far as, when they created the Local Road Safety Program, they said 50% of the safety dollars now goes towards the locals, and 50% stays, but they haven't said whether they reserve, like Minnesota said, 70% towards pro-active ones. He commented that they have gotten success out of the Local Road Safety Program for the projects that were identified there, but we were also successful on 32nd Avenue, which was a massive project, out of the Highway Safety Program, so that is the black box that he is trying to make lighter.

Grasser asked, if we made a choice here, and we start not getting the results, or we get unintended consequences, would there be an opportunity to revisit and say that we don't want to do it on this level. Haugen responded that this is action today is an annual action. Grasser said, then that he has much less objection if we are going to do this on an annual basis.

Williams asked if there was any significance, as she noticed that the State targets are a percentage, whereas the MPO isn't, shouldn't we have a percent in there someplace as well. Haugen responded that it could be if you want, but it doesn't have to be.

West commented that he would take the smallest step possible, try to be the least restrictive on ourselves as we can. Williams agreed, adding that we can then look at it again next year.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MPO IDENTIFY FIVE OF THEIR OWN SAFETY TARGETS FOR THE MPA.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

c. Future Bridge Scenarios

Haugen reported that you have the travel, you have the graphics, you have had the chance to look at them ahead of time, you also had access to the actual overall travel demand model, not just what each four of these bridges are but also the 2015 and 2045 numbers as well on the website.

Haugen stated that the anticipation, as we thought, is that the further south we go the less local traffic connection is. He commented that if we do nothing, the corridor that has always been the corridor of concern, remains a corridor of concern. He added that something that is new is that at 32nd/Washington it is now popping up as an intersection of concern; even if we don't do an additional bridge, but if we do additional bridges there is more concern on some of the options.

Haugen said that they tried to identify, versus the functional class, if there was really any great separator, and there is some differentiation. He added that when they look at trying to decipher what is regional traffic, what is local traffic crossing the bridges, we are using a couple of points in East Grand Forks to help guide us, and that is the change in traffic that occurs just north of Rhinehart Drive on Bygland Road and also what happens when the Mallory Bridge, which is 220 on the East Grand Forks side connects into U.S. #2, and you can see that the further south you go the more local traffic or traffic that would normally be diverted up Bygland Road, occurs further south and the further north you go there is less regional traffic coming off of U.S #2 and 220 Mallory Bridge to reach that bridge the further north you go than there is the further south you go, as a percent of total bridge traffic, so it seems that as we kind of, at least from past plans' information, the further north the more it serves more local traffic, and the further south the more it serves more regional traffic and less local traffic.

Haugen summarized that he thinks what you are attempting to do is; there are four sites, and we want to see if we want to reduce that amount to do the next set of analysis, which will update our cost estimates; identify those touch-down points, whether they are high or whether they are low; look at the first intersections to see if they need to have changes to the geometry, and we know that we will probably have to look at 32nd and Washington; so start looking at those key intersections and such to start the next step if we are serious about trying to identify a local bridge.

Haugen commented that you have all been invited to, and it seems we have a strong attendance, a meeting on Thursday, February 22nd, to go over the same information with the MPO Board, the two City Councils, and the Two County Commissions, and yourselves.

West stated that in his mind it remains a question of two different types of bridges; you have a city bridge and you have a regional bridge. He said that there are two separate needs, and serves two separate functions, so it is really a matter of if you are going to put one in the city you have three spots to choose from to move city traffic versus if you want that regional, bypass corridor then the Merrifield Road, County 6, provides that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

Williams said that it is really, then, a matter of prioritization rather than elimination. West responded that that is correct, adding that that is what is going on, and what are we trying to accomplish. He stated that if money was not a factor it would be great if the City built one at one of those three locations, and the County built one a few years later at County 6, that would be great.

Haugen stated that the question we would ask Kimley-Horn and MPO Staff is, based on the information you received, is there something that needs to be clarified, is there anything else that could be added to the information. He commented that for a local bridge he hopes everybody can see that Merrifield is not really functioning that way. West said that this report substantiated exactly what he thought would happen, it just put numbers to it.

Williams asked if they were going to look at the feasibility of actually building something in these location, is it actually feasible to put a bridge on 32nd and try to route truck traffic and everything else through an established neighborhood, two schools, twenty-five mile per hour speed limit; are they going to look at the actual feasibility matching a project with what is out there right now. Haugen responded that it will go as far as the MPO Board, and others want it to go. He added that from the discussions he has been a party to they are trying to replicate the Point Bridge in function, so that would prohibit large trucks, it would prohibit certain types of traffic. Williams said, then, with that in mind we can still plan on having all the trucks run through the downtown areas, trucks are prohibited on the Point and they would be prohibited on the new one, how is that going to work. Haugen responded that, again, they are trying to replicate the Point Bridge.

MATTER OF FUTURE NON-MOTORIZED BRIDGE BETWEEN DOWNTOWNS

Haugen referred to the staff report and commented that the MPO Board has expressed an interest in looking at, as part of the Kennedy Bridge discussion, to locate a separate bike/ped only bridge between the Kennedy and the Sorlie.

Haugen reported that back when the flood protection project was still being designed, in 2001, we were assisting that discussion process of where such a structure should be located. He said that it looked at four bridges, two of them were built, and the one that wasn't built is on the Red Lake River. He added that there is information on a downtown area bridge, it has focused in and around the old Railroad Pier, and so the question is is this enough information to satisfy what the Board has been asking for or do you want us to update this information. He explained that this current information was all based on assumed design hydraulics, assumed other things, but we now have reality out there so information can be updated.

Haugen stated that there is a question in to the NDDOT as to whether or not the MPO can fund this type of study again. He explained that the MPO Board, both City Councils, and to some extent the MnDOT are the entities interested in this issue. Williams commented, you said there is a question as to whether it can be funded again through the MPO, what if the area was expended. Haugen responded that it isn't a question of the area, it is a question of the hydraulics.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

West stated that in his mind, actually constructing a project like that seems like a very low priority. Lang agreed.

Haugen reported that the context of this was, should the Kennedy have anything or not, and part of it was that they didn't want it on the Kennedy but would rather have something elsewhere. He said that he thinks there is a thought that if we can do something elsewhere, can they remove what is on the Kennedy and reallocate that space. Williams stated that she hadn't heard that before.

Haugen commented that some of our funds are being ate up by this new possible Washington Street Underpass project, and this is currently not in our work program, and he doesn't have a scope of what it would cost; so the real question is whether our State and Federal Partners say it is something that the MPO can fund, or if there is a percentage of the costs that the MPO can fund.

West stated that he feels we have way bigger issues than this to deal with, so it would be hard for him to support it. Haugen said, though, that there is a very strong desire of the MPO Board, which is being fueled by City Council members, to do this.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO APPROVE DEFERRING THIS ITEM TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD FOR THEIR REVIEW AND DECISION.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program progress report was included for your review.

b. Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Haugen reported that there is a Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 20th, at 1:30 p.m. at Grand Forks City Hall, Conference Room A102.

Haugen stated that there are two agenda items; to start discussing financial forecast and also they assembled a list of projects that we will be considering as part of our plan, so we will start looking at a massive list of projects to make sure that we are identifying all possible projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 14th, 2018**

c. Special Joint Future Bridge Meeting

Lang asked about the Special Joint Future Bridge Meeting scheduled for next Thursday. Haugen responded that it is being held at the Grand Forks County Office Building, 6th Floor, at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 14TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 4:07 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Teri Kouba, Senior Planner, called the March 14th, 2018, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Darren Laesch, MnDOT-Bemidji; and Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning.

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Dale Bergman, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Brad Gengler, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, and Rich Sanders.

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

Guests present: Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local District; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; Josh Benocken, MnDOT-Bemidji; and James Kiedrowski, KLJ.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Kouba declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF AERIAL IMAGERY CONTRACT

Kouba stated that back in January staff brought forward an RFP for our Aerial Photo Update, with a February 19th deadline for submittals. She reported that they received four proposals,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

adding that all four were submitted before the deadline; and that the selection committee met and interviewed all four, and decided to go with Quantum Spatial. She added that they did come in well under budget, at \$39,515.00, so staff is now requesting approval to forward the contract on to the MPO Executive Board for execution.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRMAN EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH QUANTUM SPATIAL FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, NOT TO EXCEED \$42,000.00.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF MINNESOTA SIDE FY2018 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Kouba reported that the City of East Grand Forks brought forward an amendment to the FY2018 T.I.P. for the purchase of a bus. She commented that we did advertise for a public hearing for this item so she would open the public hearing at this time.

Ellis stated that, just to clarify the reason for this amendment, they had five vans set for purchase with one of their federal grants, but Cities Area Transit keeps getting vans on the North Dakota side, so we felt it would be in our best interest to purchase another larger Dial-A-Ride vehicle for some of our larger pickup and have a back up vehicle for East Grand Forks City's bus, so in the T.I.P. it showed this having State monies programmed, so we are clarifying this by changing it to the federal dollars that we already had set aside for the vans, and moving from vans to one single bus.

Kuharenko asked what the difference is between a Class 500 and a Class 300 bus. Ellis responded that the Class 300 are smaller buses than the Class 500.

Laesch asked if this has all been approved by MnDOT's Central Office. Ellis responded that it has, adding that this is less money that the State has to put aside because we have that ten year CIP that she has to put into the Black Cat every year, so they are very familiar with what her plans are for the next ten years. She added that she doesn't like to lose federal dollars, and since she can't purchase vans off the Minnesota contract, she has to try to figure out a way to purchase vans independently, so it is just easier to purchase a bus with her federal dollars.

Grasser asked if this was the bus that would go back and forth between East Grand Forks and Grand Forks. Ellis responded that it isn't, that is a separate one. She added that they received new expansion dollars for a Class 500, that is one of the \$470,000 large buses that is going to be used.

Kouba closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2018 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Viafara reported that we are also seeking your recommendation for approval of this amendment, that has to do with the new overlay project that will take place in two stages; one on South Washington between DeMers and Hammerling, and the second on North Washington between 1st Avenue North and 8th Avenue North, both during this construction season.

Viafara stated that they are asking for this approval for two reasons; one is because that project has changed significantly, and then the issues such as ADA compliance will be considered; and then cost and sharing is another matter, so anything that is supposed to be done is within the proposed Long Range Transportation Plan, so the approval of this particular amendment does not in any regards affect the cost of the plan so it continues to be fiscally constrained, so in addition the public hearing is set for next week, March 21st, and comments are expected to be accepted until 11:00 a.m., so this is the overall information you have, and staff is seeking approval.

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF SCOPE OF WORK FOR A.T.A.C. TRAFFIC COUNTS

Viafara reported that this item entails approval of the Scope-Of-Work for A.T.A.C. to proceed with the Traffic Count Program Study. He explained that we currently have a number of intersections that have video cameras located in the system; but those cameras are being used just for video kind of activities, and with this new information there is the potential for them to provide more recordings for decision making, so in that sense a number of intersections are being

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

considered around primarily the 42nd Street Corridor and the DeMers Corridor for new cameras to be installed.

Viafara commented that scope of services, the entire contract is for the amount of \$55,688.00. He pointed out that in the packet are the conditions and elements that the MPO is expecting to be delivered.

Ellis stated that it states in the report that there are some minor revisions that are being made to the Scope-of-Work, do you know what those are. Viafara responded that they have to do, basically, this is an overall, it is minor in that sense because when Mr. Haugen put this one in here we had already received some comments that the University needed to address, and the whole idea was to determine what else we can do with the traffic analysis as we want something more than just a simple report; we want more insight, so that is basically the revision, and the consultant agreed that they can at least give some consideration when they are doing their analysis. Ellis said, then, that the consultant is considering providing more data at the same price. Viafara responded that it will be within the same scope, that they will at least give us more insight. Ellis said, though, that they aren't changing the contract. Viafara responded that they would not be changing the contract at all, including the cost.

Laesch commented that he sees that they are going to provide some estimates for upgrading the East Grand Forks signals; as far as what is happening on the Grand Forks side, is that something that is the responsibility of the City and/or MnDOT to pick up these costs, or is there the ability for the State and MPO to do it. Viafara responded that he would ask that you please wait for Mr. Haugen to return to give you the answer to that question, as he doesn't have the answer at this time. Laesch stated that he is in full support of finding out what those costs are and looking at what is needed to make upgrades to those traffic signals. Kouba said that she thinks that's the main purpose, just to get the cost estimates so we understand what it will take, and also include all the stakeholders. Ellis commented that, typically, what she knows from an MPO is that they can only pay for planning activities, they can't pay for actual equipment; so it would just be an estimate and we would have to take it from there.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FROM A.T.A.C. FOR THE TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF FY2018 SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK

Kouba reported that as it currently stands it appears that we aren't looking at a flood forecast, but we have it in our plan that we will make sure that we continue to ensure that our contact list is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

up-to-date in the event we were to have a flood. She asked that everyone please look it over and submit any changes by the end of next week.

Information only.

MATTER OF FY2018 BIKE MAP

Viafara reported that the whole idea behind the preparation of the Bike Map is; this map is based on previous efforts that the MPO has done through the years, and is really just a matter of tweaking what has already been done, which is basically the truss of the map.

Viafara commented that new information has been included; one is that we would like to provide efficient, directness and accessibility alternatives to most of the routes; safety and security of the bicyclists so what we try to do when we show and display this network is to tell the user that this map and the network corresponds to the principles of bicycle facilities that improve access to the system, the safety of cyclist and their enjoyment, so we believe those elements are also included in the map.

Viafara stated that the map is also related to key goals and objectives that are stated in the bicycle plan; one of them is that we would like, by producing this map, to foster economic vitality, we would like to foster access and mobility, and we also would like to foster environmental energy and improve the quality of life, and the final one is to integrate and connect the overall system in the cities.

Viafara said that one objective that has been new to us is also tourism, so in that case we have partnered with the Historical Society and have included historic neighborhoods for people to use their bikes and ride around. He stated that we have also included the two downtowns, the bridges that allow bike and ped traffic, and the railway crossings, the quiet zones, and crossings on safe route to school. He said that these are very important, at least we consider them to be important in addition to listing of the school, park and pools, and listing the bus transfer stops because we would like the bicycle map to also be related to the ability for people to ride their bikes, and whenever they feel, also to use the bus now that the bus offers the bike rack.

Viafara commented that in addition to that there are some panels, those are the panels that we have for your consideration. He stated that we list the existing type of roads and those roads bicycle facilities; we list the Red River State Recreation Area, the Bike on Bus Program, the Historical Preservation Commission Program; we have some points on Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety, and we have one panel dedicated to Rail Safety for Pedestrians and Bicyclists. He added that we are also encouraging people to participate by making available opportunities for participation and provide the acknowledgments and list the MPO Staff, so those are the elements that are supporting the drafting of the particular map for 2018. He said that at the moment we are envisioning that the map will be distributed widely next Friday at the Home Show.

Halford stated that she has a few comments. She pointed out that on the public participation part, where you say under the Bicycle and Pedestrian Greenway Advisory Committee to visit the Greenway Website, it should probably be www.bikingtheforks.com instead. Viafara said that he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

would make that correction. She said that her other question was whether or not he received permission from the all these people to be on the front of the bike map, especially the children, as she knows that that has been an issue in the past, where you can't have their photos without permission. Viafara responded that these pictures are public, so that is how they got them, from the newspaper. Halford asked where, publicly, they were from. Viafara responded that they are in the public domain already, they are no longer private. Halford asked if the were from the City. Viafara responded that, yes, they are in the public domain. Halford stated that she knows that Safe Kids has brought this issue up, so she would still be careful about using these photos. Viafara responded that Safe Kids are already aware that we are using these photos. Halford suggested that he check with Aaron Kennedy, as you have him and his daughter's photos are shown on here. Viafara responded that they provided those pictures to us, Safe Kids provided those pictures to us. Halford said that she has one more comment; the bus stops that you have labeled on the bike map, are those the current bus stops or are those the ones that will be changed for the summer. Viafara responded that they are the current ones. Kouba commented that the finalized bus stops for the proposed routes have not been finalized.

Williams said that it is her understanding that this has already been printed, is that correct. Viafara responded that it has not yet been sent to the printer. Williams asked if corrections were wanted now then. Viafara responded that if she has some he would welcome them. Williams pointed out that there is a bike route that is missing from the map, adding that it is the one that is the parallel route for Washington on North 15th. She added that the street names are incorrect, so streets such as 42nd Street South should actually be South 42nd Street, so the nomenclature is wrong for the street names. Viafara asked if this was the case with all of the streets. Williams responded that as far as she can tell all of them are incorrect.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BIKE/PED PLAN

Viafara reported that this item is just to give you an update on where we are at concerning the Bike/Ped Element. He referred to a slide presentation and stated that he will go over this quickly.

Viafara stated that vision statement has been prepared and has been accepted by consensus, so that statement is the one that has been guiding our activities. He said that what was considered in order for us to produce a vision statement, so safety was one, the need for friendly environments in the community was another, bicycles, buses and trains at the national level were included, whether bicycle or pedestrian activities are physical modes of transportation was also given attention. He added that other elements such as fostering mobility and efficiency, all of them were considered when producing the statement.

Viafara commented that they then went into developing a number of Goals and Objectives that were also approved, and now we are finalizing the performance measures, and saying that the majority of the performance measures are complete, they were reviewed, input was received from the stakeholders, and the one that are here, under consideration, are the ones that at the moment there are only three performance measures, supporting three goals that are at the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

moment being addressed. He said that once these are addressed we will move to finalize the other two sections of the plan that are already in the making.

Viafara stated that, concerning the performance measures, those performance measures are associated to the different planning factors:

- 1) Economic Vitality - we have determined that access to community destinations and access to jobs are the measures that we reflect the performance measures.
- 2) Security - Security is under consideration because originally we had thought all the measures back, even the ability for the stakeholders to conduct the data, this is a list to heed their advise and start seriously giving some consideration to them and to incorporate them into the document.
- 3) Accessibility and Mobility - is also a measure that is under consideration, but the other topics continue like access to transit stops or network crossing opportunities over barriers.
- 4) Environmental/Energy/Quality of Life – these are fine.
- 5) Integration and Connectivity – again this is under consideration because there is a need for us to define some performance measures connected to network completeness.
- 6) Efficient System Management - which is basically what happens to the CIP or grants that the stakeholders may apply to, or for, in order to support bicycle/pedestrian activities.
- 7) System Preservation - is fine, mostly aligned with the overall system preservation measures that are occurring now.
- 8) Safety – this is aligned to the other performance management measures.
- 9) Resiliency and Reliability – is fine.
- 10) Tourism – is fine.

Viafara said that this is based on performance measures that the overall plan has been developed. He commented that on the top of the table you will see “every year”, “every two years”, and “every five years”, and the idea is that all of those measures will be measured based on that frequency that is on the heading; so some measures will be considered every year, some every two years, but at the end – the five year of the plan there will be a report of the overall performance of this particular plan, so that is where we are.

Grasser commented that he would start by noting that you skipped over some of the introductory portion of the staff report, and he is kind of going by what they do, typically, with the City; and this report, looking at the background he knows that the bicycle elements and ped elements have kind of had a multi-year background and history on this already, but he doesn't think it is reflected in this particular part of the staff report, so just to kind of help out he is going to ask his staff to help write a background so he understands what the background is, and they can share it and maybe insert it as part of the staff report because he knows there is quite a bit of additional background that goes into the history of the whole project if that is okay.

Viafara responded that the Engineering Department is a stakeholder, and we heed your advice, we are here to work together so whatever you want to bring; would you like him to resubmit this report to the Executive Policy Board. Grasser asked if this was going to the Executive Policy Board as just information only. Viafara responded that that is correct. Grasser stated, then, that he thinks that if we just report what we are planning on doing it would be fine, but it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

kind of depends on what you are planning on bringing to the board. Viafara responded that he was planning on bringing what was discussed today, but if you want some of this included then we can move it; so he will wait for their information.

Halford stated that she has a question on the analysis part, under 1, where it states: “approved by consensus by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee”. She said that her understanding was, during that meeting, that that is not true, that they did not approve the Vision, Goals and Objectives, but rather agreed that you should continue forward with the work we needed to proceed forward with, but that they wanted to see the document as a whole before they approved anything, so she doesn’t know if we need to make a motion as a group here that that needs to be changed, or it is just a simple correction to the staff report. Viafara responded that that is not the understanding, certainly it is yours, but his understanding was that we met a number of occasions, and in one of those, with the Steering Committee, we came to the decision that both the vision and the objectives were approved, and he can bring the agenda where this was approved. He added that when you guys requested that he please provide the parts to see where the document was, that request was met and three parts of the document were given to you. He said that as a result of this we got some insight from different stakeholders that helped to incorporate them into the final report, that is where we are at now, and he has been addressing some concerns brought to our attention by the Engineering Department, and, as a matter of fact the latest one is those three points, and that is where we stand.

Halford commented that she understands on some of the things your saying, but still, she thinks that is something that maybe needs to be asked of other stakeholders in that group because she is pretty sure that it was agreed that you should move forward with the work you need to do, but that they weren’t approving it until they see it as a document as a whole. Viafara responded that he cannot really work under those conditions. He said that the stakeholders are very important, but nobody will work on something and then wait for your approval, that is why we have taken a planning approach, which is more or less incremental. Halford agreed, adding that there were so just so many drafts back and forth and the timeline that they kind of came to the point where they said that they can’t keep doing this, we need to see it as a document as a whole instead of this piece-meal document, so continue to move forward, but they didn’t approve anything of what you have so far. Viafara stated, again, that that isn’t his understanding of what occurred.

Kuharenko reported that his recollection of what happened at that meeting is much in line with what Ms. Halford ended up saying; was that the general concept, or the general thought was that we need to keep moving forward on this plan, and so to keep making that forward process, but at the same time they were reserving the right to make comments later on so it wasn’t an approval process. Viafara said that he hopes that he never misunderstood you, but that is not the feeling that he has gotten from other stakeholders; like from Mrs. Crocker, or Bruce, or any of the others. He added that we came to a decision that they were also kind of concerned for the delays that the plan has been experiencing; and they were almost ready to abandon the process, so then they came to the decision that we move on or there is no point for us to continue here because addressing some of the concerns has become onerous for both the stakeholders and for the MPO, so when we had that meeting it was his understanding that they were really approving for us to move on, and if you read the minutes it states that we have come here to do this and to move on. Halford asked if he had minutes from that meeting. Viafara responded that he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

doesn't have them here right now, but that is the spirit of those particular minutes. Grasser asked if those minutes go out and get approved by the group later on. Viafara responded that they are submitted to the group for further consideration. Kuharenko commented that he doesn't remember seeing these minutes. Viafara responded that if you look at some, in some cases when he has sent the invites the minutes have also been attached. Kuharenko asked that these minutes please be sent out again.

Viafara asked that we take this opportunity, also, for us to, in good faith, to move along because the whole process has become dragging, has become also onerous. He said that those are the comments that he has received from some stakeholders, that it has become burdensome. He stated that the plan is meant for the community, some people are representing the community and they would really like to see all, particularly the government agencies, working together in good faith and moving along, but answering the number of questions, that rightly so, we've done it and certainly we are happy receiving those insights, but it has taken a toll on the performance as a professional and also on the development of the plan, so we have to settle for something. He added that, nothing is perfect, but at least he believes that every effort has been made to accommodate your needs and desires, and also to address the desires of the community.

Kuharenko commented that he would like to give the Technical Advisory Committee a little background information on this. He stated that last time that the Bike and Ped Advisory Committee ended up meeting was back on December 18th, and at that point in time they ended up going through looking at the performance measures and one of the big things that was discussed was what departments or entities are responsible for the various performance measures. He said that he knows that the Engineering Department were assigned a number of these aspects as well, and they ended up sending the comments that you see within this report back on December 22nd, so we had a meeting on Monday and they sent the comments out that Friday, and here we are three months later and he believes they still haven't gotten a response yet. He pointed out that it states in the report itself that MPO Staff provided a complete response on addressing these concerns, so he knows that this has been a long process. He added that he also knows that at that December meeting some of the things they ended up discussing there was removing the two performance measures that you have on 2.1, and also about the concerns that were related with the 2.3 sidewalk inspections, just because of the amount of manpower that would take. He stated that, in looking at all of this, one of the things they do want to focus on is the Efficient System Management of this, making sure that what we are doing for these performance measures is something that we are either already doing or are not going to be overly burdensome and not take a lot of manpower to do, and that sort of thing.

Viafara responded that if you look at what is under consideration to the report, so this is under consideration so the things, you will see them. He added that, unfortunately, to tell you the truth, David, and this is very important, let him put it this way; sooner or later, one day, even if that costs a little money, we need to come to an agreement because plans are supposed to be measured, and sometimes the argument that things have not been done in the past, or that they require too much manpower, we need to try to address them because otherwise the system, it is part of the system, the system will never be accessed or enjoyed; for, for instance, just to say, sidewalk inspections, recently he was stopped by the police because he was walking on the roadway, but if you take a walk around Washington it is impossible to walk, and you probably

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

don't know it because he is the one walking, but if we were to do a neighborhood assessment, particularly now that there is a project happening, then those issues can be addressed. He stated that the problem is not only on the roadway, that is why we are pedestrians, and kids and others that are entitled to ride their bikes, at least in that area, on the sidewalks, so we need to come, he doesn't really know if it is a valid issue, but we cannot really let those things disappear just for, out of sheer needs, that we don't have to believe a network can be met.

Ellis commented that, you just gave Mr. Kuharenko the reason for his concern; we have a plan, that has to be assessed, therefore we don't want anything in the plan that we cannot measure or assessed accurately with the funding and the manpower we have, so you just, in essence, addressed his concern, which is; if we have a plan we have to measure it and follow it, therefore, we want to make sure the plan is something that we all agree to and can follow, do you understand that. Viafara responded that he can certainly understand that. Ellis stated, then, that you have to expect that we are still going to have concerns, and we are still going to want to make sure that we can see it as a whole, so we know what we are being held to in this plan, okay! She added that that is kind of the issue sometimes with some of the plans, that we get to a point where we are held to something that we maybe cannot follow, or we don't have the same direction. Williams commented that we then impose on ourselves, and it is not a minimum that is required, we have added a level that we don't need to add, so we want to meet the minimum requirements but not overburden ourselves with things that are not required. Ellis said that totally agrees that you want a plan that you are following and assessing otherwise there is no reason to have the plan. She added that she gets that we need to continue to move forward on it, but we still want to make sure that it is something that we have all agreed to.

Grasser stated that he thinks that part of the issue there is, when you go back to the engineering comments; we made philosophical comments last December, and what they are looking for is, we need to do measurables, right, but can we do measurables of things that we are basically, as much as we can, already doing instead of coming up with different sets of measurables. He said that the comments that are actually in the report here from engineering are suggesting measurables that they think they can do in various categories, that are not going to take a lot of additional manpower and effort, and one of the things they asked for on these things, and he calls this a fiscal note, is how much manpower is it going to take to accomplish the different things because, again, if we can measure them fairly easily, then let's go after those; but we also need to know from an operational standpoint as we are putting together City budgets, if we now have a task that takes 2000 man-hours to do in a year, that translates into a new person, or something to that effect, and that goes back to the issue of are we approving these things in modules, okay, on the screen it talks about things that we are going to do on an annual basis every two years, every five years, and again it takes x-amount of manpower, so we are not going to approve a module and commit to ourselves to a module when we don't know what all those measurables and follow-ons are going to end up being, and that is what they are struggling with. He stated that he knows from a planning standpoint we like to approve one before we move to the next, but then they get caught with the "I know we approved all these goals and objectives previously, so now we can't go back and change them, and that is what they are reacting to, is the apparent inability to go back and reconsider once new information is available at the end", so that is what they are struggling with when we talk about are we approving a module, or have we had consensus to move ahead, that we reserve the right to comment further,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

because should we find, again, those things that look like they are going to be a really big issue in terms of manpower or dollars, we have to deal with it at a local level too, so that is kind of what the crux is of what we are all dealing with here, and we are making comments, and are trying to move productively forward, but he looks at the bullet points we have here, even in the staff report, and as Mr. Kuharenko said, we put these in in December, these don't appear to him to be large, onerous things that need an extensive amount of response, these are recommendations of things, and it's March 14th and we haven't gotten anything back, and quite frankly we feel like that burden of delay is being put on the Engineering Department, and that is the way they feel the comments are coming through and, quietly frankly, they are taking exception to that because they are one of the few, Engineering and Planning, one of the few that are spending the time to try to do through this and introduce comments, they are trying to move forward in a productive away, so that is where they are trying to go but those are their reservations when talking about a couple of these different items.

Viafara responded that Mr. Grasser's point is taken and will be heeded, so thank you for the insight, and you will see the responses to them.

Grasser asked if this is just information at this point, and will we talk about some of the philosophical aspects of it. Viafara responded that that is why he would rather suggest if you could please make sure that we get something for the report that we can insert for the Executive Policy Board, or submit another report, it is up to you but as it is this is what we thought would go to the Executive Policy Board, but your comments, now, need to be considered by basically making them available to others to appreciate your insight. Grasser asked if anything further was needed from the Technical Advisory Committee. Viafara responded that nothing more is required, but added safety clarification, in part also, the Engineering Department has been privy of all this back and forth, the needs for addressing some of those elements of consideration so then whatever results happen at the end they are aware of these things coming. Grasser commented that they have kind of, quite frankly, purposely not done a lot of comments because they are also concerned about the frustration and the manpower it takes every time we do so they have actually, since December, haven't provided much of anything, he doesn't believe, in terms of additional comments, and again they don't want to spend their time worrying about things that don't amount to amount to anything, and yet they don't want to approve something that later on does turn into something, so they want to see the whole package so that the comments can all be put into the proper context. Viafara responded that they will see that.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Revenue Forecast

Kouba reported that we put forward, at the Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting in February, some of the areas we are looking at; and that we are still waiting to hear something back on. She commented that she knows that the NDDOT is drafting a document for all MPOs to follow on how to forecast revenue for their MTPs. She added that we are also trying to determine how we are going to handle the additional sales tax in Grand Forks as well. She said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

that the group also agreed to a \$510,000 amount for HSIP funding for the North Dakota side per year as a base. Grasser commented that the report says \$510,000 just for HSIP, that is competitive through the whole State, right. Kuharenko responded that HSIP is competitive, but he believes there is about \$6 million available annually. Kouba added that that is just a base per year, but it doesn't necessarily mean we will get that amount ever year, it will depend on how it is distributed. Grasser said, then, that what we are saying is that, long-term average, Grand Forks might see \$500,000 a year. Kuharenko stated that, and Mr. Johnson might be able to chime in on this, but he believes we have about \$6 million dollars available annually, at the State level. Grasser said, then, that supposedly, over time, would be in the range of \$500,000.

Kouba stated that this is what we have come up with for right now, as the base per year, that way we can figure long-term; and we do understand the carry-over concept, but other than that we are still getting input for the revenue forecast process.

Information only.

b. Universe Of Projects

Kouba reported that we presented our current list of projects at the Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting for review and comments, and she knows that we have received some additional projects, but we want to make sure that there aren't any others that we need to be aware of for the next few years.

Kuharenko commented that he thinks that for them, one thing they are kind of waiting on is trying to find out what is the revenue model, what inflation rates should they be looking at for the federal funding coming in. He stated that they have been working on it, but they are waiting to see what kind of revenue forecast they should be looking at, what kind of inflation factors we should be using on construction project so that they can get a better feeling for what they should have in there.

Laesch asked how far out are we looking at for projects. Kouba responded we are looking out to 2045. Laesch commented that they can share a 10-year plan, but beyond that are we just looking at major projects beyond that. Kouba responded that that is probably be what they will have available for us, but if you know of any other projects that might be beyond ten years, please let us know.

Grasser said, then, on the next update; when we talk about the transportation system and the list of plans, you've got the Interstate, the State Highways, the NHS, major arterials, minor arterials, collector streets; are they trying to get a local, they clearly aren't going to allow us to get all those things, so when we talk about a universe of projects, it is easier for us to start identifying the big ones on like the NHS system, it is much harder when you start going down to the lower classified streets. He added that the a lot of the additional sales tax revenue for Grand Forks will be dedicated towards the local street network, so does that put it on book or off book from the MPO; and he will be honest that he doesn't think the MPO should be involved in some of those truly local street projects; so he thinks focusing on the NHS and some of those higher classified streets makes a lot of sense, but he struggles with creating a list. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

added that, as an example at the local budget level, he doesn't even get a list of street projects for the next year, because with a spring like this, we are rearranging priorities right now as we speak, reacting to Mother Nature and deterioration, so producing a list can give a false sense of knowing what the crystal ball will show.

Kouba commented that we are kind of the defining mark. She stated that, you do understand that there are some classified roads that are considered more local than anything else, but there is the possibility that federal funds might be applied to them; there are some collector streets as well, so we don't want to get caught flat-footed and not have it included on the list in the event that would occur.

Grasser reported that, just some information, what they do on the local side, when we do these outside projections, is we put them in categories, and the MPO has done some of that too with short-range, mid-range, and long-range projects; and sometimes they will just say, like with a traffic signal, to be determined because we don't know if it is going to be at this intersection or that intersection, when its six or ten years down the line, but they have the sense based on past history that we will need something someplace, so, again, without defining it as a specific spot, we can still define it as a fiscal likely need.

Kouba commented that in the Universe of Projects list that was handed out, there's lots of those kind of various locations city-wide. Grasser stated that he likes that, and he encourages, where we can define them lets define them, but, especially when we get out in those out years it is really hard to know what is going to be happening.

Kuharenko said that he is also thinking that with those performance measures that we are going to have coming up, particularly on, we got on the Interstate System, we got on the NHS System, and he would think that a lot of the federal fund will be focused on the NHS System, so he thinks that is probably where they are going to be focusing a lot of the attention.

Kouba stated that, again, this is Universe of Projects, and we obviously know that not all are going to get funded now, or even in the near ten years or so, but it makes sense to have a placeholder in place for them just in case funding becomes available.

Information only.

c. Future Bridge Study Status

Kouba reported that the MPO held a Special Joint Future Bridge Location meeting in February, and unfortunately not very many City Council members from either side attended. She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to try to determine whether or not we should continue studying all four locations, or cut any of them out. She said that the decision was to keep all four locations and to take the issue to the respective City Councils for their input.

Kouba commented that this will be submitted to the East Grand Forks City Council on Monday. Ellis reported that they are going to recommend to continue moving forward with the report with 24th and 32nd as the local options, as 47th Avenue and Merrifield don't meet the local traffic

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

needs. Kouba stated that they will probably keep Merrifield just because it would be a regional location.

Kouba said that Mr. Haugen is also working on setting up a similar meeting with the Grand Forks City Council to submit this to them for their input as well.

Information only.

d. PM2 And PM3 Information

Viafara reported that there is further information on this item on the website at:
www.theforksmmpo.com.

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

Viafara commented that PM2 is the measures of performance for pavement and bridges on the NHS System. He explained that pavement includes anything on the Interstate and Non-Interstate Roadways; and bridges are only those on the classified roadways.

Presentation ensued.

BRIDGES:

Grasser said that he isn't familiar with this, but they get a bridge inspection report, and he thinks the last time they talked about doing those inspections on a four year cycle, which is a different issue, but is the NBI rating, do you get to that through the inspections that you are currently doing, or is this a different thing. Bail responded that the NBI ratings are stated when you do your bridge inspections, it is part of the National Bridge Inventory. Grasser said, then, that you will get that when you are done with the bridge inspection. Bail responded that that is correct, and added that they have to be included with any bridge inspection that is done anywhere. Grasser said that he is just trying to figure out if that is something that they are already getting or if it is something new.

Viafara commented that we have a number of those bridges for North Dakota and a number of those bridges for a portion Minnesota; with the numbers and the ratings that we have received so they are available in case you want them. He went over the calculation formula briefly.

Grasser asked if, on the Minnesota side, they are correlating their bridge expectation with the level of funding that you are giving to them. Laesch responded that they are estimating whether their bridge performances are going to lead us on the funding. Grasser said, then, that you are trying to make those two match anyway. Laesch responded that they had, prior to their recommendations coming out, they had to set up some goals, prior to that, so he thinks their goals are more ridged than what the feds came out with so he isn't sure if they will be adjusting theirs to hit that minimum instead, or what their philosophy will be from this point on.
Presentation continued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

PAVEMENT:

Grasser referred to a slide illustrating pavement calculation data, and stated that Grand Forks has a number of NHS Systems that are posted AT 40 mph, and not more; even Washington has some that are posted 35 mph and some 40 mph, so are you going to use different criteria on the same roadway, or can it be less than or equal to 40 mph; you may want to think about that.

TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY:

Viafara explained that this applies mainly to freight systems. He added that we don't have a greenhouse situation here because this is attainable, so we don't do an air analysis condition.

Presentation continued.

Williams asked if, when going through all these calculations, is there any type of thing as far as miles per hour or anything like that is easy to relate to. She said that most of this stuff is all, it would actually be ridiculous to do some of these calculations in our area when she can drive, during the peak hour, from one side of town to the other in less than fifteen minutes, so is there a simple way of going through this and saying that if the average speed is so much, or if you can get from here to here in a certain length of time that it is acceptable. Viafara responded that he would defer to Mr. Johnson to provide some insights.

Johnson asked for clarification on Ms. Williams' question. Williams clarified, stating that, on the freight reliability calculations; she can see going through all these calculations, but is there a certain mile per hour in the peak time that is acceptable, or a time/distance measure that you can get from here to here in this amount of time it is acceptable, because that is a lot of calculation in a small area when the whole city is less than four miles wide. Johnson responded that he doesn't know if he will be able to provide exactly the answer you want to hear. He said what he knows about the reliability stuff is that it is mainly about distances; that it isn't so much about the details from one roadway to the next, but more about the level of reliability and measures today and that if it continues at the same level of reliability, then it is reliable; but if it is congested, at long as it is reliably congested, it is considered reliable.

Williams asked if they were going to set a level of service to strive for or something like that; like as long as it is functioning at B or better during the peak it is okay. Johnson responded that in terms of travel or reliability they wouldn't.

Grasser asked Mr. Johnson if he knew when they might be having any of these targets coming out on the North Dakota side. Johnson responded that on the pavement, bridge, and reliability; he believes the timeline for the State needing to notify the Feds of their targets is May 27th, but they actually don't officially have to report them to the Feds until October; so they shared some of this information with the MPOs, in terms of the reliability and the pavement, but the bridge issue is something they are still working on getting out to the MPOs.

Kouba commented that, with this information, she believes that once the State has set their targets, then we have another 180 days to review and determine whether or not we will be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

setting specific targets and measures for our MPO area, or if we will support the State's targets and measures. She added that right now the States are the ones that will end up with any kind of penalties; but if we, as an MPO area decide to have targets and measures we will not face any kind of penalties for not measuring them, it is just in relation to what the State does; so, once again, you have put out there in the past what kind of financial backing will we get if we are just backing the State, or if we have our own targets. She stated that we will have more discussion on this issue next month.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minnesota FHWA T.I.P. Guidance On Incorporating Performance Measures

Kouba reported that because of the incorporation of the performance measures, Minnesota FHWA has given us T.I.P. guidance on incorporating those performance measures and; while they aren't saying we have to do it, they are strongly encouraging us to make those changes within the written body of our T.I.P.s beforehand. She added that, once again, we do have our deadline to do this, at the end of May, but could have to do it sooner if we need to do any amendments to our T.I.P. prior to that.

Williams commented that she thinks there was a motion on this at the last Technical Advisory Committee to not do anything with this until we are absolutely required to do so. Kouba stated that that is correct.

Information only.

b. NDDOT Advised To Hold On Underpass Study

Kouba reported that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting we forwarded a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to amend the MPO Work Program to include a Washington Street Underpass Study; however since then the NDDOT has requested that we hold off on that as they are still working out some issues with it.

Williams asked why they are asking us to hold off on this study. Kouba responded that there is an issue of whether or not the MPO can actually do the study, or if the State will have to do it, so they asked that we hold off amending our Work Program until that is clarified.

Information only.

c. Add Downtown Transportation Planning To FY2018 UPWP

Kouba reported that this item, too, is on hold as to whether or not the MPO is going to participate in it or not. She said that they are working with Meredith Richards and Keith Lund on this item, and will update the Technical Advisory Committee once it has all been ironed out.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

d. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Kouba reported that the monthly work program update is included in the packet for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 14TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:00 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the April 11th, 2018, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Nels Christianson, BNSF; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Grand Forks Airport Authority.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Stephanie Halford, Darren Laesch, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Jane Williams, Mike Yavarow, and Rich Sanders.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA SIDE DRAFT FY2019-2022 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that included in the packets were the tables and project listings from FY2019 out to FY2022. He stated that there were no real changes on the street side from what is in the current T.I.P., but there were some changes on the transit side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Haugen referred to the information in the packets and went over it briefly. He pointed out that there were more hours of service and more miles being run so the cost increased, and is being reflected here. He stated that initially MnDOT was funding the first two years of that, now the T.I.P. is reflecting that MnDOT will continue funding that service additional years as well.

Haugen commented that there are also some capitol purchases shown that MnDOT will be assisting with the purchase of some items that benefit the system widely, but physically will be located on the North Dakota side.

Haugen reported that we did advertise for a public hearing that will occur at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

Haugen stated that the District and himself did reconcile their A.T.I.P. and this T.I.P. to ensure they match.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE FY2019-2022 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmaz, Bergman, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF CONSULTANT FOR CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS' ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN

Kouba reported that back in January the MPO received a request from the City of East Grand Forks to assist them with their ADA Transition Plan. She stated that we amended the project into our Work Program, and then released an RFQ.

Kouba commented that we received two proposals and the Selection Committee met, interviewed, and chose SRF Consulting Group. She added that they did come in under budget and agreed to all the tasks we requested be done, so staff is requesting the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the execution of a contract with SRF Consulting Group to assist with the City of East Grand Forks' ADA Right-Of-Way Transition Plan.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH SRF CONSULTING GROUP TO ASSIST WITH THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS' ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Bergman, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA 5339 AND 5310
CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Kouba reported that back in February the NDDOT, along with the MPO, released solicitation for projects for the FTA 5339 and 5310 Programs.

Kouba stated that Cities Area Transit is the transit provider for the area, and if anyone has any projects they would like considered for either program they have to go through them, they can't submit their own requests.

Kouba commented that for the 5339 program there were five projects submitted: 1) Medium Duty Bus (35-foot); 2) Digital Signs for Transit Center; 3) Destination Signs for inside the buses; 4) Manlift; and 5) Bus Stop Way Signage (this is a last minute inclusion and will go before the City Council for approval on April 16th).

Kouba stated that for the 5310 program there were two projects submitted: 1) Mobility Manager and 2) Replacement Mini Van.

Kouba said that these all fall within the realm of our Transit Development Plan, and staff is requesting the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve all of the projects as being consistent with the Transit Development Plan.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA 5339 AND 5310 CANDIDATE PROJECTS, AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Bergman, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

Haugen reported that one other thing, when we talk about 5339 grants, and the projects, he would ask Mr. Bergman to share some exciting news he received.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Bergman stated that on April 2nd we were notified that the City was receiving 5339 funding for a bus and the bus facilities in the amount of \$3.6 million. He said that in figuring out the dollar amount we got now, along with previous funds that we were going to add on to fix the buildings, we should have a total of \$4.88 million dollars. He commented that they originally requested \$8.6 million, but this still turned out very well for us.

Haugen added that along with that award we are going to have to make some amendments to our Transit Development Plan and also to our T.I.P.; and he hopes that Mr. Bergman and Ms. Kouba have been talking about that. Bergman responded that they have had one discussion, but he has been working on the RFQ for architects to do the work on the bus facilities. He explained that the original contract for work on the bus facilities, which was approved eight years ago, expired three years ago, and he didn't think we were going to be getting any funding so he placed it on the back burner in October, and then all of this occurred, so he has been working on a new one.

Haugen asked if they weren't also hoping to start construction this season. Bergman responded they were. Haugen said, then, that there is typically a sixty-day process for the MPO to amend adding that, so keep that in mind. Bergman said that they will start the process next week.

Haugen commented that as we discussed last month, and we will have more discussion on the fact that there are different timelines that kick in, or requirements that we have to meet; and obviously we talked about the Safety Performance Measures, but there are some Transit Performance Measures that kick in this fall, so we need to be aware of what is required when, and we may have discussions next month where we trying to address everything at once, but we do know we have to make amendments to our current plan and our current T.I.P. to accommodate your award.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT UPWP AMENDMENT FOR CITY OF GRAND FORKS' DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Haugen reported that last month we discussed that we would be amending our work program to get things lined up to do some transportation planning for Downtown Grand Forks, and to a lesser extent East Grand Forks. He stated that the first thing the staff report irons out is our actual funding that we have available for the FY2018 calendar year.

Brooks commented that the City of Grand Forks is going to ask that this item be tabled. He explained that staff met and it is his understanding that they aren't quite ready to have this go forward yet as they are still in the process of hiring the consultant, so in talking with Mr. Grasser and Ms. Richards it was decided that they may end up doing the project all in-house with the current selection, potentially, so, if for some reason that doesn't work out they will probably come back next month with this, but for now they would like to have this item be tabled.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM FOR ONE MONTH.

Haugen asked, for discussion purposes, if they could separate out some of it because it includes the cleaning up of our actual funding amounts, and also something about getting things lined up

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

for amending our Street and Highway contract for additional bridge work. Brooks responded that he was just talking about tabling the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Planning project.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE PULLING THEIR ORIGINAL MOTION.

Haugen reported that the first item; and we'll separate this into three things; so the first one deals with cleaning up our revenue, the second one deals with the potential downtown transportation project, and the third one deals with setting aside funds for a possible amendment to our Street and Highway contract.

Haugen commented that first, we originally were identifying \$610,000 being available out of the FY2018 Consolidated Planning Grant, but in working with Mr. Johnson and Minnesota we have now identified that the true estimate should be \$514,000. He explained that the previous year's, because we were allowed to use FY2014 dollars, it delayed the use of FY2017 dollars, and that total is actually, after audits and end of the year, \$329,000; so the first thing we would be asking is to amend our revenue to make it reflect these new funding sources and their dollar values. He said that the end result, as you can see, is about a \$20,000 decrease from what we had previously thought out work program could contain this year.

Haugen stated that the third one is, as we discussed with the last agenda item, involves the possibility that we might be tasked to do an additional scope-of-work; and since we were potentially doing a work program amendment we wanted to address all of the things in the work program at the same time; so we were originally setting aside so much dollars for the downtown planning, and the remaining dollars, which is around \$66,000 was going to be put into a line item for the Amendment #2 – Street and Highway Plan to develop with those bridge issues, and you see it reflected in the table at the end, \$60,000.

Haugen said that we don't have a precise scope of work yet for that Amendment #2 to the Street and Highway Plan, but it is going to be focusing on going to the next step with the bridge analyses; so far we have only done a traffic impact analysis. He stated that the next step, depending on which locations we are including, would be the touch down points, updating the cost estimates, and those items we spelled out in the scope of work amendment that we would be processed through the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board, hopefully next month, but this gets this out of the way and in our work program and the budget that is all identified as to what we need to do to place our dollars at for 2018.

Haugen commented that the last thing is not something that is part of a motion, but just to highlight and bring to your attention that a couple of months ago we did amend the work program for the Washington Underpass Study, and he just received word earlier this week from the NDDOT that they continue to want us to hold on that study, so we aren't doing any activities to further that project along.

Haugen said that, based on conversation a motion to approve the recommended Amendment #4 subject to striking out the Grand Forks Downtown Planning activity. Kuharenko asked if it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

would also include not striking out the U.S. #2/U.S. #81 scope of work. Haugen responded it would.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT #4 SUBJECT TO EXCLUSION OF THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PLANNING ACTIVITY.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmass, Bergman, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING, AS SUBMITTED

Haugen reported that the FAST-ACT requires that the MPO, the State DOT and the Transit Operator reach an agreement on how the performance-based planning measures will be processed through all three entities. He said that this agreement is a separate agreement from another agreement that most of you, who are long time Technical Advisory Committee members are familiar with that lays out transportation planning, general for responsibilities by party, T.I.P. responsibilities, work program responsibilities, special study responsibilities, that is a separate document and that has to be updated as well, but FAST requires a May 27th deadline for this particular agreement to be in place.

Haugen explained that Minnesota has been working with its MPOs and transit operators drafting up the MOU. He stated that it is a two-part document; the MOU itself is a one-page document with signatures, and it is an MOU so it isn't very enforceable through court or anything of that fashion, but it does require the signature of the transit operator, which on the Minnesota side is the City of East Grand Forks, the MPO and the MnDOT.

Haugen commented that a follow-up document is meant to be the one document that pertains to procedures. It is separate from the MOU that has to go around for signatures, but it is referenced, and as you can see the original draft was in August, and an update done in November, and a further update in March. He said that it tries to identify all of the performance measures, etc. that are required, and also tries to identify which agency has what responsibilities in connection with data requirements.

Haugen stated that from a pure technical point of view, because PM1 or Safety, is the one that is already in place this MOU could only address PM1, but there is no real unknowns with PM2 and PM3, as to the process, so they are included in here as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Haugen reported that he knows that the City of East Grand Forks is vetting it through their process concurrently with the MPO, and actually discussed it last night at their meeting. Ellis commented that it will go for consent next Tuesday.

Haugen commented that MnDOT is asking us to get this done sooner than later, so with that it is a template that all the other MPOs and transit operators across Minnesota are signing off on. He added that we have worked through and identified any concerns we had and they have been addressed so staff is recommending approval of this MOU, and would ask that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a similar recommendation.

Kuharenko asked if this is something that the City of Grand Forks will be looking at from the NDDOT as well. Johnson responded that they are working on it. He said that he was trying really hard to get it ready for today's meeting, but you will have to consider it at our May meeting instead.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA MOU ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Kuharenko, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Universe of Projects

Haugen reported that they have been shopping their spreadsheet around, adding that it is a rather opposing spreadsheet, but they have been able to get some responses back and have done some cleaning up and consolidation of projects.

Haugen stated that they categorized the projects into subcategories; we obviously have projects already programmed in our T.I.P., those are right around \$70 million dollars, because we identified existing plus committed street network, or as housing and employment needs to be located in greenfields, they need to have streets to them to model, so we are identify another \$65 million dollars worth of projects that are needed between now and 2045 to support that growth.

Haugen said that they went through the Safety planning documents and identified all the projects that are being recommended in those documents on both sides of the river; and there are \$20 million dollars there. He added that some of this, almost half, is already programmed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

He said that they also have some questions on the Minnesota side as to what exactly some of the projects are identifying, and they know that they are trying to identify them for us.

Haugen referred to the Multi-modal Streetscape and Studies should actually should have a higher value, but it is reflecting the two Urban Grants candidate projects, it is kind of where the new North Dakota Urban Grant, or Mainstreet Program, is being placed in, and so far we have only identified the two requests that were submitted, and then we also have the one request for the 47th Avenue Capacity Issue NEPA document, so this value should be closer to \$4.5 million dollars.

Haugen commented that the State of Good Repair is basically all the projects that were identified in the 2040 plan that aren't already programmed or completed, so as a baseline we are carrying forward those projects we prioritized in the current MTP, in this category of State of Good Repair.

Haugen said that the biggest chunk are what we are terming discretionary or illustrative projects, projects that have been identified in the past, projects that were identified from specific corridor studies or other studies that have been done; and you can see that almost half a billion dollars is shown for this category, for a total of three quarter of a billion dollars in projects.

Haugen referred to the tables in the packet and went the information briefly. He asked that everyone please give this information another look as we don't want to miss any projects.

Kuharenko commented that, in discussing the State of Good Repair projects, he knows that one of the things he sent an e-mail on last week or the week before was regarding the available federal funding, and that they thought that a lot of that should be focused on the NHS system; especially because of the performance measures that we've got they can come up with a list for those projects based on the NHS system, and he can get that out to everyone; but in regard to the rest being federally eligible, that would be a much larger task and it is something that where, even this past year Cherry Street pretty much fell apart on us, so that is a lot more difficult to do and he would think that they can get something more focused on the NHS system, so that is probably where we should end up focusing a lot of our federal dollars on, is on that system. Haugen responded that there are two problems with that; the first one is the North Dakota funding doesn't fund the NHS versus the Non-NHS, it funds regional versus urban, and there are a lot fewer miles on the Urban system that is part of the NHS, that the revenue that is being offered by North Dakota is too much to maintain the Non-State owned NHS. He stated that the second issue is that we do have to show the feds that their federal aid system is being maintained and operated in a state of good repair, so functionally classified collectors and above should have some work done that gives the State and the Feds ease of mind that their prior investments are being maintained.

Kuharenko said that he would counter on that a little bit on the use of federal funds by saying that he agrees with you that the urban road section of the NHS is small in comparison to the regional, however in looking at the projects that they requested in this last go around, to reconstruct Columbia, the overpass and University, the current condition of the northern part of Columbia, and then getting into a more robust maintenance cycle on Columba and Washington,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

south of 32nd, as well as following up with their traffic signals and that sort of thing, that a lot of the federal funding is focused more on the NHS system than on the rest of the classified system; and from the performance measures that we have currently, as far as he is aware, that is more geared towards the NHS and the Interstate System bridges, than necessarily the rest of the classified road network, and even though it is federally eligible, the available federal funds would tend to have it more focused on the NHS system than the rest of the remaining classified road network.

Haugen stated, then, that we will have to come up with a balance. He added that we can't neglect the rest of the federal aid system without some way of assuring that it is being maintained, and that five years from now, or ten years from now we aren't going to be saying "boy, we missed the boat and now these other federal aid systems are bad"

Johnson commented that Mr. Haugen is correct. He added that the other risk you run is that federal funding might move in the future to only fund NHS, right now you've got money available to fund all of those federally classified roadways, so you don't want to completely walk away from them.

Haugen said that we found in our current 2040 plan that our State Highways are in horrible shape and need a lot of funding. He stated that there is a balance that we have to come up with, we can't totally not address the Non-NHS Federal Aid Roadways, and we are required to focus on the NHS system, but we can't focus on it by ignoring the rest of the federal aid system. He added that we also have some State Highways that aren't even on an NHS system that we have to deal with as well; and we do know that some of your recently raised sales tax are currently addressing some of the federal aid roadways that were previously identified in the state of good repair list from the 2040 plan, so we aren't saying that their being neglected, we just have to show our State and Federal partners that they are being maintained.

Kuharenko commented that that is one situation where it can end up varying quite a lot from year to year, that's why they want to focus on classified road system versus the local roadways. He said that he knows this year they are hitting a number of local roadways that they had petitions on with that sales tax money, and they are also hitting some classified roadway systems as well, but that can vary from year to year and so that point in time we start getting into how much is actually being spent on the classified roadway system versus the local, so that is another balance they have to play as well.

Haugen said, then, that we can assume here that there we are going into program periods; short, medium and long, so we can assume that we have an annual base of "x" dollars being available, but also know that our revenue likely won't grow at the same rate as the expenditures grow, so, last time what we did was to put all of year of expenditures at the mid-point of the short, medium and long; and our revenue was placed not at the mid-year, but as an annual growth, and within those periods that was the total that was available.

Kuharenko asked if we ever got a determination as to what we are using for revenue inflation. Johnson responded we haven't yet. Haugen added that we did on the Minnesota side. He said that right now every fourth year is capped at \$860,000, without assuming any increase. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

added that on the trunk highway side in Minnesota, they have identified a third project, but they only go out ten years with their identification of projects, and previously we had two projects identified and the third they have identified is in 2021 we are doing the west bound lane of U.S. #2 and U.S. #220, and in 2028 they are doing the east bound lane of U.S. #2; other than that the Minnesota funds can't reasonably forecast any additional element to the MPO study area. He said that we can identify a lot of competitive opportunities to federal or state fund on the Minnesota side, but we can't assume an allotment of those to come in as new projects.

Haugen said that, where he was going with his previous point is that with the ebbs and flows that you talk about, sometimes the classified system sometimes just local systems, but we should be able to assume a reasonable amount would be going towards the classified system, and address it that way instead of, again, trying to plug everything into a specific year with a specific cost, we are trying to YOY at the mid of a time period cost to acknowledge that it is an estimate and there is a lot of range that is going on to that estimate. Kuharenko commented that he was looking more for if we had a percentage of inflation that we are using for revenue, and what percentage of inflation are you using for construction costs.

Haugen stated that what we are trying to do on the Main Street Program is, there is some unlikelihood we will get a grant every year, but it is likely that as this continues out several years, we should get some success and get grants, whether it is one every three years or every four years; then every five years we would agree to a reasonable forecast assumption and go with that for the next five years, or if we find out it is grossly in error we can make the changes mid-stream, so it is important that we identify all of the federal aid roadways in our study area.

Haugen said that they are talking with the counties. He added that, historically, both counties have not enjoyed, have not utilized a lot of federal aid on their system within the MPO area, but that is now changing so we also need to bring them into the mix; and we have had recent discussions with them to get that done. He said that, again, he is asking everyone to review the lists and help us identify what those projects might be and the timeline of when they should occur.

Riesinger commented that he noticed that the airport intersection is listed in there in the 2030-2045 Safety Operations table with a current cost of \$1,722,000 for an intersection reconfiguration/ITS improvements; do you know more specifically what that all is referencing. Haugen responded that what they did with that specific listing is the actual local roads safety improvement program identifies an R-Cut at a cost of \$1,000,000, but our U.S. #2 Study recommendation is that Staggered-T at the \$1,722,000 cost so he believes the description is still generic, but the dollar value show is the highest of the two; so it is identified with the higher dollar value and as an intersection reconfiguration, not specifically identifying either an R-Cut or a Staggered-T, but the value is the higher value. He added that he believes that North Dakota is about to do the cabinet work there, and he thinks part of their decision is to put in speed minder signs ahead of time, and then do some modifications to the locations of the flashing lights, so some of the ITS that is referenced there is being done probably sooner than one thinks.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

b. PM3

Haugen reported that they are skipping PM2 as they are still waiting for information. He said that the PM3 is reliability; PM3 is the, and he thinks the Mr. Viafara went through that with you last month, the calculations, the details of how it is calculated and he believes you also made reference that there is now a tool that is available that does all that work for everyone so you just need to go in and download that information, and that is what these maps are showing, but the one thing that the tool is trying to clean up still is this issue of using the pre-FAST NHS system, and we are trying to do a PM3 using the current NHS system, and so for the States, in their first effort in identifying targets they are going to struggle with that issue because not all NHS routes are being loaded up in the tool, and there are some Non-NHS that are being ported out of the tool; however because the MPO has 180 days that issue will be resolved by mid-summer and we should be able then to rely on the tool having a correct NTS Route System in place.

Haugen commented that another thing it allows is the 2017 year that these follow up pages are recording out of was a transition year from a contractor that was collecting the data one way to a new contractor that is collecting data, so we will have more consistent data when we go through the effort of identify what our targets may be.

Haugen referred to slides of three maps and went over them briefly.

Kuharenko said that he has a question on the Non-Interstate reliability portion; does that take, if we end up having a year-long project, is that taken into account into these calculations or is that going to possibly ding us somewhere down the road. Haugen responded that when we set the targets we need to account for that and set our targets knowing that it will ding for that year if we have a lot of construction, our travel will be reduced. He added that it is a two or four-year target, so one year is softened out over a long period of time.

Haugen stated that on the PM3 it is being reported out as all the MPO area, it isn't being reported out on the Minnesota side only, so when you look at the State of Minnesota data where we talk about interstate they also report I-29 for Grand Forks/East Grand Forks and I-29/I-94 for the North Dakota side for Fargo/Moorhead; and so whereas in the safety we are between two states PM3, utilizing this tool we are in the same boat.

Haugen commented that this tool is also collecting data for the Non-NHS Routes, the State of Minnesota is purchasing the ability to utilize and access that data, and it will be giving all MPOS access to that data as well. He added that it will be similar to how North Dakota purchases the travel demand model network, and allows us to have access to it, so what is free and available on the website right now is this NHS system, what MnDOT is purchasing will be available to us at some point in the near future and will be the non-NHS routes.

Johnson stated that one thing he would add is, and most of you already know this, but there is a common misconception that they have heard when dealing with this reliability, that it not the same as congestion; you can have reliable congestion, so it is how reliable is that facility working on a day to day basis, if it is bumper to bumper every day, that is reliable.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Haugen commented that there is no built-in penalty if you don't meet the target. He added that the State PM3 does need a decision by May 20th, and that starts our clock for the 180-day period we are allotted. He asked if everyone recalls with the safety performance target, he forgets which, but one State reported theirs a couple of days earlier than the other State, and therefore we had to make a decision on one side of the river on one date, and on another date on the other side of the river, so they have since clarified that our 180 days start on the day the last State makes its decision. Johnson asked who provided that direction. Haugen responded that it is in the Federal Highway Headquarter Q&A.

Information only.

c. Future Bridges

Haugen reported that we went through the task of trying to identify how four locations benefited the local traffic impact and presented it at a meeting of the MPO Board, to which the Technical Advisory Committee, the City Councils from both cities, and others were invited, and the Board made a recommendation that staff go to each individual agency for their recommendations. He said that East Grand Forks is recommending focusing on just 24th and 32nd Avenues and Grand Forks has formally asked us to keep all four options on the table, and also consider adding 17th Avenue as well. He added that he is meeting with Polk County next Tuesday and Grand Forks County hasn't yet scheduled the agenda item yet, although it has been requested several times.

Haugen commented that just to give a recap on where we are with 24th, 32nd, 47th, and Merrifield, when we were at the Grand Forks City Council meeting they really wanted to know what impacts an interchange on 47th Avenue would have, so we said we would run that model. He explained that the reason they didn't run it in the past was, by definition an Interchange on Interstate is to serve regional movement not local movement, but we did it anyway. He said that when they ran it they found that the interchange operates just as the other interchanges do, there isn't a strong correlation between interstate traffic and new southern bridge locations, however Merrifield is the one exception to that general rule.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over the information briefly.

Presentation continued.

Haugen stated that our next steps, if we are truly going tackle these, and keep all four crossings and maybe add another crossing, would be to resurrect all of our previous work we did after the flood, and update it so it reflects today's costs; revisit how the bridge profiles were done, do the actual benefit/cost calculations, etc.

Haugen said that we have already recommended an amendment to the Work Program, so we aren't being delayed by a need to do it later. He added that he already identified to Kimley-Horn the possibility of the scope of work and he provided them with the information we generated from the 2030 plan, but we do have to remember that the have a draft by early

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

October is still a deadline for us, and we need to have the 2045 plan adopted by the MPO Board by the end of December of 2018.

Information only.

d. Open House April 18th

Haugen reported that we will be holding an Open House on April 18th at Choice Health and Fitness Center starting at 5:30 p.m., with a presentation at 6:00 p.m.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included in the packet for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 11TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:40 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the May 9th, 2018, 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: Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT (Proxy for Darren Laesch); Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmaz, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Grand Forks Airport Authority.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Ryan Brooks, Darren Laesch, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Mary Karlsson, Kimley-Horn; Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mareck, WSB & Associates; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present: Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, for the benefit of those in the audience today, could everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kuharenko reported that his name was misspelled in the voting sections of the minutes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO CORRECTION OF MR. KUHARENKO'S NAME, AS REQUESTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen commented that we do have a request to suspend the agenda to hear discussion on Agenda Item 9: Matter Of 2045 Street/Highway Element Update. Consensus was to suspend the agenda to hear discussion on Agenda Item 9.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen distributed copies of the updated power point presentation and stated that our consultants from Kimley-Horn and WSB are here today to give a presentation.

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

Revenue Forecasts

Karlsson reminded the committee of the Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting on February 20th, where they walked through the initial revenue forecasts, really focusing on identifying the programs, and then began to get their hands around the general dollar amounts in those programs.

Karlsson stated that in March and April they worked to refine the assumptions. She thanked everyone that met and/or talked with her to get this accomplished.

Karlsson commented that today we will be reviewing the Draft Revenue Forecasts, and then they will give everyone some time to digest the forecasts and then in June we can finalize them.

Karlsson referred to the revenue sources and pointed out that this is very similar to what you saw in February; breaking it out into different programs. She stated that this time she is going to structure it so that we first go through the federal funds that are distributed by the State DOTs; then through the state funds that are distributed by the State DOT's, and then we will go through the funds that are distributed by the local entities. She said that it seems to flow a little better that way, if we can give up who the distributing agency is instead of purely the source of the funding, whether it is Federal, State, or Local.

Karlsson referred to the list of federal resources that are distributed by the State DOTs and commented that you can see that the programs are a little bit different in North Dakota compared to Minnesota; but the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a unified program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Karlsson referred to a slide listing the key changes that we are seeing from what was discussed in February and went over it briefly. She pointed out that the first one is the potential that Fargo will become a Transportation Management Area (TMA) in 2022. She explained that what this means is that it could have an impact on the funding that is available throughout the State of North Dakota because North Dakota has to take a certain amount of funding and put it toward a CMAQ program.

Karlsson stated that the second change, a positive change, is the Main Street Initiative. She said that they worked with the NDDOT to develop a potential revenue projection; again this isn't a source that existed in the past, so they developed a methodology to come up with a number that should be federal aid acceptable because it is and identified funding source that will be allocated, but there is no guarantee that Grand Forks will receive funding, but in working with the NDDOT they decided to base it on population as an assumption, so you will see they came up with an amount of \$600,000.

Karlsson commented that the last change is the HSIP funding, which is a significant addition from the current plan.

Karlsson reported that, while a possible 30% reduction in Urban Regional funding looks like it is a big number, it works out to about \$1 million dollars, so it isn't a huge reduction, but it is somewhat of a reduction, but then these other two sources will end up evening it out so there will actually be zero change in the amount of funding.

Karlsson pointed out that they added the North Dakota Interstate Program, so this is one area that they still need to work on with the NDDOT to coordinate with them to see if there will still be funding that Grand Forks can participate in for the Interstate. She stated that they also added in the Mainstreet, and are saying that is about \$600,000 a year. She said that one of the things they will need to discuss on that is if it should be an annual function, so every year the region would be receiving \$600,000; or should we be assuming that that would be every two years, every two years we would get \$1.2 million or every three years \$1.8 million.

Grasser asked if, on this slide, this is how it is going to be distributed and broken down to Grand Forks. Karlsson responded that it is just for the Grand Forks area within North Dakota, and the other column is Minnesota. Grasser commented that it might be beneficial to adjust the title in there to make sure we understand, you are kind of bopping back and forth between wholistic North Dakota and then back to Grand Forks, just so it is clear which number you are talking about. Karlsson stated that, again, this would not just go to Grand Forks, it would also go to the counties, which you will see in the next slide, so if you want it can say this is Grand Forks and Grand Forks County.

Haugen commented that part of what he thinks Mr. Johnson is asking the Technical Advisory Committee to weigh in on is, among other things, the Main Street Initiative. He said that the reason why it is kind of important that we agree on a forecast whether annually or every other year or third year is how you frame the project that you will be applying for or want considered, so obviously every year you could consider something in the realm of \$600,000 or every other

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

year you could be looking at a project that is \$1.2 million and so the question comes back to what kind of projects are we envisioning we will be applying for, what scale of project, because not every year does it have to be a \$1.2 million or \$600,000, but it shouldn't be \$5 million dollar projects every year.

Kuharenko commented that, as a point of reference, he knows that the last Urban Grant Program application they applied for, 2019 and 2020, they ended up targeting about a million dollars in federal funds for each of those applications; and they were trying to figure out what would be a reasonable project size at that point in time, so that was their best guess; whether or not they would keep moving forward with that size of project, or reduce the size of project.

Karlsson said that she is hearing, if she had to translate that she would say maybe once every two years at \$1.2 million; that, maybe is how you want to characterize the funding. Grasser responded that he doesn't know enough about the program; you're asking for an answer to something that he probably has more questions on, because the Urban Program we may target a certain project, it might be \$1.2 million, and ask for it this year and if it gets turned down reapply versus if you assume you are going to every other year, every other year suggests to him that you've got an allocation, and you can count on giving up one year to get the next; but with this being a competitive program he is going to submit every single year, and while we may not get it every year, but he would hate to forgo a year and then not get it and essentially lose out on funding, so he would be very leery about characterizing this. He added that he thinks \$600,000 a year in general; you're asking how we are going to strategize the implementation, we are at the planning stage here, so he would be uncomfortable saying we would do this or that, in any event today. He said, again, on the Urban they don't always get their request every single year, but you throw it in and see what happens, it is a competitive process, and this would be a competitive process. He stated that from their standpoint, they would also consider how small of a project should it be before it is worthwhile doing all the federal paperwork. He commented that, maybe it is just because it was their idea, but he thinks that that million dollarish type timeframe is not a bad one, but he wouldn't necessarily say they would give up every other year to do that. H

Haugen stated that all of this is good input; adding that they aren't expecting direct answers today but would ask that you think about it and we will bring it back next month so we can come to an agreement on what our financial forecasts will be from that point forward.

Bergman asked what the Main Street Initiative monies can be used for. Haugen responded that it can be used for all of the Title 23 activities, and Title 49. He explained that Title 23 allows their dollars to be crossed over to Title 49 so transit operations, transit capital, anything that is allowed under Title 23 so it is very open.

Grasser commented that he thinks that some of this they will have to see how the downtown master planning thing comes through because that will also suggest maybe priorities and scope and those types of things, we just don't have those answers today.

Haugen asked Mr. Johnson to walk us through the 30% potential cut issue, there might be some interest in having a little more knowledge on what is going on with that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Johnson gave a brief overview on the possible 30% reduction in Urban Regional funding. He explained that they ran through, internally in their department, scenarios using assumptions, and went over them briefly.

Johnson summarized that with all of this information they came up with a potential Urban Regional Program of about \$17.5 million and an Urban Roads Program of about \$17.5 million as well. He said, though, that one thing to note here is that the makeup of the Urban Grant Program could possibly take a million dollars off the top of each one of those programs and that has been accounted for. He explained that when they looked at the TMA option, the difference is when the STPBG funding is allocated to the State, the urban pot of money is split, so the TMA gets their chunk, the urban areas get a chunk, and the rural counties get a chunk. He added that the county number doesn't change all that much in the scenario that they brought; so then when they divided that out and tried to look at it, now when they makeup the Urban Program that number that was about \$35 million, but with a TMA is now just under \$25 million for the TMA; so half of that would make up Regional, which is \$12 million, the other half is Urban Road with \$12 million, and then the TMA population actually also equals out to right about \$12.4 million, so they are all right in line with each other and end up being fairly equal.

Johnson commented that there are a couple of things to note here; as Ms. Karlsson alluded to, the \$3.5 and the \$4.4 is about a 30% reduction on the Urban Regional side; on the Urban Road side it actually works out, surprisingly well, or status quo, because eventually Fargo and West Fargo would no longer be in the Urban Roads Program, even though there is an equivalent 30% reduction available to the Urban Roads, the amount of money that Fargo and West Fargo is currently getting in the Urban Roads Program is almost identically about that 30%, so removing them from the program, Watford City, and using that new number of \$12.4 Urban Roads and running it through the formula, everyone's yearly amount available from the Urban Roads Program is almost status quo; for example, the Grand Forks number shows a slight increase of about \$34,000, all the other areas also show slight increases, and that is even showing a new allocation of about \$420,000 for Watford City, so on the Urban Roads side there won't be much of an impact with the new revision of the TMA, and adding Watford City assuming all the other formulas and stuff stay in place. He explained that the regional is about \$4.4, but it is a more competitive type number.

Grasser asked, procedurally, this \$2.458M starting in 2018, that is the theoretical amount we would receive under a fully funded transportation bill, he is assuming, is that a correct assumption. Haugen responded that it is. Grasser commented that this has always been a difficult issue; what's it been, ten year ago or so we kind of had that great financial reset to correct the funding balances between a bill theoretically provides and what is actually appropriated, is that somehow addressed in the Long Range Plan, or are we going to assume that Washington is magically going to just change their process and just come up with all the money they are supposed to.

Haugen responded that he thinks the basic question here is, the rescission that is looming out there under the current FAST ACT, congress is supposed to have a set rescission, but he doesn't remember the dollar amount or how it impacts all the programs across the board so he would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

defer to Mr. Johnson to answer this if he can. Johnson responded that he isn't positive what the impact is, but the way the law was originally written is that there was a rescission apportionment; so any appropriation that the State is sitting on, those would be pulled back, but he doesn't remember the actual numbers, but he believes we have the opportunity to use some apportionment moving around if we don't want maybe a program that has a little bit of a higher apportionment number to it right now, we can move it and have it programmed for those certain things to help us down those funds needs and move forward. He added, though, that Fiscal Year 2018, the fiscal year we are in right now was the last funded year of the FAST ACT, Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020 are not funded, so there are a lot of functions going into all of what they are doing, not only what he just explained, but also the plan that Mr. Haugen is trying to lay out that Ms. Karlsson is representing with this table of figures, they are assumptions, and they are all something that we can all agree to today and sponsor now but can be completely different.

Grasser commented that he appreciates those complications, and he is really a simple guy when it gets down to it, and why is his simplistic thought process then behind these numbers, these are high end numbers likely to go to down to some amount in the future, these are high end optimistic is kind of how he characterizes it in his head.

Haugen stated that he would provide that, the way the current formula and accounting that the State does is, every year you are not going to have a \$2.5 million dollar project, but they account and balance, and in fact he thinks you are borrowing from another urban city in the current T.I.P. so if the rescission does come, you might be on the positive side of the rescission because your balance was a negative, and if you deduct a negative from a negative it is a negative, you don't lose anything. He said, though, that then they go right back to this formula and these numbers would be the numbers that would build up again, so you are losing paper money at a bank that may never have been real money anyway, so the short answer is that we know it is out there, but if our assumption is that it isn't going to have a major impact moving forward, if the decision comes in 2020 or 2019 or 2021 that causes us to say that it is a huge change in our fiscal picture, we will be required to revisit our financial planning.

Grasser commented that the hard part is, how does this go over the next twenty five to thirty years; these things have a tendency to kind of recur.

Karlsson stated that the federal guidance is that you have to have a reasonably defensible assumption; so what they are showing here is, according to federal law right now, is reasonably defensible. She added, though that you are right, you don't want to go take a loan out on this, but it is following the federal guidance and it is following the best information we have available, and you are right, from a strict financial planning perspective, you may have to do some over assuming things. Grasser said that that is what he said, again recognizing these are probably high end numbers on the planning level.

Haugen said that it is kind of a similar discussion on the 30% decrease, and the MPO Directors met last week and he raised this concern to the DOT that if we decide that we are going with a 30% decrease on the regional side and craft our plan around that, when we come to solicit programs for the T.I.P. we will be expecting, then, that the regional program should reflect that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

30% decrease, and it is just a matter of how long might the State wait before they say that it is our State Highways that are taking the 30% hit here, should we revisit the formula and try to make it equal again; and so he is just trying to, push might the word, the NDDOT to have some confidence level, or discussion at least, that if we move forward with the 30% decrease that four months from now it isn't going to get flipped on us and we are in the midst of adopting a plan with that 30% decrease and now we are hearing different information, so that is a push on the 30% decrease that he is being the squeaky wheel about. Johnson commented that they have an internal meeting on Friday to work on a response to that question, so they are moving on it, although he doesn't know if he will have an answer for you by Friday, but they will put some thought into it and try to come up with a solution.

Johnson state that two other things he just wants to make sure he highlighted are; number one, and this has been historical for quite some time with the current make-up of the Urban Program and where the funding comes from; within each act there is a base formula for allocation to urban areas that they, as a State, must provide and they have historically been higher than that number, quite a bit higher than that number and then even with these reduction and these changes he is noting, because of the grant program reduction and the funding formula, they are still providing quite a bit more to the urban areas than they are required to, so that is something to consider to as part of the assumption that they are assuming that things are going to stay the same with how things are funded.

Johnson said that the other thing to highlight is that there is a lot of talk, and a lot of concern about federal funding and the possibility that it may reverse its current split from 80% federal/20% local to 20% federal/80% local, which would have an enormous impact on everything we do across North Dakota if that were to occur.

Haugen commented that he thinks the last point to make is that Mr. Johnson is trying to get guidance to all three MPOs that is the same, and that might be a first for us. Johnson responded that that is correct. Haugen said that we just happen to be the first MPO with a deadline of the end of this year for new MTP; so you are on our schedule to some extent.

Karlsson referred to a slide listing the funding programs, and the amount of funding they provide and reported that she did add that the Grand Forks County has been receiving roughly, or has been allocating roughly \$400,000 per year within the MPO area, so that is a change that is not in the current plan. Grasser asked if they are expected to keep that money in the MPO area. Haugen responded that they aren't.

Karlsson stated that on the Minnesota side there is \$25,000 a year in HSIP, that has not changed from February. She pointed out that they did add in the Statewide Performance Program and the District Risk Management Program, each providing \$1 to \$2 million a year in funding; and the City Sub-Target Program that provides \$860,000 every fourth year.

Williams asked if it would be fair to say that the supply is going to be reduced by 30%, but then the demand is also going to be reduced by nearly 30%, is that correct. Karlsson asked which program she is talking about. Williams responded that it is the Urban Regional funding, where it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

says that the Urban Regional funding may be reduced by 30%, but there isn't a line in there that says that demand is also going to be reduced, so that is kind of mis-leading. Haugen responded that the Fargo/Moorhead area would be removed from competing for those funds. Williams agreed, adding, though that that is about 30%. Karlsson pointed out where it states that the NDDOT is anticipating a 30% cut that would not be replaced, then under Urban Regional, as Mr. Johnson explained, there is a 30% cut here, but because Fargo/Moorhead comes out there isn't a change, so these numbers are showing no net change.

Haugen commented that from a statewide perspective the elimination of Fargo/West Fargo, the 30% cut is absorbed statewide, so for the GF/EGF MPO that 30% cut is real. Johnson responded that it is technically for the NDDOT because there is a 30% reduction in available funding of Urban Regional dollars, however that leaves, if not more, maybe 30% less from the Fargo/West Fargo area that is no longer eligible for a part of that, so it is a true statement, however because that is a competitive number, today Grand Forks theoretically has access to apply for \$17 million dollars, but now they have the theoretical ability to apply for \$12.5 million dollars so the reduction is a little more real than just removing of the roadway Fargo/West Fargo, so the way Ms. Williams is saying it is correct.

Karlsson stated that she will continue to work with Mr. Johnson to make sure that they are communicating this correctly.

Williams commented that her concern is that it states that it is going to reduce the funding, there is no follow up statement explaining the offset, and she just doesn't want anyone to get alarmed.

Karlsson referred to a slide discussing State funding, distributed by the State DOTs, and reported that there aren't a lot of changes, but they did add a couple of things. She commented that at the February meeting we talked about the one-time legislative funding that occurred in the past, and she wants to acknowledge that that did happen in the past, and that we are following the guidance, but also wanted to point out that there isn't an amount shown, just an acknowledgement, and then also acknowledging that the North Dakota Bank loan program is an action in North Dakota for State funding. She commented that under Minnesota there aren't any changes.

Karlsson referred to the next slide and pointed out that it lists the State and Local funding that is distributed by the local governments. She explained that the sources are for both Counties and Cities. She stated that for the County, in North Dakota we have the gas tax and County property taxes; and in Minnesota we have County State Aid, County Property taxes and County sales taxes. She added that on the City side, in Grand Forks there is the existing sales tax, the new sales tax, gas tax allocation, city property taxes, and special assessments; and on the East Grand Forks side there is the Municipal State Aid and special assessments. Haugen stated that when we talk about gas tax allocation in North Dakota we are really talking about the Highway User Distribution Fund, which is actually more than just a gas tax.

Karlsson stated that the key changes to this category is obviously the new sales tax for Grand Forks. She said that this is a significant amount of money, remembering that the new sales tax

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

sunsets in 2037, it is a twenty-year program, and brings in \$65 million dollars end of year expenditure between 2018 and 2037.

Karlsson said that starting with local, how the numbers shake out; for the Grand Forks County there is about \$100,000 a year from their various sources; and then on the Minnesota side they are still doing some work to marry up with how the State Aid works with the property and sales taxes. She added that you can see that based on the T.I.P., that there is about \$750,000 being spent in the MPO area, however when we talked to the Finance Director and County Engineer they were both very clear that that is not something that happens regularly so they are still having a conversation as to what that amount will be.

Karlsson stated that we just talked about the new sales tax in Grand Forks, which is about \$3 million dollars a year and sunsets in 2037; and the existing sales tax is about \$3 million now, but, again, in talking with the Finance Director they feel that they should probably reduce that a little bit given the current trending of sales tax revenues in the City, which she thinks is a very good decision, so they are lowering it to about \$2.9 million. She added that, based on some information that Mr. Haugen provided, through the City's budget book, there is about \$2.9 million dollars the Intergovernmental Users fund.

Karlsson stated that in East Grand Forks we are looking at about just under \$600,000 per year, that is all usable Municipal State Aid plus the match. She added that it already has the loan payback reduced.

Grasser asked if Minnesota can get special bonding as well. Karlsson responded that they can. She explained that two slides previously she has this identified as "potential" funding. She stated that at the State level there is State Trunk Highway Bonding that they can do, and at the local level there is the Local Bridge Bonding as well, but it isn't something that we can assume.

Grasser commented that we are talking the income side, and they seem reasonably accurate, but are we going to translate these dollars into projects, because some of these dollars goes toward operating the highway department and other operating systems besides projects, so he doesn't know if you have taken a look into that, so this won't be all project driven. Karlsson responded that those are great point. She added that that is what Mr. Mareck is going to talk about next, how we go about the process of identifying projects, and identifying operating costs is one of the key things that they did; they made sure they had a line item in there that said that all of this isn't available for capital, that a lot has to go for operating, and they make sure that they communicate that very clearly, that all of this funding is not available for capital.

Universe Of Projects

Mareck reported that we touched on this at the last meeting, so just a quick update on the Universe of Projects list; which are any and all projects regardless of size, there is no financial constraint, no consideration of whether it is politically palatable or not palatable or environmental; it is just kind of an open-ended brain storming of any and all projects, whether

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

City, County or State, that have been identified in various plans and programs that we want to consider, ultimately for the regional MPO Transportation Plan.

Mareck stated that they feel they are getting pretty close to a final product, and he knows that Mr. Haugen has been coordinating with a lot of folks on getting data, so they appreciate everyone's cooperation and help with this.

Mareck commented that, he has just a couple of points to share; MnDOT provided them with some maintenance information that they were assuming for the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges, and he believes that that was inclusive for the entire bridge in both cases they will need to work out what the DOT shared for those projects. He said that there is also our question about whether we want to show any maintenance tasks for the Point Bridge. He added that they are also looking for some additional data on the state of good repair projects for the City of Grand Forks and Polk County and Grand Forks County.

Haugen reported that when MnDOT sent us their list they identified the work on the Kennedy and the Sorlie and included the total dollar amount; and we didn't show that at all on the North Dakota District list, any work on the bridges, so the first question is does North Dakota agree with that work in that timeframe, and if so then we automatically have to show that there is a cost on the North Dakota side for your half. He added that of the three existing bridges, two are having some work scheduled in the future, while the third, the Point Bridge, had work done on it ten years ago so will it need work done again sometime before 2045, so we should factor that in as well. Karlsson commented that this is definitely where we want to add that operating cost as well. She added that, although it isn't a project, per say, you'd want to have that in as a line item to say that it is something that required some of the funding.

Mareck referred to a slide and explained that this, then, is where we are at so far with the entire list, and this is kind of a geographic representation of the various projects, where they are located, and what category they are in. Haugen asked if this needs to be updated with the data from MnDOT and East Grand Forks. Bourdon responded that it was updated yesterday so it should be complete. Haugen said that, just to point out, of the \$4.54 million; all future river crossings are lumped into that, and we most likely won't be doing all of them so this number is if we did all of them.

Mareck stated that the next steps will be to put this all together. He commented that Ms. Karlsson was talking about the financial plan, that is the constraint of what you can actually build over the next twenty years; we also have performance measures from both DOTs that are being pulled together into an MPO set of performance measures that incorporate local values and priorities, so the performance measures and the priorities and goals that come out of that, combined with the financial forecast of what will be available, will be combined with this huge Universe of Projects list that is almost a three quarters of a billion dollars and consider all of those things together will give us the alternatives analysis, which will be the next step in the process; considering all of those things and coming up with a financially constrained project list that is supported by the Cities and the Counties and the DOTs and the MPO, that you will ultimately adopt with your transportation plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Mareck referred to a slide listing the timeline for the Universe of Alternatives and went over it briefly. He stated that back in February we had an initial draft of the Universe of Projects that has been refined over the early spring months and they are now hoping to finalize the Universe of Projects by the May 23rd board meeting if possible; and then in June and July they will actually work through the alternatives process where they will look at the financials, the performance measures, and this Universe of Projects list altogether and ultimately come up with your financially constrained plan that we can then present at the July public meeting.

Future Bridge Update

Bourdon referred to a slide and explained that it is a slide that has been shown before, when we were talking more about four river crossings, and based on input they were asked to revise the scope of work to update the analysis that was done before and add some additional analysis, so instead of four they are now looking at 5th and 17th Avenue South as well. He explained that their last analysis had some things in it, in terms of some of the travel demand output, and what would happen on a link-based analysis as well as intersection analysis, so they want to update the data to include these additional analyses. He commented that there are also some changes they want to revisit near 24th Avenue, with the Elks Drive alignment, based on some input they received.

Bourdon stated that in the past, and they will go through some slides that have been worked on in the past, one thing that made some sense just because it was transportation planning focused before, would be to update some of the cost estimates that were done in years past to kind of bring them up to today's values. He said that, for instance, the 47th Avenue South crossing didn't have a crossing estimate, so we need to do a high-level analysis to provide some more metrics that can be focused on cost estimating and some of the other performance measures.

Bourdon pointed out that the next slide shows the next steps. He explained that he already talked about adding a 17th Avenue South crossings and adjustment to Elks Drive; but one thing that they think makes sense is to look at some of the operations that will be anticipated near each of the crossings; so additional intersections at a Synchro level or intersection capacity analysis that have been added to make sure we kind of understand what happens near the touchdown points on both the west and east sides. He said that they will then update the prior memo and incorporate some of this additional analysis related to Synchro and the revised cost estimates, and a new cost estimate for 47th Avenue South, and then we will come back and present the results.

Bourdon reported that the next few slides shows information/data for each of the five locations being studied. He went over the information briefly.

Haugen commented that the current Draft Scope-of-Work for Amendment #2 was included in the packet. He asked that everyone please review it and submit comments as soon as possible as we are in kind of a time crunch given that we have to have the update completed by the end of 2018.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Haugen stated that the two things that Mr. Bourdon and himself are trying to discuss, and you don't seem then quite yet reflected in the Scope-of-Work are:

- 1) They took a shot at trying to identify the local versus regional, they thought they had a fairly clear request to focus on local traffic; so many of you saw what information they provided to try to give a sense of local versus regional, they aren't sure what additional information they can be trying to provide to answer that question, so they are trying to seek your insight on this issue.

Bourdon commented that there are some different ways, using that information, that would be helpful to present information that would maybe help with some decision making or things that maybe aren't obvious to them that would help in terms of explaining the impact of a particular crossing for local traffic versus regional traffic.

- 2) For all of the crossings, except for 47th Avenue South, they have an expectation of who is going to be the lead agency on those crossing, anything north of 32nd Avenue South; 32nd, Elks, 17th, both cities are expected to be the leads on those; Merrifield Road, in the past both Counties have said that they are anxious to do a bridge at this location, so again the assumption is they both confirmed that they are interested in being sponsors for this. He said that the one they don't have a clear answer on, on the Minnesota side is 47th Avenue South; it isn't close to a County State Aid system, it is a mile away from the flood protection system, and it is more than a mile from their current city limits, so one of the things they are trying to work a scope on is to sort of flesh out the challenge that the Minnesota Side lead agency may pose for this site.

Kuharenko referred to Amendment #3 and asked if it is what we discussed for the work program last month or is this going to be in addition to that. Haugen responded that it is what we discussed last month.

Haugen commented that, again, they would like to get any comments or insight from this body sooner than later. He explained that they are going to try to have the MPO Board consider approving Amendment #2 next Wednesday. He stated that, again, the timing isn't what we would like to present but it is the timing that we have to present.

Grasser asked if we are going to somehow think about or acknowledge off the bridge itself improvements. He said that we talked about it on the Minnesota side because the road is physically missing, but even on the North Dakota side, lets say 32nd Avenue South, or almost any of those roads, they are all old they are all in poor shape, so if we have traffic to them are we going to accelerate improvements, will there be financial recognition, or should we build-in or reconstruct part of the road to at least get it to Washington or something like that; and then how do we deal with a really wild card issue such as a pedestrian underpass. He stated that he doesn't know how to deal with those things, but there might be permutations to this beyond the bridge itself.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Haugen responded that part of the answer is just the normal preservation or the state of good repair of these corridors; when are you scheduled to do something and what type of work would that entail if a bridge was placed at that corridor, how drastically would that change the scope, so there is the difference in up-scope that we would try to address, but there is going to have to be some basic work done on all those corridors by 2025.

Williams asked, so if we already have a mill and overlay scheduled, and it would require a complete reconstruction, you would just take the difference between those two. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that this is where you guys would all do your magic if we were to add 4000 more vehicles above and beyond what would be there in 2045, that would mean we would have to do “X” instead of what we were doing before.

Grasser said that that is kind of the question, like on Belmont Road, if we add that traffic do we now go from our small two-lane section that we currently have or do we need to add turn lanes, it isn't just a matter of state of good repair, it might be a capacity extension too. Haugen commented that they are looking at all of the intersections along Belmont at all of the proposed bridge locations.

Bourdon stated that the intersection analysis would point out if an additional turn lane is needed, or some other change to an intersection, and that could all be factored in; and then he thinks there has to be some dialogue about what the difference is, in terms of where we are versus what you were already planning. He cited 24th, and explained that they looked at what the existing condition is based on what they have in the existing condition report, and it isn't great, so there is likely something that needs to be done, so we will have to have some dialogue in terms of what that is, but an enabling project or a project that goes all the way to west we will have to have some dialogue to make sure it is reasonable and will somehow tie into the bridge. He added keep in mind that this is going to be the planning level study so we want to keep it at a higher level, with higher level estimates, and we aren't going to necessarily be getting into every bit of minutiae in the planning step. He said that estimates at a higher level should have some contingents in there to make some planning level decisions. Grasser stated that another thing that should maybe be included is some sort of look at pedestrian facilities, because there are some corridors that either have sidewalks on one side that isn't a bike path, and none on the other side; so if we are going to trigger those issues that could get pretty pricey as well.

Mareck commented that another thing he would note is that we have been focusing a lot on the river crossings, and that is good, but you have your entire network that they analyzed and did a level of service analysis, which was a regional model put together, so you have your DeMers, your Washington, you major arterial corridors and other parts of the system, above and beyond the river crossing analysis where they did show various levels of congestion in the forecast in the 2040 forecast, so none of those congestion points have really been contemplated, as far as being added to the Universe Of Projects list, so as we wrap up the Universe of Projects he would encourage everyone to think of what you desire to include capacity improvements in some of those corridors; if there are any of those major arterials where you have a desire to show capacity expansion of some sort it would be important to make sure that those are shown in the Universe of Projects list.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Grasser stated that that is a good question, but he has no idea where to start on it. Mareck said that they have mapping that will show you level of service A through F for your major arterial corridors, and how your different arterials grade out on a congestion basis. Haugen pointed out that most of them are in the discretionary list. Grasser commented that the catch-22 on this is that from a federal level we don't talk about doing any kind of capacity as up to a level of service D is acceptable, and state of good repair we don't do capacity improvements at all; but he could see on a local level, once we start getting into that level of service D, there will be an uprising and they aren't going to care about federal standards, they are going to want to see something done.

Kuharenko commented that if we start doing intersection improvements and we need to start acquiring property as well, we are going to need to try to balance that with congestion issues as well.

Williams added that it would help us greatly, when we are looking at a list, and you are showing the cost of a project, if we know whether or not it includes buyout acquisition, utility relocation, design, or is it just going out and assuming that all of that has been done and all we are doing is building the road, so if we know what we are talking about that would be extremely helpful. Mareck responded that all of the project costs you see in the Universe of Projects list are going to be planning level unit costs, "X" amount per mile, it isn't going to be to a final design level. Williams said, then, that it doesn't include right-of-way or utility relocation. Mareck responded that there is a generalized assumption that is made, but it is not property specific, so basically your full Universe of Projects list is an educated guess based on some unit costs that are done at a planning level to give you a placeholder to consider that project in your programming, and then once you develop a project and get it into the program, then you will need to review all of those costs and come up with better estimates. Karlsson added that any of the projects that have had a cost estimate done, that are in the plan, they take those costs and inflate them based on what was in there, so you would know better than they do what costs exactly are in there.

Mareck stated that many of those costs are already defined based on studies, and they are adjusting them based on the year of expenditure and then they will look at them as cost based on the year anticipated for implementation, so under the short-term, mid-term, and long-term plans you will take your revenue forecasts and you have a model based on what the revenue will be over time, then you have inflation for a particular time frame to try to true it up as close as possible.

Grasser said that they have made this comment before so it is important to put some of those notations, not just in the report, but almost on the table where you are doing the estimates because, again as you are pulling them out of other studies, not all studies have been consistent in the manner that they handle those; so again, from the construction side of the world, and the notation side of the world they need to have a sense of if there is just a generic allowance of 2% for right-of-way, that is fine but when they start looking at a project we need to know if that is going to be way higher or way lower so they can start factoring that in, but if they don't have that sense they can't really get into it to get a sense of how accurate that number might be.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Karlsson reported that the other piece of comfort that it would give, is that you remember that this plan is updated every five years; so as you mentioned about the level of service D, her previous boss always used to tease her about, well Mary, autonomous vehicles aren't going to show up tomorrow, we are going to be updating the plan soon enough that we are going to be able to address what is going to come, and she takes comfort in knowing that we will be living with this plan for three or four years and then this conversation will start again and we'll update it, but she knows that isn't a great answer. Grasser responded that it is actually a good answer, and it is important to keep that in context when we are trying to predict paving for the next 25-years; he agrees with you that five years is probably, at best, a fairly reasonable estimate to try to identify some projects, so he agrees with that statement.

Bourdon referred to the next slide and explained that they held the third public meeting on April 18 at Choice Health and Fitness, and had fourteen attendees sign in. He added that most of the interest was more related to river crossing dialogue than anything else. He said that it was a good meeting, but there weren't a ton of comments, but they did have some dialogue during the meeting and they stayed later for any questions anyone had.

Bourdon reported that the next public meeting is anticipated in July, and we will see where we are in terms of presenting stuff, ideally they will be presenting a lot more about where the plan is going in terms of some of the finalized financial information and projects list and more implementation information on what is planned, so they are hoping it will be in July but it could slide a little later.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE BASED MEASURES
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING/AGREEMENT**

Haugen reported that last month we were considering the Minnesota side Memorandum for Performance Based Planning processes, and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval but the MPO Executive Policy Board wanted to wait to see what the North Dakota document looked like, so included in the packet are both the Minnesota Side and the North Dakota Side documents. He added that we are fortunate enough today to have the authors of both documents participating, Mr. Johnson on the phone, and Ms. Retzlaff in the audience.

Haugen stated that there is an obvious difference between the two documents, the number of pages. He explained that the purpose of North Dakota's being shorter is because they aren't as advanced with the performance measures as MnDOT; MnDOT has a ten-plus year history of working performance measures, North Dakota is still ramping up for that.

Haugen commented that some subtle differences; the first is the title of the documents is different in that Minnesota calls theirs an MOU and North Dakota calls their and MOA, but he thinks there is an understanding that they are synonymous terms, but other than that he thinks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

both authors would say that they are both basically taking things out of the Federal Register and inserting it into the documents, and not creating new sentences or paragraphs.

Haugen stated that the action you can take is to reconsider the Minnesota document if you wish, otherwise your action from the prior meeting stands; and then there is the option of considering the North Dakota document. He added that staff continues to recommend approval to authorizing signature and entering into these agreements of both States.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES FOR THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE MOU AND THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE MOA ON THE PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Riesinger, Retzlaff, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Laesch, Yavarow, West, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF STATE PM2 AND PM3 TARGETS

Haugen reported that each State has to finalize their PM2, Pavement/Bridge; and their PM3, Travel Reliability performance targets by May 20th.

Haugen commented that included in the packet was a draft that was available as of Friday, distributed in front of you is an updated document.

Haugen referred to the updated presentation and explained that the targets are just for the NHS facilities, but there are a couple of things to understand; for PM2 and some of the PM3 targets there four-year targets, and then after two years you have the ability to revisit your target to see if adjustments need to be made. He said that there is some argument within the planning world that is that really a two-year target and a four-year target or a four year target with a two year adjustment; but you are seeing them labeled as two year targets and four year targets, so just know that after two years you have to visit your target and there will also be determination by Federal Highway after two years as to whether you are progressing.

Haugen stated that the travel reliability still has no penalty clause, and North Dakota targets are still not ones that have been formally adopted by the director. He asked if Mr. Johnson had a date as to when the director might be taking action. Johnson responded that he does not have that information at this time. Haugen commented that, again, MPOs have 180 days after the May 20th deadline.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Haugen referred to a table listing both States' targets and went over them briefly, pointing out the differences between the two States.

Kuharenko asked if we know where Minnesota and North Dakota are at today for each of these targets, as a baseline. Haugen responded that we know that based on the data that they have an analyzed performance forecast, like on the pavement there is new requirements of some measures that you have to collect, and some of those haven't been collected yet so they are utilizing the data that was available to them. He added that they are also using some of their existing predictability models, particularly on the pavement. He commented that both sides, he knows for sure on the Minnesota side they are, and he believes that they are on the North Dakota side, because of the penalty clause that is a part of this they have put themselves in kind of a protective position, they are very close to what the actual percents are now, and they don't foresee the rapid decline in any of these, so the penalties is really at the poor condition being above a threshold of four. He added that they are comfortable with where they are on the poor conditions.

Ellis commented that, in a sense, the only what that this affects is, because the States spend money on their interstate system, so the only way it would affect us is if they're not meeting their performance measures; they may pull some of their federal dollars aside or put more into their projects which would leave us less money, is that correct; do we really have a say in what they are setting as their performance measures for their interstate. Haugen responded that we do, adding that it is a cooperative process, and because, obviously on the Minnesota side we have less say because we don't have an interstate in the MPO area, but on the North Dakota side the interstate is in our MPO area and it is still a cooperative process. Ellis stated that that would be the only reason why she would want to know what you are looking at right now as far as percentages because if they are so far off then we aren't going to notice a decline in funding, but if North Dakota feels that they are going to be able to comfortably meet those then she wouldn't have any concerns with it. Kuharenko agreed.

Haugen stated that on the PM3 side they are very similar on reliability on the interstate system, again they discussed this, even though there isn't an interstate on the Minnesota side, the way that the PM3 information is released is that it is for the MPO area as a whole, and not divided by each State, so the number on the Minnesota side obviously includes the rest of the State across Minnesota.

Ellis commented that, just as a side note, do you think that some of them trying to meet their PMs might have something to do with why their corridors of commerce all ended up being in the twin cities. Haugen responded he doesn't know the answer to that. Ellis said it is just a guess on her part.

Haugen stated that the only real significant difference in the PM3 is the truck travel time reliability. He explained that the metrix here is on a scale of 0 to 3, and the mid-point is 1.5, so it is a percent of how many of your segments are above the 1.5, so Minnesota is using the 1.5 as their mid-point but North Dakota is using 3, which is at the extreme end of the spectrum.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Ellis asked if the feds approve the State's PM measures. Haugen responded that they don't approve them, they report on them and then they have to show progress. He added that some of them have penalties, but travel did not. Ellis stated that that was her only concern, is if the feds looked at the PMs and said, no, they want to set them higher; because for our interstate program that would obviously shift funds too, but there isn't anything to say that they could adjust or not adjust them at this point. Haugen responded that there is nothing that says that they will be adjusting them two years from now that we report on these measure. He added that the feds will make a determination if we are making progress or not, and they can adjust. Retzlaff reported that on the Minnesota Side their federal partners were involved when they were setting these targets and if they would have had any concerns they would have mentioned at that point.

Information only.

MATTER OF STATE PM1 (SAFETY) TARGETS

Haugen reported that the annual cycle is back up. He said that, if you recall, a couple of these are also connected to the National Safety Administration, fatalities and serious crashes, so each State has to report those targets by the end of June, and so both States are reporting all of their safety targets in all five of these categories at the same time. He explained that, officially the due date is for all five targets is the end of August, and then we will have the same 180 days, so what is showing right now are the 2018 targets that were established last year and in red are the 19 proposed targets, and, again, listed by each State. He went over the targets briefly.

Kuharenko said, then, that every year we are going to have to come back through and revisit, reconfirm, and reagree with the States on these targets. Haugen responded that that is correct, every year by February is the current schedule. He added that the only thing that has changed is, if you recall, we had one State reported theirs a couple of days earlier than the other State so we had two different due dates, and now the feds have now clarified that it is 180 days after the last State has set their targets, so only one date.

Kuharenko asked if there was a general feel; he knows that we a set decrease on a number of these items, is the general feeling that it is going to keep with that maybe, or is it going to be reevaluated, will each individual State be reevaluating where they are at and refiguring what their targets are. Haugen responded that each year they have to go through the calculations. He stated that each State has a little difference in how they use calculations, and Minnesota is factoring in some growth; North Dakota didn't consider that when they calculated theirs, so, again there is the penalty clause that attaches to these safety targets, and both States are aware that and are looking ahead. He added that if they continue this trend what will it mean for our next year, what will be our target, so we have some sense of what they need to do to achieve that. He stated that we probably won't revisit this until sometime late this fall or early next spring.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

MATTER OF PROPOSED NEW CITIES AREA TRANSIT ROUTES

Haugen reported that Ms. Kouba is out sick today so he would ask that Mr. Bergman please give us an update on the proposed new bus routes.

Bergman stated that they held several public meetings for the proposed new bus routes; the last one was held at the Grand Cities Mall last night, with only two people attending. He said that they did have a good turn-out at the one held at the Senior Center and at the University of North Dakota.

Bergman commented that they are still compiling all of the information together. He pointed out that one mistake they found, that they didn't realize until maps were printed for the proposed changes, was on the night bus area as they totally forgot to show the northend of Grand Forks, so they are addressing that now.

Ellis said that an adjustment needs to be made to the East Grand Forks tripper route within the City because the morning pick up is a little on the short side, so they are going to add another hour or hour and a half to that route as well.

Bergman reported that a couple of things that were brought up was about having volunteer riders the first week that we would start these if it gets approved by the City Council to use girl and boy scouts to do this. He commented that hopefully in the next couple of weeks we will have this all finalized. He added that he recently received a call requesting a meeting with Development Homes and their staff on Friday morning.

Ellis stated that with every comment they received they went through the routes just to make verify what their comment or concern is; what they feel may or may not work, so they are going through every question individually and looking at every route and responding, in essence, to every person that submits a comment so that they make sure they are clear on what out routes are or aren't doing, so she thought this was a good process. Bergman agreed, adding that he thinks they had more turnout on this than they have ever had for any process they've ever had in the past.

Bergman reported that one thing they did find out last night was that Hope Church, who owns the Grand Cities Mall area, their number one key is that they want transit, and they want it there, and they will work with us to get a transfer center there, which would be plus for us.

Ellis said that they also have night service in East Grand Forks, which they have not had before.

Haugen stated that comments can still be submitted through May 16th. He added that this information is on both Cities' websites and the MPOs website as well.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included in the packet for your review.

b. Near Southside Draft

Kuharenko commented that he saw that we had a draft on the Near Southside project came up this morning. Haugen stated that it is out for staff comment and then it will go out to the neighborhood.

c. Bike/Ped Plan Update

Kuharenko asked for an update on the Bike/Ped Plan, as to when we will be seeing the latest rendition of that. Viafara responded that they putting together the agenda and you will receive it by the end of the week.

d. Legislature Update

Haugen stated that he saw that the Legislature is wrapping up and they might ask for a vote by the public for dedicating sales tax on automobile parts and services. He said that it was transferred over and it is looking like it is iffy that it might get put on the ballot. He added that there is also an implementation schedule proposed on it that the 100% won't be until 2024, it will be phased in because the taxes are being taken from other general funds services and dedicating them to transportation, but it could raise \$250,000,000 a year.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 9TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:10 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the June 13th, 2018, 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: Darren Laesch, MnDOT; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Grand Forks Airport Authority.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Stephanie Halford, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Dale Bergman, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Scott Mareck, WSB & Associates; Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; Mike Bittner, KLJ; Meredith Richards, Grand Forks Community Development; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, for the benefit of those in the audience today, could everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 9TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE MAY 9TH,
2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPWP AMENDMENT #5

Haugen reported that we are trying to accomplish two principle things with this agenda item:

- 1) The first one is, at one time during our discussions on the Washington Street Underpass project, we decided to set aside funds to assist in the project development for the project, but a couple of weeks ago the NDDOT requested we not pursue that study which freed up those funds we had identified for that project. He stated that MnDOT identified a request to do an update on a 2007 Study that was done on Minnesota 220 North, so we would like to amend the work program to move the funds for the Washington Street Underpass Study to the Minnesota 220 North Study Update. He added that MnDOT has also indicated that they would provide the 20% match for that project.
- 2) The second one revisits the Downtown Grand Forks Planning Transportation effort. He said that there has been some communication of the MPO, now that the City has hired a consulting firm, RDG, undertaking some of the work for this project. He explained that as part of that communication they are trying to get the MPO to include it in the work program, and they have resurrected the old amendment that was tabled back in April.

Haugen commented that, if you will recall, in April we had an intersection study at Gateway Drive and Washington Street that we added more funding to the budget, but in the end we did not swap out the actual work, and you will see this later in the proposed scope of work. He added that since the packet was sent out there has been some addition communication with the City of Grand Forks on not really wanting to swap out and so the intersection study, so the proposal hasn't been changed in the packet, so he would ask that someone from the City of Grand Forks please give us a little more information on what their desires are on this.

Brooks responded that he will talk about the Downtown Planning Study. He explained that they were down to a kind of parking study that they feel they need to have done, but the Skewed Intersection Study he thinks is still desired by their Engineering Department. He stated that, timing wise and budgetarily, he doesn't know if there is enough money to do both, but if there is enough to do the downtown planning they could certainly fit it in, but he is thinking that he probably won't have much time to work on it very much or have the scope of work done so he was thinking that it maybe could slide to 2019. He said, though, that if there is funding available, and you want to put it in late in 2018, they could certainly do it but he does know that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

the Engineering Department do want to keep the skewed intersection study in as well as it is a priority for them right now.

Haugen commented that the communication that was taking place last week was about a \$120,000 worth of transportation planning goes to Downtown Grand Forks, being identified as something that the MPO might want to undertake. He added that the request was to not swap out the Skewed Intersection study, so he offered that they could start both projects because we aren't going to finish either one this year, but we would then finish them next year, and next year we would program them, so he doesn't know how that fits. He said that the skewed intersection study, again, as he mentioned was at a different dollar amount, but right now he thinks the consultant cost on that is \$110,000 to \$120,000 so we could split that money up and free up the funds as the whole study wasn't going to be \$110,000 for the intersection study so we could certainly start both, and what they are doing on the work program is not the detailed study of what we are actually going out for with that scope and cost and selection, it's setting the stage, the foundation so that we can go to the next step and have our State and Federal partners agree that that is appropriate to do that type of work with planning dollars. He referred to a table of projects and stated that he doesn't know where we are at, possibly eliminate the strikeouts and, referring to a table of projects, determine how to split the funding.

Kuharenko said that last month we ended up, he believes, pushing forward Amendment #4, correct; and that increased our revenue. Haugen responded that we did that in April. Kuharenko apologized for the error, and said, then, that in April we ended up moving that forward, and he thinks it was like \$126,000 in available revenue, and something like half of that was going to be going towards the Long Range Transportation Plan consultant for a bridge study, and the other half was probably going to be going to the Downtown Study, so right now, as it stands, we should have about \$60,000 available, is that right. Haugen responded that the funds are sitting in the highlighted line item on the table. He explained that it was put into that line item and didn't change the scope of work but did change the funding. He said that they took the \$60,000 and added it to what was already there. Kuharenko said that he thought that back in April we didn't make that change because it would have removed the skewed intersection. Haugen responded that, again, they didn't change the intersection study language they adjusted its budget.

Brooks said, then, that the skewed study is still in the work program under 300.20 as well. Haugen responded that it is. He commented that right now the official work program has the skewed intersection study in it. He added that the proposed amendment was just swapping out the text and not changing the budget amount, and then what is being offered is to not strike out the text but just split our budget for the 2018 dollars and then in 2019 finish off both studies. He said that he is still unclear of what the City of Grand Forks' downtown planning request is, parking will certainly be a part of it, but what additional work will be desired. He stated that the list that he was asked to look at was around \$120,000 of work, and that was sort of what he was led to believe was the scope that was of interest for the MPO to undertake; if we just split this in half we can finish up the rest, if we do this, we can finish up the rest when we work on the 2019-2020 Work Program as to what the final allocation toward each individual project will be, but what this does it to get us to the next step, and that step would be for the Intersection Study doing the RFP, the detailed scope of work, going through the qualification based selection process and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

for the Downtown Plan it gets it in the budget so the next step would be the same thing depending on what the scope of work is. This step is already taken care of and we can progress to the next one in a more timely fashion.

Haugen stated that the initial thing that is going on is to swap out the underpass study, which the State says they don't want us to do, so that frees up that budget amount and that line item; MnDOT and East Grand Forks says their Central Avenue/220 North Corridor Study should be updated and we have the ability to do that with this; and so what we do with the Washington/Gateway Intersection and the Downtown Transportation Plan is; initially the thought was that we would swap one out for the other, but now the proposal is to split the monies and start both and then finish them both next year.

Haugen referred to a project table and went over the changes being proposed. He then gave a brief history on the Skewed Intersection project as well.

Grasser asked, for someone that doesn't know all these numbers and things intimately, he finds the discussion and the tracking history a little bit hard to follow, so he was wondering if on the staff reports it would be possible to give a small summary of what Amendment 1 accomplished and/or changed, what Amendment 2 accomplished and/or changed, etc., so that we have a historical record that we can look at to track what has occurred.

Brooks commented that as long as Engineering is okay with moving the Skewed Intersection Study to 2018 and finish it in 2019; the MnDOT stuff seems good to him. He added that we would then come back with a scope of work once they nail it down, and that still has to come through for approval. Haugen responded that the RFP and all that stuff would have to be approved, and then it will come back through once we have the consultant selected and the negotiated scope of work, so you can still say no at that point.

Laesch reported present.

Williams asked if what Mr. Brooks is saying is that we would put the downtown study on hold and leave it as a placeholder, then. Brooks responded that what he is suggesting is that we would just leave the skewed intersection study in as being done in 2018 and 2019, and the downtown study, as he understands, would be done in 2018 and 2019 as well. Haugen stated that that is correct. He explained that the writing wouldn't change for either, the strikeout would change and a couple of other minor changes would occur, but the main change would be that we would split the funding into two with the downtown plan taking half and the skewed intersection study would take the other half and then when we do the 2020/2021 budget we would figure out the finishing touches on both. He added that the 220 North study would have a completion date of the end of June, and the transportation stuff we could go as late as December if necessary; we couldn't with the Central plan, but you said you might want it done sooner than that. Laesch responded that he thinks that they are going to talk about the scope a little bit this next month and figure out what they want done and then set the timeline, but he would think that having a completion date in 12-months would be sufficient.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Grasser stated that he thinks that for the skewed intersection on their side there isn't anything terribly urgent on there; he wants to be sure that we don't try to push projects and interject projects such that it has an impact on the ability to deliver the Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that we have a lot of stuff going on here and the completion date for the Long Range Transportation Plan is coming up so he thinks that we need to make sure that they aren't asking the MPO to deliver stuff that is going to impact that schedule.

Haugen commented that most of the work for these two projects would be to get the RFP out, waiting for the response, and making the consultant selections. He said that by that time the transportation plan is hopefully in the approval stages and we are cleaning up loose ends and not creating new studies or requiring amendments, so from a staff perspective with all this timing releasing pressure and focus on this one. He added that we are showing that we are spending all of our funds that are given to us, which he knows is a keen interest for both North Dakota and Minnesota, but particularly Federal Highway.

Kuharenko asked what the skewed intersection study was originally programmed for. Haugen responded that the consultant costs were somewhere around \$55,000 to \$60,000.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT 5 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF THE WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS STUDY; PROGRAMMING THE MNDOT 220 NORTH STUDY; SPLITTING THE FUNDING FOR THE SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY AND THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION IN HALF; PROGRAMMING THE WORK FOR THE SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY AND THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY TO BE DONE IN 2018 AND 2019; AND TO DETERMINE THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN STUDY SCOPE OF WORK AND COORDINATING IT WITH CITY STAFF.

Laesch asked for clarification as to whether the dollar amount that they talked about for the MnDOT 220 North Study remain the same. Haugen responded that it did; \$70,000 for a consultant.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Ellis, Brooks, Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharenko, Laesch, Emery, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Bail, Hanson, Gengler, Halford, Bergman, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Yavarow, West, Sanders and Christianson.

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY2018 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2018-2021 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this used to be very simple T.I.P. amendments, but now with the new performance measures and different timelines, etc., it has gotten a bit more complicated. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

explained that the reason it is late getting on the agenda is because we just received further guidance from Federal Highway, and in fact even today we were getting clarifications of what is going on.

Haugen stated that in the past, if you recall, on the Minnesota side it was clear that if you did a T.I.P. amendment it didn't trigger a plan amendment; on the North Dakota side we had some differing guidance, and this was a North Dakota T.I.P. thing so we had to shake out what, beside a T.I.P. amendment, what other things did it entail with all the timelines being triggered, etc. He said that the guidance we received is that since it is FTA it doesn't trigger the prior interpretation of a plan amendment; so now we know we have to do a T.I.P. amendment, and in the past these T.I.P. amendments were just like you see in the packet, going to the project listing, make the minor changes, and process that; still as of today we aren't sure if our text in our T.I.P. needs to be amended to include a write-up on safety performance. He added that, clearly, if this were federal highway it would require that, but FTA is still trying to get clarification from their headquarters on whether or not it triggers anything on their end. He said that in the meantime all you are seeing is the old T.I.P. amendment type of process.

Haugen commented that this all came about because of an old grant for the Veterans, a statewide grant that Grand Forks was leading, and at the end of the grant process there were still some dollars remaining. He stated that the equipment that Grand Forks has for vehicle location notification, etc. is no longer adequate, and this money is available and needs to be spent or turned back, so the scope or work was really just changing the word "rural" to "urban", but that simple amendment has triggered a lot of this other discussion, but the actual change to the T.I.P., as far as funding is that the total cost is \$140,000 with \$99,400 in federal funding.

Haugen stated that we are still unsure as to what the language of a safety performance measure will entail if we have to do it. He added that his understanding is that this T.I.P. amendment needs to be processed in June, and between now and the MPO Board meeting it might come through as this or it might come through with that additional safety measure writeup, and you all have that from past TAC meetings as to what the guidance is.

Haugen said that, as you will notice, the public notice is identifying that the actual opportunity for the public to make formal comment is at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday, with written comments being taken prior to that, so whatever action we take today will be subject to public input received, but staff is recommending approval.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. AMENDMENT, SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Ellis, Brooks, Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharenko, Laesch, Emery, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Absent: Bail, Hanson, Gengler, Halford, Bergman, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Yavarow, West, Sanders and Christianson.

Haugen commented that, just as a follow-up to this starting perhaps as early as next month, and certainly in August we will be doing a plan amendment to the transit projects. He said that the biggest one, of course is their huge 5339 bus barn renovation grant, that needs to be amended into the plan and also the T.I.P. so at that time we certainly will be amending our plan to address the safety performance write-up for that so that when we do the T.I.P. amendment we will also have the safety performance writeup with that T.I.P. amendment.

He stated that perhaps the lesson now is from this point forward we will be having all T.I.P. amendments and plan amendments now having to address, for now temporary safety performance, and by the end of this fall all the other performance measures.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that we wanted to devote most of our time today going through particularly the Universe List of Projects and Revenue. He said that Scott Mareck is here to walk us through this update.

Mareck referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and commented that this plan has been under development since last May so they are a little over twelve months into it and they have another six or so months to go before final approval, but today he wants to give an update on the process and timeline; the Universe of Projects, which is kind of the full gamut of any and all projects that could potentially make it into the plan; the Financial Forecast, which they are pretty close to having a final draft; a supplementary Red River Crossing Analysis they are working on; and then the next steps and timeline. He reiterated that this is the overall schedule, getting back to late spring early summer of 2017 through now, and gave a brief overview of the timeline and what they have accomplished to date.

Presentation continued.

Grasser stated that when the presentation was made at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting the word “discretionary” seemed to cause some confusion for the commissioners. He said that they view the use of that word as being money that we can allocate anywhere we want, so he doesn’t know if the word “discretionary” is the right one to use in there to portray that it is, and he thinks it is essentially a project need that we can’t find funding for; and he isn’t sure what the right description is but if it caused confusion at Planning and Zoning, it might not be the right word to use. Mareck responded that one way that people describe that is illustrative. Grasser said that that might be better as “discretionary” caused confusion. Mareck stated that he doesn’t think that they are necessarily “married” to using that term, so if there is a better term that works for everyone they are open to changing it. Haugen commented that the challenge is that we view illustrative as a budgeted category of things and that isn’t what this is doing, this is just saying that the projects are categorized in this fashion with no budget assigned to them just cost

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

estimates assigned to them, so the word “illustrative” also then implies there has been a budgeting decision that they are beyond fiscal constraint, so “illustrative” is not probably the appropriate term either. Grasser suggested that maybe just putting an asterisk or something by them.

Laesch asked for an example of a discretionary project. Mareck responded that one of the big ones we have been talking about is the South End River Crossing; we have three or four different alternatives that we are evaluating that are in the \$25 to \$50 million dollar range, depending upon what comes out of those phases. Haugen cited other examples as well, adding that it isn't just all tied up in interchanges and underpasses and river crossings, there are some existing roadways that are identified as candidates for reconstruction if financing were to become available. Grasser asked if we should be carrying the North End Bypass project. Haugen responded that the MPO Executive Policy Board keeps wanting to continue including it as something, not so much that we are actually pursuing funding, locating, or costing out, but as a reminder that it is maybe a long range wish.

Mareck reported that these projects are broken down into the various funding categories including the T.I.P., which is an existing program; existing and committed network, which is basically a local program funded with local funds; Safety program, which are a lot of your intersection improvements or safety type improvements and operational type activities. Williams asked to go back to the T.I.P. slide and asked what dates are being shown, is it 2015 to something. Haugen responded that it is certainly 2018 to 2022, but it might include some 2017 projects as well. Kuharenko commented that he thinks one correction might be on 32nd Avenue, as that project incorporates the intersections for the interchange ramps and he believes that also goes out to South 20th Street as he doesn't believe they are doing any work at 17th or at Washington. Haugen stated that the project termini is Washington to I-29.

Mareck continued going over the funding categories to include State of Good Repair, which is your pavement rehab projects like mill and overlays, full reconstruction, and bridge preservation rehab projects. Haugen pointed out that this map doesn't reflect the latest Grand Forks list. Kuharenko asked if it was based off of the old 2040 Plan. Haugen responded it was. Mareck added, though, that they do have the Grand Forks projects in their Excel table, they just weren't reflected on this map.

Mareck stated that the last category is discretionary or illustrative or whatever you want to call it which includes all the other projects that have been identified but not included in any of the other categories.

Mareck commented that the next step after we finalize this kind of mega project list is to do what is called an alternatives analysis. He explained that what that does is it takes the financial forecasts, basically your checkbook with how much money you have to spend, and breaks it up into a number of sub-pots; so you have six to eight different programming categories that will each have a dollar amount assigned to them, and so they will take that big project list and assign each of those projects to one of those funding categories that have a finite amount of funds in them, then they will assume a local match, and once they go through that exercise and allocate

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

all the funds then that will ultimately be your financially constrained plan. He added that the philosophical guidance that will help you, along with your own input to decide where to invest those project dollars is based upon your performance measures, so again that is looking at pavement, safety, capacity, multi-modal, looking at all your different transportation investment areas, there is a performance metrics that they've developed, however they aren't going to get into that today, but there are performance metrics that have been developed and there is guidance from the DOTs and FHWA along with some local input on that as well, but those performance measures will help you identify where to invest those project dollars.

Mareck stated that after they come up with an overall subset of the Universe of Projects that you want them to consider as the financially constrained formal MPO plan, they will work with ATAC and have them run the travel demand model so we can have sort of a network performance output on how that subset of projects will result in improved congestion on your overall system.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen could refresh her memory on the 17th Avenue South overpass; they went back and forth saying there will never be one, but it is in the 2040 plan right now correct. Haugen responded that it is not in the 2040 plan. Williams said, then, that this would be an addition. Haugen commented that it is, again, one of those things that is an identified project that has not ever been absolute in a recent plan. He added that an interchange at 17th was in a plan several iterations ago, but the current plan does not show it or recommend it. Johnson stated that he thinks the I-29 Study said that it wouldn't provide any benefit to any of the other cross-roads, therefore that should not drive it need but there may be potential other needs for linkage in the future.

Laesch commented that in regard to splitting out the projects in the investment categories; a lot of their projects are going address your state of good repair, safety, and multi-modal all in one project; are you making some assumptions as far as splitting out each project or does the whole project go into one of those categories. Haugen responded that there are going to be some projects that address multiple things, but there are also some funding categories that can only address that specific funding category and safety might be one of the prime examples of where those projects are really going to stand alone as addressing only a safety need. He pointed out that as you will see we have different funding amounts on each side of the river; and one side there may not be very many projects and in the budget they are small scale, but on the other side there might be more opportunity because we have \$7 million plus on one corridor on the North Dakota side addressing just safety issues. Mareck agreed, adding that some funding programs are flexible, where you can use the program to address a variety of different needs where others; like the HSIP, which is exclusively for safety operations; your main street program will be more for your downtown, multi-modal transit, street scape types of improvements; so everything kind of depends upon the program you are talking about how the funds can be used, but as they understand there is a requirement to do a financial constraint based upon the program, so each of those programs has a different color of money, it is not all green, its purple, yellow, etc. so it does create a little bit of inflexibility, but we can work through that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Mareck stated that today we are going to go over what they think is a finalized draft of the overall revenue forecast. He referred to a slide listing those revenue sources distributed by both State DOTs and went over them briefly.

Mareck commented that the main issue they just learned about in the last week was that NDDOT has decided to not assume that Fargo will become a TMA, at least for this existing planning horizon, however that could change during this horizon, but for now we are going to assume that there will not be a 30% reduction in federal funds for the GF/EGF MPO Plan.

Presentation continued.

Mareck reported that kind of a new wrinkle that they are being asked to add into the financial plans is operational revenue. He explained that this has not been required, they understand, in previous plans so it is something that is kind of a work in progress. He stated that they will fill in the information as it becomes available and they know it may be a little challenging to come up with some of these numbers, but as they understand it there will be some flexibility in what they are able to show, but the hope is that over time we will be able to fully populate the operation side as well as the capital side to show what those future revenues will be.

Mareck referred to slides listing the North Dakota and Minnesota totals in forecasted revenues and stated that this is where the rubber hits the road. He reiterated that we were talking earlier about all the different silos and different colors of money and pointed that that these next two slides list those funding sources for both States.

Grasser asked, in regard to how you are categorizing dollars, if we have, let's say a federal project of \$1 million dollars what are you programming in that as the expected City match, City project cost. Haugen responded that we are using an assumed 80% if it is fundable with federal aid dollars and 20% would be the match amount. Grasser commented that, internally, when they look at a federal project, when they are figuring out the total cost and matches, they are usually more at a 70/30 or 60/40 split by the time they get through all of the project development phases and all those different things, so they will account for the expenditure somewhere in the line of, we look like we have more dollars for match than they really do. Haugen responded that as we get into the allocation of this project and this time band we will be working with not just the federal aid projects, but now with the sales tax you will be doing some project on the federal aid network without federal aid involved, so at that point we can start identifying how much we think will be covered by this revenue source versus how much will be covered by that revenue source, so we are starting out with the generic 80/20 split, but we can get project specific on some of the key projects, but he doesn't know that we have to through every project, especially the outer years.

Mareck added that the plan is really kind of meant to be a 30,000 elevation snapshot of just a best guess at this time; we don't know how all these numbers are going to shake out; but Mr. Grasser is right that there are circumstances where you will end up providing more local funds than we are showing in the plan; but if you know if there are certain projects that you know for sure it will be more than the 20% you can let us know and we can show that, but we are just

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

trying to use the minimum amount required by federal law, which is 20%, and use that as a guide. Grasser commented that in those concepts though, if we are spending to a 30,000 level; which he agrees we should have, we might use a 70/30 maybe. He said that they know every single project that they have, that probably isn't on a state highway, is going to cost them more than 80/20; it is only a question of whether it is 70/30 or 65/35, but he thinks by default on that you assume something greater than the 20% local share; and he agrees he would rather not do it on a project by project basis, but to use that argument he would say 20% is probably not an accurate analysis either. Haugen responded that they will canvas each individual jurisdiction to see how they want to approach this; Grand Forks might want to use the 70/30 split, and that is fine so they will start, from there you will get an e-mail soon; and that might be comfortable when 80/20 is assumed in North Dakota, so they will try to get a sense, but they will certainly going to spend more effort on the short-term and maybe half of the mid-term projects than the long-term projects.

Mareck continued, summarizing that they have identified roughly about \$900 million in need in the Universe of Project list in current dollars; so keep in mind that if there is a significant change in any of our revenue assumptions during the life of the plan it is required that the MPO then revisit this assumption, so, for instance NDDOT tells us that we do not have to assume that FM/COG is a TMA, and that we will have to cut back our federal funds by 30%, that would be considered a significant change in our assumption so we would have to go back and ratchet down that financially constrained plan to illustrate that change. He added that if there would also happen to be a change in congress with the allocation of federal funds that come into the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, that would obviously have a trickle-down effect to local jurisdictions and the MPOs. He cited things like the FAST-ACT expiring in a couple of years, which is during the time-frame of this plan; and right now the Federal Highway Trust Fund doesn't have enough funding coming in to keep up with the revenue going out so unless they come up with a way to fix that discrepancy, there could potentially be a reduction in federal funds coming from Congress to the States; so these would be examples of a need to go back to revisit the plan and make some adjustments.

Grasser commented that at the national level there has been some discussion about changing the federal formula from 80/20 to 20/80, is that something that could actually happen. Mareck responded that that would certainly turn everything upside down if that were to happen; it would be a brand new world so hopefully that doesn't happen, but they would have to deal with it if it did.

Mareck stated that it is assumed that it is reasonable to use the current established rule as we know it today, and lets assume that that is reasonable, so no one is going to question us for using the current legislative landscapes at the State or Federal level, and that is basically what we have to go by right now so that is what they are using at this point in time.

Haugen commented that the flip to 20/80 has been discussed, particularly at the Executive Branch level. He added that even the BUILD program that is out on the street right now, there is still 100% funding for rural properties, so the 20/80 is still far from law, but for now since we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

have to do this by the end of the year, it is reasonable to forecast that it isn't going to arrive in January, but if it radically change we are mandated to radically revisit our plan.

Grasser stated that he isn't sure this is right place to ask this question, but on the Universe of Projects; and he knows that Mr. Haugen submitted the Universe of Projects on the Urban Grant, and one of the things that has been desired by our local politicians was that we had to bury some of the underground utilities in the alleys, and things like that, is kind of portrayed in some of the mutual concepts of that program, and now we are getting direction that those aren't qualified federal, and he gets it that we would kind of determine qualified federal but is there the potential that we would be interjecting some other non-Federal sources in there that would make those he is trying to figure out if it is right to excluded from the Universe of Projects, but he isn't sure that they can include it either, so he is trying to figure out where to go with that Universe of Projects thing. Johnson responded that in terms of just burying the utilities for essentially an aesthetic reason that wouldn't be a federal expense from the current funding that we have available. He added that we can put federal aid on utilities if we are in fact mitigating, in-kind, so if we were doing a project say downtown and we impacted an above ground utility we can pay for it and put it back above ground, but if the utility company wants to bury it they pay the additional cost to bury it, so you're right, that would not be something that they would be able to fund as of right now. He said that the NDDOT is, to his knowledge, still the only agency that has an active program for funding for the Main Street Initiative right now; there are other departments that are working on things that maybe could potentially bring some additional funding to the table for those elements, or there maybe is the opportunity this next legislative session for some sort of State revenue to provide the ability to do those types of things, but right now they don't have a funding mechanism in place. Grasser said that he is wonder if they remove them from one set of books but then keep them in mind for another set of books. Johnson responded that he thinks that would probably be a good idea, to keep them out there as another element and concept the City wants to pursue as part of the overall Main Street Initiative that may be currently unfunded.

Haugen said that in the spreadsheet available they have identified, perhaps, some projects that you've already identified as being replacements for those ten utility relocates; adding that they haven't changed the dollar value; and it seemed to be a one-for-one change, there aren't as may projects but the dollar values are fairly close.

Mereck stated that the last thing he wants to touch on briefly is the addendum that is being worked on for the Long Range Plan to do an update of a previous river crossing study.

Mereck reported that ATAC has rerun the Elks Drive location, explaining that it is a very minor variation of the 24th Avenue modeling; and added that they also did 17th Avenue as well.

Mereck reiterated that he is with WSB, and they are working with Kimley-Horn, who is actually the prime on this overall plan; and they were not able to be here today so he is filling in for some of the commentary that they would be doing.

Mereck reported that the travel demand modeling has been completed and they are doing some micro-simulation models of intersections and the Kimley-Horn team is working with the Army

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Corps and coordinating with them on some slip-plain locations that have been identified and are doing a very high level preliminary engineering review of the river crossings and Lidar files have been obtained and in the end they will have a high level travel demand modeling and traffic analysis of the immediate intersections east and west of the river crossings. He added that they will also be looking at a very high level of pavements for each of these corridors and also providing a planning level cost estimate updated to current dollars for each of those river crossings.

Haugen commented that the next thing on the schedule will be this last bullet where we will be trying to assemble a group of elected officials and others just to walk through what the 47th Avenue Road Authority on the Minnesota side processing, adding that if the Township can do it that would be awesome, but they are struggling to figure out how they can, so we need to find a surrogate, and that is what the June meeting will be trying to do, just to help identify what all that entails. He added that in July we will get the full analyses for all five crossings.

Mareck went over the timeline for the plan and stated that they will be seeking approval of the final plan in December.

Mareck referred to the project list and asked if anyone wanted to go through it in detail. Haugen stated that we can do that now if anyone wishes. He added that it is critical that we have we have this list kind of buttoned up so we aren't lingering next month and still questioning why projects aren't the list or why projects are on the list.

Williams asked where the written list for the Universe of Projects is located. Mareck responded that Mr. Haugen has it on the computer and can pull it up if desired. Haugen added that the list is available on the MPO website for review as well.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the list of projects and pointed out that there are project categories; there is the T.I.P. list of projects, the existing plus committee list of projects, the safety plan identified list of projects, the Urban Grant or Mainstreet list of projects. He said that on the Minnesota side it would be the Main Street Urban Grant. He pointed out that the ones in yellow are highlighting that they are projects that are not eligible for the Urban Grant Program, and says that there are some projects further down on the list that are identified as replacements or surrogates. He added that there is also a list of State of Good Repair projects, and the ones that have these are the ones that could be replacements for the Urban Grant project. He pointed out that the last part of the list are the discretionary projects.

Grasser said that when they gave staff their list there were actually two lists; one was the classified streets and he is wondering if we were to receive to federal funding for certain project they would be essentially reconstruction on most of them, but if they are going to end up doing them as local, how do you reconcile those two lists. Mareck responded that what they did, for now, and they are looking for input, is that if there two numbers; a larger number and a smaller number, for financial constraint reasons they assume the worst case scenario. He explained that they do this because if you show the lower cost and then come back and want to do the higher cost, you would have to do a plan amendment because it would be outside the financial

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

constraint, so if you are going to have the bigger cost in the plan, and end up doing something smaller for whatever reason you might still have to coordinate with the MPO and let them know, but you might be able to avoid a plan amendment because the smaller amount would be a subset of the bigger amount.

Haugen referred to the list and stated that they are identifying them as all reconstructions, and the dollar amount represents that higher value. Mareck said that if anyone knows for certain that a project will not be a reconstruction project, please let them know and they can change it; but if you want to have the option to do either he would recommend sticking with the higher cost number. Grasser responded that he thinks that the ones that maybe wouldn't be a reconstruction project would be ones like a street that they built in the last five years, that may need some maintenance activities by the time we get to 2045, so that is what he is referring to. He added, though, that almost all of the older streets would most likely be a reconstruction project.

Haugen commented that he would anticipate that, just as they had to do with the Grand Forks District's list last time, where they had some reconstruction projects identified, to get it fiscally constrained it pushed some beyond the life of the plan and a lot of these reconstruction projects will be pushed beyond the life of the plan as well; but still identified as perhaps the ultimate project you would like to see done, but we have the option if you, for whatever reason, would decide two years or a month from now that Cherry Street should no longer be reconstructed and should be a mill and overlay, and should be considered in a fiscally constrained plan; the only way we could do it is squeeze it in at the mill and overlay cost and that is still available as an option to us, but right now we just put in the most costly project when we had those two options. Grasser asked if that suggests that if they do a mill and overlay with local money that we have to go through amendments every time we do one of those projects. Haugen responded that we are trying to identify state of good repair on the Federal Aid system and so, yes, for the first five years that would be a way to show that they are being maintained otherwise they aren't being shown as having a project that is impacting the Federal Aid system, bringing them up to a state of good repair.

Haugen reported that the one list had the reconstruction extension of Columbia and South Washington, that was placed in discretionary because you had a state of good repair project identified, and you had it listed as illustrative, so that was the only project out of your list that they did place in the discretionary list otherwise all the rest are either in the Urban Grant or the State of Good Repair for now. Kuharenko asked if that was the reconstruction project for those two. Haugen responded it was.

Haugen stated that if they have not received any changes by Friday, they will consider this list good to go and will use it in the plan.

Kadrmass commented that he hasn't had a chance to talk to Mr. Noehre but he wanted to ask about the segment on Highway 2 from 55th to 69th. He said that you have discretionary, you have from 55th to 69th for the rural to urban section upgrade, and then on the MPO T.I.P. you have reconstruct from 69th to the Air Force Base, so what is happening between 55th and 69th in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

the timeframe to the discretionary project. Haugen responded that there is nothing identified. Kadmas said that he just wants to make sure we don't forget about that one.

Haugen said that he was just going to talk briefly about the additional revenue that we are identifying now that we didn't in 2040, the main funding sources. He explained that they are, obviously the new sales tax in Grand Forks is one contribution; Minnesota DOT, in the old plan we didn't identify any work being done in our study area now there are a lot of identified projects with corresponding revenue programmed to it; and then to a much lesser level we are now including county revenues, so other than inflation and more revenue coming in, generally those would be the three things that really have shifted to a larger dollar amount.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included in the packet for your review.

b. NDDOT Draft 2019-2023 S.T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the NDDOT released their Draft 2019-2023 S.T.I.P. He commented that the only program that hasn't announced an award are the FTA 5339 and 5310, otherwise all of the other programs have announced their awards. Johnson commented that one other one would be the Urban Grant Program.

Kuharenko commented that adding to that, they did receive notification from the NDDOT that they were awarded TA funding for 17th Avenue North. He said it wasn't the full amount but it was about \$205,000 or \$208,000. He said that this will be going to the City Council for their approval to accept the funding.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 13TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:59 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the July 11th, 2018, 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: Darren Laesch, MnDOT; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Ryan Brooks, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Nancy Ellis, Ryan Riesinger, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Troy Schroeder, NWRDC; Meredith Richards, Grand Forks Community Development; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 13TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 13TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE
FY2018-2021 T.I.P.**

Minnesota Side

Haugen reported that this amendment will be the first amendment that we are addressing that will also address the performance measures that we are now required to include. He added that it is in regard to safety.

Haugen stated that the amendment itself is due to the possibility that several projects that East Grand Forks is scheduled to do this summer may be funded by a different funding source than the City's Subtarget that the City gets through the ATP every four years.

Haugen commented that he isn't sure if this is something that is just Minnesota opportunity for SAFETEA-LU monies left over from the Safe Routes To School Program, or if it is a national call and this is just the Minnesota portion of it. Laesch responded that he believes it is a national call for funding, but they reached out to Minnesota early in the process. Haugen said, then, that across the State of Minnesota they are trying to identify projects that are really "shovel ready" to try to get access to these funds as they are set to expire, so the Minnesota District 2 Office was able to identify four projects, that are a part of a larger set of projects that East Grand Forks is doing with their City Subtarget funds.

Haugen said that he doesn't know if they have received word as to whether or not if this will be funded out of this program, so, because there will be a very short timeframe between making a decision and accessing the funding so we are sort of taking tentative action so that when the MPO Executive Policy Board meets next week, if we don't have an answer by then, we will be asking the board to approve this contingent on the award being done at the Federal level, and the State level.

Haugen commented that the two things we don't know is if this will truly be funded out of these other pots of money, out of the program or not other programmed amounts,, and the other thing that is hopefully going to happen is that more dollars from the Federal side will contribute to the total dollar amount. He explained that the way the Sstate has been considering this is one of two ways; right now he thinks that if the total project is like \$1.2 million dollars, they have \$860,000.00 in City Subtarget so one way of doing this would be to just replace the difference between \$860,000.00; well let's backtrack; . he He explained that SAFTEA-LU Safe Routes to School funding allows for greater than 80% match, so there is a possibility that there could be a larger match than \$860,000.00, so the question is how much more federal funds beyond the \$860,000.00 will actually come from the Safe Routes to School program, we don't know that dollar value yet. He added that another thing that could happen is that the actual City Subtarget will be removed and all of the federal funds would be coming from the SAFETEA-LU Safe Routes to School program.

Haugen stated that what they are showing on the draft amendment is just the fact that the funding source is going to change, but we don't yet know how to change the dollar amounts so we aren't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

proposing any change to them yet. He said that we hope to have an answer by Monday and the public hearing notice was published for Next Wednesday's MPO Executive Policy Board meeting.

Haugen commented that the first time he heard about this was a couple of weeks ago, and they were hoping to have an answer to all of this at the end of June, but now are hoping for an answer by next Monday so are moving this along, but, again, if they don't have an answer and the Board meets Wednesday and they want to approve this it would be contingent on award of the different funding source and approval at the local level.

Haugen reported that the public hearing notice was published for next Wednesday's Board meeting. He stated that it is his understanding that the City awarded the bids for this project last evening at City Council. asked if the project had been awarded already. Emery responded that they did award the bids last evening, it had. Laesch asked if there were any concerns, now that it has been awarded, that it won't be eligible for the SAFETY-LU funds. Emery responded that he talked to Lou and was told to go ahead and award it.

Haugen stated that the second part of the amendment is the write up for our T.I.P. based on the Minnesota Federal Highways' guidance that they provided to us back in April. He said that a copy of the draft write up was included in the packet, but since then Federal Highway Minnesota did ask for an additional piece be added to it.

Haugen referred to a slide showing the requested information and explained that what is essentially saying is how MPO Staff are learning about performance measures, and how they have engaged with our MOA's with both States and how we will be moving forward with them.

Haugen commented that, with this addition Federal Highways Minnesota is comfortable with the draft before us, so Staff is recommending approval contingent on both the public's participation and also the Federal Award outcome.

Halford referred to the public hearing notice and pointed out that it says North Dakota side instead of Minnesota and she was wondering if that would create a problem. Haugen responded that it would not.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE FY2018-2021 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT, AND ON THE FEDERAL AWARD OUTCOME.

Laesch asked for clarification as to whether the dollar amount that they talked about for the MnDOT 220 North Study remained remain the same. Haugen responded that it did; \$70,000 for a consultant.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Halford, Laesch, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Riesinger/Audette, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR MN#220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY

ViafaraHaugen reported that a copy of the Request for Proposals for Transportation Planning Services to undertake the Minnesota 220 North Corridor Study. He stated that the information that is needed by the prospective consultant, including the scope of services and products to be delivered by their services is included.

Viafara said that he would like to bring to your attention is that the purpose of this scope is to retain a consultant to conduct an analysis of the segment that is between Minnesota 220 North down to the intersection of DeMers/9th Street, and then one mile over to 23rd Street North.

Viafara commented that just for information what was included in today's packet has since been updated and a few changes were made in order to clean up the overall document. He referred to the RFP document and went over the changes made.

Laesch stated that MnDOT's focus is more on the intersection of U.S. #2 and 220; he said that he knows you have that one on the slide, but the one in the packet doesn't have it. Viafara responded that what is in the packet is the old version and wasn't updated. Laesch said that, again, their emphasis is that intersection as they have a lot of safety issues that they would like to address with an HSIP project, and they would like this study to further analyze that. He added that they are also looking at the intersection to the north to replace the signal, so they would like to update the whole corridor before they move ahead with any projects. He said that that his reason for rephrasing to ensure that the focus is more on the higher volume areas of the corridor.

Viafara continued going over the changes that were made since the packet went out.

Kuharenko referred to #6 Proposal Format and Content Section C and pointed out that it says US2 and US Bus 2 Study. Viafara responded that, again, the document in the packet has not been updated, but the incorrect studies have also been replaced so in the next version you will not see that. He added, though, that there are two areas that you will find U.S. #2, it is an intersection with 220.

Emery referred to the Staff report and pointed out that it gives a budget of \$70,000, but when you look at the Request For Proposals it shows a budget of \$60,000. Viafara said that he would make that change. Halford asked if it was \$60,000 or \$70,000. Emery responded that he thinks it is \$70,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

MOVED BY LAESCH, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR THE MINNESOTA 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY SUBJECT TO CHANGES, AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Halford, Laesch, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Riesinger/Audette, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN
TRANSPORTATION PLAN STUDY**

Haugen reported that he has been working with Meredith Richards, Grand Forks Community Development, and she provided a scope of work of the most interest to coincide with the effort they are doing with their Downtown Action Plan.

Haugen referred to the scope of work, included in the packet, and pointed out that it entails a Parking Study Update; looking at the one-way pairing of 3rd and 4th Streets; looking at University Avenue Corridor and strengthening the connection between UND and the downtown; and doing Downtown Traffic Management by looking at what roads we can switch people to and determine what type of improved traffic coordination we get with the signals on the Minnesota side, trying to see if there is a defined bike network that we can identify, see if there is more transit opportunities including looking at autonomous transit.

Kuharenko asked how exactly does the Downtown Action Plan the City is currently working on, and this scope of work mesh together. Richards responded there is a little bit of background just ahead of this but they are in the process of doing their Downtown Action Plan and this paragraph kind of lays out what that will produce in the way of deliverables. She stated that the context kind of behind why they are doing this was the idea that over the next five to ten years Grand Forks is expecting on the order of \$100 million dollars in reinvestment in Downtown Grand Forks, so they want to make sure that for this intermediate term we are prepared with technical elements so that as these investments come in we are ready. She added that, obviously the streetscape is going to be first and foremost with the DeMers reconstruction, but longer term, private sector issues like updating our Design Guidelines, and having a redevelopment strategy that addresses some of the economics and financing is important.

Richards stated that, again, the context for their Downtown Action Plan is to get prepared for this infusion of reinvestment so that it is strategic and coordinated, and that we don't miss any opportunity; so then the transportation elements that flow into that; yes the parking study is, obviously the MPO printed that in 2011, so that clearly needs to be updated with 3rd and 4th Streets. She added that, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, a big part of our Downtown Action Planning process is looking at the redevelopment of the Water Treatment Plan, so we want to make sure that we know if there are unintended consequences with the idea that 3rd Street should be vacated

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

so that construction can really access the view that would be up and over the dike, as well as some of other things that are mentioned such as congestion with the bar closing time, and the long term issue of the one way pairs that would be eliminated. She stated that the University Avenue Corridor, again, this has been a long term discussion formed of how we can build bridges physically and perception wise between campus and downtown. She added that coincidentally the Downtown Action Plan consultant RDG is doing some of that work on campus right now so we can take advantage of that.

Richards reported that for the downtown traffic management, she is going to just throw up her hands and say that it is a little bit over her head in terms that she isn't quite sure what this means and so she kind of unsure of changing the words in line four.

Haugen commented that a lot of this is based on a proposal that the Selection Committee entertained with the selection of RBG; a follow-up proposal of work that they can do. Richards added that out of the interview process, the reason they selected RDG's design, was that there was kind of a dazzling presentation by Mike Bitner, and that kind of stimulated some thought about what else could we incorporate into downtown traffic planning.

Kuharenko said that he supposes that that number four, kind of how it ties into the DeMers Avenue reconstruction; he knows they are working on the design and getting it out the door as quickly as possible; and it looks like the final report for this is due at the end of June 2019, so about a year from now is when this is supposed to be done, so does that make sense for the DeMers Avenue Reconstruction; and he doesn't know when the Downtown Action Plan will be wrapped up. Richards responded that the timeline on this kind of surprised her because it is longer than she expected it to be; and the RDG plan will wrap up sometime in May or June 2019 so some of the earlier elements they really need to have prioritized to make sure that they get done and the information shared with RDG during the time that they are actively planning, so she isn't quite sure how to deal with that timeline issue, in terms of this RFP.

Haugen stated that Ms. Richards did share with him the surprise, and he replied back a couple of things; we are starting later than RDG is starting, but there is still a scope of work that has to have time to it. He said that for some of the data collection we need to wait for the Kennedy Bridge to open up to its typical four-lanes of traffic otherwise the closure of two lanes will certainly affect the data.

Haugen said that in terms of the relationship to the actual project on DeMers, he doesn't think anybody was intending to imply that whatever comes out of this study will change the design, it is just going to build off of what is being designed in place, and to see what else needs to be done to manage the traffic downtown, so other activities could be done in the future. Williams stated, then, we could take the downtown traffic management out of this study and move it to another study that we do for the 2050 update, so we would keep all of this but it wouldn't be a part of this study, correct. Haugen responded that it is supposed to be a part of this study; so as Ms. Richards works with the strategies of what redevelopment is going to be, where it is going to be, and what kind of traffic will be generate, and how we would manage that differently than it is currently managed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

Haugen commented that we will be looking at whether there is potential for changing mode share as this downtown builds vertically, are we going to be able to capture changing how people get; particularly getting people to the downtown as DeMers Avenue is the main corridor, but is there a way to capture motorists prior to getting to the heart of DeMers Avenue downtown. He stated that for many years that was a reroute concept for the Downtown; from the west side.

Haugen stated that in terms of signal coordination, this is geared more towards adaptive signal timing. He said that MnDOT is looking at upgrading their signals in East Grand Forks by 2023. He explained that we currently have ATAC under contract with the Counting Program to help inform MnDOT what equipment works best with the Counting.

Haugen commented that in the past we have always been hampered by two different signal systems that aren't great at communicating with each other for the DeMers Avenue traffic flow, this might be the opportunity to help identify to MnDOT how their investment would work, and show them, through simulation, how that might work to make traffic flow better in both downtowns.

Williams asked if it wouldn't work better if all the traffic counts and everything that is included in Number 4 were done after the DeMers construction because we don't know what the bump-outs are going to do; if it is going to divert traffic, but to go through this using existing traffic, it isn't going to be any good once DeMers is done because that will be a major change. Haugen responded that it can be updated, but from the information he is getting this is what is desired by the City to have us undertake. He added that with the dollar value that we've allowed for this to work, it fits within the dollar values, so again they have given a skeleton proposal to one consultant saying this is the work we want done, so work with it within the RFP, but this is what we would like you to help us do with our Downtown transportation.

Kuharenko referred to Number 4 in the Scope of Work and commented that he is still looking at this with the timelines we have coming up, with the differences with the traffic flows we are going to have between the Kennedy and reconstruction of DeMers Avenue he doesn't know how worthwhile it is going to be to have this particular segment at this point in time. He said that he would have a problem that this might be, just for the sake of the timeline, but also for the aspect of funding as well, maybe removing this portion and getting it put into either a study down the road after DeMers has been reconstructed, after North 5th has been given a mill and overlay, it might not be the right time for it. He added that he would probably be inclined to go as far as saying we should just remove this segment from the scope of work and focus on those items #1, #2, and #3. Haugen said, again that the communication he is getting from the City of Grand Forks, this is the proposed segment they want us to consider, so you are reconsidering all this, that is fine.

Discussion on whether or not #4 should remain in the scope of work ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

Richards stated that she is looking for information that will inform her consultants as they do the elements of their study which were those items she mentioned; redevelopment strategy of streetscape and design guidelines. She added that she is the first to admit that she hadn't thought about the issue of data collection and how it would change based on the Kennedy Bridge reconstruction, but all she knows is what she wants at the end, but she doesn't know how to get there, so that is why this Technical Advisory Group is here.

Bergman asked if MnDOT would be looking at signal priority too. Laesch asked what he meant by priority. Bergman responded that you have TSB that you use on emergency vehicles and buses. Laesch responded that he would think that would be considered. Williams added that in Grand Forks they currently have a system they are using, the GTT Opticom, where they have the preemption for emergency vehicles, but they also have a true transit priority so that it is set in there. Laesch said that he will have to talk to their traffic engineer about this, as it is certainly something that is desired.

Grasser said that it sounded like we are getting caught in a catch-twenty-two in here that circumstances have changed, probably, from discussions that we had, and those types of things; and he is concerned that we need certain things to move very quickly in the downtown, and if we can't deliver them, is there some way we can use existing counts and get something and more thoughts into the study as opposed to waiting because the waiting thing is going to potentially make much of the study irrelevant relative to being able to apply it to decisions that otherwise wouldn't be made, so he is wondering if there are some things we can do to cut down the dollar of the scope of work, as some of those items are not meant for item 4 seem to be a little bit more global in nature, and might be better off to defer to a; he is sure you can't do it in our current Long Range Transportation plan, but even another study or the next one down the line. He said that his understanding is that we are probably looking at a kind of corral the downtown the next five to ten year planning period so the best investment and so those things that may only have impacts down the line, the things suggested might be things that we back out in the interest of time; and again if you do traffic counts you are not trying to date back the counts and project them out through the years, you are only trying to project them five, and maybe there is enough info that today's data and past data that we can maybe use it to get us close enough for a shorter time frame.

Haugen commented, obviously for DeMers itself we could rely on the traffic data that was done; as far as traffic operation analysis it is those other streets off of DeMers that we really have limited counts for. He added that it is his understanding that for traffic management it isn't so much focusing on the management of DeMers, as we know it is going to be changed there next summer, it is with that reality, and we have more demand coming in, and what is being built there the traffic operation study asks if it is going handle all future traffic, so we need to try to start the path of converting people to other modes, with vertical density is going to allow better opportunity than is currently there.

Williams said that they have to know if 3rd and 4th are a one way pair to get to the second part, the second part is dependent on the first part and she thinks that the stumbling block, in that we have to first determine whether the 3rd and 4th one way pairs are going to be there or not, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

then if we figure out if they are or not then the next report can be the downtown, because she wouldn't want to try to guess what would happen if we make both of those streets two-ways, so your counts are going to be all different.

Haugen pointed out that the schedule shows that we aren't able to hire anybody until September 1st.

Kuharenko asked if there was any other way to get the timeline a little bit more compressed because that would then allow Ms. Richards to get the information over to her consultant. He said that he doesn't know if we end up making the draft report submittal due in April, in March, and then the final a month after that it would be a much tighter for the timeline. Halford asked what Ms. Richards' ideal to making timelines was. Richards responded that her consultant has kind of laid out a pretty solid scope of work to the end of this year, so she isn't real sure of at what point the products of these studies would be necessary for them to stay on schedule. Haugen stated that the parking is something that obviously doesn't have to have traffic counts, and waiting for the Kennedy Bridge, so that is on its own schedule so it can be moved up and done faster than being part of the complete documentation things we have to do. Richards commented that the University Avenue Corridor does not seem to be too time sensitive.

Haugen commented that #2 has to be determined before #4 can be done, so we can identify different time frames for one and two within the RFP and allow longer ones for the other two.

Grasser asked if #3 depends on traffic counts. Williams responded that she doesn't think that the University Corridor is going to be affected as much as the downtown with the changes. She said there might be a little bit of change at 3rd and 4th, but she actually thinks you can go ahead with the University Corridor also. Haugen asked when the Kennedy Bridge would be fully functional, or as normal as possible. He stated that the big things are there are on and off ramps on the Minnesota side, when are they going to be fully functional. Emery responded that they will have to switch to the south half of the bridge probably in August or September, and then they will probably open the whole bridge probably in October or November.

Discussion on traffic count data needs ensued.

Kuharenko asked when the final report is due. Richards responded that their timeline has them completing their work in May. Kuharenko said that you are talking probably preliminary approval in April. Richards responded that the timeline is for preparation drafts in May. Williams commented that there are a couple of items in here that if there were any changes made you would need to go through the public comments and such, so in essence this report would need to be done at the end of January or early February.

Haugen asked, just to flip the question; can the Downtown Action Plan schedule slide a month or two. Richards responded that the focus right now is streetscape, streetscape, streetscape; and that has kind of altered the course that they would probably follow for a project like this, so in fact what they are calling their Kick-Off meeting won't occur until October. She added that obviously streetscape has to be done by the DOT timelines, once that is accomplished their

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

process is not willing to deliver a final booklet, so we'll get a streetscape element, and that will be done well before May, and then they will get a parks and open space opinion, and we aren't really worried about the timeline for that element.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN, SUBJECT TO CHANGES AS NOTED; SUBMITTAL OF DRAFT REPORT BY THE END OF FEBRUARY 2019; SUBMITTAL OF THE FINAL REPORT BY THE END OF MARCH 2019; REMOVAL OF ITEM #4 IN THE SCOPE OF WORK; AND FOR STAFF TO DETERMINE COST DIFFERENCE AND BRING REVISED COST ESTIMATE TO THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Halford, Laesch, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Riesinger/Audette, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that they are trying to get some revenue forecasts finalized, and will touch on Performance Measure 2, and give an update on where we are at on the River Crossing Analysis.

Universe Of Projects

Haugen commented that he believes that we are only waiting for it; there was a meeting with the Districts and other staff on the North Dakota District and Mr. Noehre was going to modify his spreadsheet to show the work of that effort, but it hasn't been delivered yet, but he is aware of the request for it.

Haugen stated that with the Universe of Projects they do still have to identify each individual potential river crossing projects.

Haugen said that on the Main Street Program they were informed that the utility relocations aren't eligible under the Urban Grant Program, so there is still a need to perhaps identify projects for that program in lieu of those that were an addition to those.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it is a reminder of the dollar values that are still in-flux, but there are still around \$900 million dollars.

Haugen commented that they are trying to get the Universe of Projects wrapped up, and sent information out. He stated that it looks like July 27th is the best date to go over the Universe List of Projects and start applying fiscal constraint to them, etc., so please schedule four hours of your time to do that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

Laesch asked how that affects the DOT side, as the projects he submitted he feels we can do fiscally, but is this kind of a give and take between all the different jurisdictions. Haugen responded that the fiscal constraint is still within the funding silos, so you really don't have any projects competing against the funding for the District Risk Management Funds, or the statewide program; some of those are still siloed so we aren't stealing from one to pay to the other. Laesch said, then, when you looked at what your total amount was are you basically taking what he submitted as those silos. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that they are using a baseline and applying what MnDOT said was the rate of growth to use for financial forecasting.

Kuharenko asked, just for clarification are you saying July 27th, Friday morning, is that an 8:00 to noon meeting. Haugen responded it is.

Haugen commented that as soon as we start to narrow down projects, they will start to run some travel demand models to see how it helps or hurts our system with those projects.

Financial Plan Draft

Haugen stated that the big change from last month is that they were doubling up on some City of Grand Forks funding programs, so they revised what they were forecasting.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and commented that we previously had a number of \$200+ million dollars, but after reviewing everything, that number has been reduced to \$126 million dollars. He explained that last month they showed what the total was, and now they are showing what the funding programs are.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side we show a total of \$30 million in the Statewide Performance and \$30 million in the District Risk. He commented that the projects themselves, again these aren't showing what the project cost will necessarily be; how many projects will be done in those time bands. He added that they aren't going to do, say another Urban Regional, a \$37 million dollar project, and only do one project in a timeband. He said that this is identifying based on a baseline of a million dollars, how that grows, 2% in North Dakota, and how per year, then add up the years and come up with these timeband amounts by revenue sources.

Haugen pointed out that this number has been revised down as the total available, and again because of that doubling error on the Grand Forks local side, it was reduced considerably from what it was last month, but we are, again reporting this in the year of expenditure dollars so as soon as we look at our projects on Friday, July 27th, and start assigning the year expenditure those costs will inflate to the year of expenditure and will coincide with the dollars available.

Haugen stated that he wants to remind everyone that this is a five year plan, but because of a potential major change in financial we may have to revisit the plan earlier than the normal five years.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

Grasser asked, on the finance end what are we doing in 2018 to 2023. Haugen responded that they are doing things differently; each program almost has a different answer because; HSIP, Interstate, Regional, Local, these top four, they are all pretty much programmed in our T.I.P. so 2023 would be the start year for them; the Urban or Main Street Grant is only awarded out to 2020, so we will start in 2021 for that program; so some of these programs have a little different timeline, but the general timeline is 2023 to 2045, but some individual programs will be a little different.

Discussion on projects and timebands ensued.

Performance Measures

Haugen stated that they are focusing on PM2, the pavement and bridge targets. He explained that, just as with Safety, we can adopt up to twelve targets, or we can adopt as little as six targets. He said that if we adopt the State targets we have to adopt both State targets, we can't adopt one State target and have a local target in that same measure.

Haugen commented that for Pavement we are looking at Interstate, Non-Interstate, NHS; both good and poor targets. He said that what we are finding out is that we are not able, in this Long Range Transportation Plan to make a uniform data collection to have one target set for the MPO, and that is for all of these targets, so with the event, unless some miracle happens, we are now recommending for these particular targets to adopt the State targets as we don't have the availability of uniform data, particularly on pavement, bridges it is a little more uniform.

Haugen stated that we officially have until the end of November to make a decision, and we also have scheduled to have a draft document done earlier than that, so maybe as early as next month we will be asking for a decision on bridges and pavement target setting.

Haugen commented that these are generally four year targets, but there is a provision in the law that requires after two years a review of how they are performing and allows for an adjustment to be made in that target, but each State considers that two year period a little differently; for example on bridges with poor condition Minnesota, even though the target value is the same, they made it a two year target rather than a four year target while North Dakota made it a four year target at 4%, but again most States have to review them after a two year period.

Grasser asked if this measures "the bridge" or percentage of the bridge that maybe in poor condition. Haugen responded that there are three components; three different parts of a bridge or culverts over a certain size.

Grasser said, though that we are only measuring Interstate and NHS, so in his mind, just going statistically, we are either going to have almost 100% or we are going to have 0%; but he agrees 4% makes sense, and he isn't saying we should change anything, but percentage wise we are either going to, because of the small number of structures we have, we are either going to totally great or totally fail. Haugen pointed out that the info still shows the Kennedy Bridge, for example, prior to the work that is being done on it in very poor shape. He explained that it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

presented poorly largely because the Kennedy Bridge data that is prior to the work Grasser stated, again, as we are measuring it on that NHS system, we have so few bridges that are on that system.

River Crossing Analysis

Haugen reported that the consultants have done the mapping that shows; you will remember that we added 17th Avenue and shifted 24th Avenue to the more logical location of Elks Drive; so the data results were included in the packets. He commented that 17th performs a lot like Elks does, its not to much of a dramatic change. He added that one big thing is that at each of the intersections the touchdown points, they have also done the calculations of level of service, and that is in the packets.

Williams asked what the level of service based on, was it the existing traffic controls, or are they all signalized, or what. Haugen referred to a slide (a copy of which is included in the packets and available upon request) and pointed out that there is a column showing the existing traffic control and the 2045 level of service, and that crossing was added; and then the proposed traffic control improvement change, and what the level of service will be. He added that there is also some mitigation and strategy; and they are still working yet touchdown points the bridge traffic doesn't change much, there is an increase in traffic, but from a level of service point of view its not.

Williams referred to a page in the document and stated that it is based on existing traffic control devices. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Kuharenko referred to the Roadway Planning Capacities sheet and pointed out it states that 32nd Avenue, east of Belmont, widening is going to be required, but yet in the 32nd Avenue River Crossing you are only showing 8,000 ADT. He said that he is wondering why we would widen 32nd Avenue east of Belmont, when it would probably be suited by a two-lane roadway. Haugen commented that it is adding a left turn lane. He added that it is east of Belmont so it is the intersection geometry at Belmont and 32nd. Kuharenko said, then, that it would only be a left turn lane at that intersection. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko suggested it might be good to word that bullet more clearly.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating alignments, in a planning view level, and commented that you will notice a difference between these photos/maps and what we had in our last study, fifteen years ago; they are using a lot thicker lines of alignment, and aren't zooming in to a greater detail. He stated that these next slides show the five alignments.

Haugen commented that there was a meeting held at the end of June to talk about the uniqueness of 47th Avenue on the Minnesota side. He said that he believes the outcome from that meeting sort of identified that basically from the flood protection south is unlikely to be, as it was identified in the draft, a City issue, it would be a County issue. He added that the County staff and officials that were there identified the possibility of perhaps, the both do not have to be designated highways to be a part of the State Aid System, but they felt perhaps one should be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

designated CSAH, and the other could just be a County road, the difference is the funding source, obviously. He said that CSAH has some State money being applied to it, while the county road is just local/county revenue sources.

Haugen stated that we are asking the County to essentially give us some sense of where they sit, as a Board, on changing their County network. He said that they have added miles, the CSAH system they had to take off miles somewhere, a new system of trade; they added just County roads that they can just add

Haugen reported that they are working on the final Universe List of Projects, and will be going over it on Friday, July 27th, from 8:00 am. To Noon. He stated that you should be getting some more information prior to that meeting.

Haugen stated that there will also be a package of information to help us work through fiscal constraint and other ways to try to narrow down the list of projects as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

Halford asked if there is a total of five sections to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan, or are there any more sections out there that they haven't gotten yet. Viafara responded that there is recommendation section and an Executive Summary. He stated that he mentioned to her that there were not recommendations standing alone by itself, there were some recommendations embedded in the overall text. Halford asked if that should be part of the Executive Summary. Viafara responded that is what they are preparing now.

Halford asked when that information would be shared. Viafara responded that he expects it will be available in about a month. Halford asked if that next plan is to take it through the approval process. Viafara responded that that is the plan. Halford asked if he wanted comments before the next Advisory Group meeting, or do you just want them to bring their comments to that meeting. Viafara responded that if they are available prior to the meeting that would be nicer because then he can prepare a response. Kuharenko said that as he was going through a couple of sections he noticed that there were a couple of pages that were intentionally left blank, so are there going to maps inserted there. Viafara responded that there will be two maps. He explained that the maps dealing with the carry-over projects from the previous plan; they will still become now, basically part of our new horizons and priorities, so they are moving them.

Halford asked if once the recommendations and the executive summary are completed, will you put all the sections together into one document so they know what it looks like as a whole. Viafara responded that he would.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 11th, 2018**

- b. Reschedule August 8th Technical Advisory Committee Meeting To August 15th

Haugen reported that because we are holding a Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting on July 27th we would like to move the August 8th meeting to August 15th to give us a little time between it and the next meeting. He added that we also had a conflict with the MnDOT on August 8th as well, so staff is wondering if it is okay to make that change.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 11TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:10 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SPECIAL
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Executive Director called the July 27th, 2018, Special meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 8:10 a.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmaz, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer (Via Conference Call);

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Dustin Lang, Darren Laesch, Dale Bergman, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Ryan Riesinger, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, and Nancy Ellis.

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

Guests present: Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local District; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Mary Karlsson, Kimley-Horn; Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mareck, WSB; and James Kiedrowski, KLJ.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that the agenda today is to give you an update where they are at with the Street and Highway Plan Elements. He said that they are trying to focus a lot of their time on the Universe of Projects; and they think they finally have a comprehensive list.

Haugen commented that, as you can tell, a few entities did give us updated lists within the last couple of weeks so we will spend a little time going over those. He added that now that we have, we think, a list; and we also have what we think are the financial revenue forecasts we can do our first attempt at fiscal constraint.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Haugen stated that many of the entities gave us an idea of what the project timeline would be so we have some update to the timeband.

Haugen said that the last item is introducing a tool that we are developing to help us somewhat prioritize the projects, and Kimley-Horn will go over that information. He added that it is a tool that they are building off of how we score T.I.P. projects.

Haugen stated that the first thing we will do is to update everyone on the Universe List of Projects. He added that you have three entities that gave us updated lists; the District, State of North Dakota, East Grand Forks and Grand Forks County. He asked if staff was going to lead on this. Bourdon responded that he thinks staff can discuss a little bit of what the changes were.

Mareck added that NDDOT sent them a new list a week or two ago so they removed all of the previously provided projects by NDDOT, and added in the updated projects, which he believes are all state of good repair projects. He said that, similarly for Grand Forks County there were state of good repair projects that were provided, and he doesn't believe you previously had a state of good repair for Grand Forks County so those were added; and for the City of East Grand Forks we also had a number of state of good repair projects that were provided that were added to the list. Haugen asked if he had the capability to show those updated totals. Mareck responded that for each of the tabs he could go over them. He added that he thought they were on the tool, but he will have to pull them up. Haugen said that we will need to have that spreadsheet distributed, but it could be in the toolbox that we are distributing after today's meeting, all those projects that were added. Bourdon stated that the projects are all incorporated into this sheet, Scott added them and they then incorporated the prioritization tool so they are all on the spreadsheet in as shown on the screen.

Mareck stated that he could go over the tools if you want. Haugen responded, yes, that he thinks we just need to know how it basically just changes the state of good repair and a bit of the discretionary.

Mareck referred to the spreadsheet and went over it briefly:

- 1) Safety is at \$18 million
- 2) Multimodal is at \$31 million
- 3) State of Good Repair is at \$356 million
- 4) Discretionary (a catch all for everything else) is at \$379 million

Haugen commented that he noticed on the spreadsheet when going over it last night that some of these additional projects might not have all the information on them. He said that he noticed that, for instance on the North Dakota list, MnDOT gave us projects on two bridges. Mareck responded that there is some data missing on a number of projects, so at some point we need to work through how to obtain that data. Haugen commented that he would guess for the two bridges we would take the MnDOT estimate and divide by two to plug into the North Dakota side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Haugen stated that, just to have a little discussion, when we get to the fiscal constraint, you will see that, at least when he did it last night and it was the first time looking at this so he didn't have this information to share, but it seems like NDDOTs projects compare to 2040 seem to be similar project types but the costs are substantially less, have you had a chance or sense of comparing the project costs at all. Noehre responded that he sent the latest update of their project cost history, so that is what they are using. He said that five years ago was at the height of the oil boom, when everything was higher, but since then things have come down and you can compare them one to the other, but you have the tool that he used to cost estimate. Haugen responded that he did get that cost estimate, it is just surprising the change of the cost total.

Haugen said that the next step is to send out this tool, and in the tool are all the projects now, and to try to finalize the missing data cells, so one last review by everyone would be appreciated. He added that there aren't very many and you probably just solved two of the missing cells. Noehre stated that he didn't add in the bridge work dollars because you already have them.

Haugen stated that the next step would be to discuss the fiscal constraint analysis, is that right; or go over the tool? Karlsson responded that she thinks we, in terms of fiscal constraint this has not changed from your previous meeting where Mr. Haugen presented this, so the numbers in front of the slashes indicate dollars by timeband; so, for example, for HSIP in North Dakota there is \$3 million dollars available for 2023 through 2027, and then \$7 million dollars for 2028 through 2037, and \$7 million dollars for 2038 through 2045. She explained that this information, again, that previously, they have it broken out by program and by State, so what is on the screen right now is North Dakota, and then on the next slide is Minnesota.

Karlsson referred back to the slide showing North Dakota and said in comparing that to what is in the spreadsheet, they are looking at, for HSIP in North Dakota, a total of \$12 million dollars of projects identified for the full timeframe. She stated that if we do look at by timebands it far exceeds the \$3 million dollars that is available in the first five years. She commented if we do that same analysis for Minnesota, we have the same findings in that it exceeds the fiscal constraint for safety.

Karlsson stated that that is the kind of analysis that they will do for each program. She said that if we go to state of good repair we find a similar situation, but again acknowledging that, for example the Interstate Program can include more projects than just state of good repair.

Karlsson, referring to the spreadsheet, said to keep \$2 million, \$4 million, \$4 million in mind for Interstate; and then if we look at Interstate in North Dakota in the short range we are at a total of \$17 million dollars, again comparing that to the \$3 million; and then in the long range we are looking at a total of \$11 million dollars and again that is compared to the \$4 million dollars in funding available.

Haugen said he has a question for North Dakota; when we look at the Interstate Program, is some of that accessible to the Regional Program or is the Interstate completely separate and distinct from the revenue that is shown on the regional side, in other words can we combine the North Dakota Programs when we look at the District List. Noehre responded that Interstate and Regional funding cannot be combined.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Noehre asked where they got the \$3 million, \$4 million, and \$4 million; is that what you came up with from your projections from previous TIPs. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that they essentially they looked at our last eight years of T.I.P.s to what projects were funded from our programs, how we aggregated, giving an annual average from the programs. He said that for the Interstate they might have gone back more than eight years because there were fewer projects. He stated that that is essentially how they calculated the base amounts of revenue was going back to past history and what we received from those programs and used an average annual number with the exception of the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridge projects; currently the Kennedy is sort of an outlier, and in the end the Sorlie ended up being a lot less than the last plan assumed it would be. Karlsson commented that to get the Interstate funding they analyzed trips from 2012 through 2021, so they analyzed ten years of trips.

Grasser said that it sounds like we didn't just go back eight years, we went back in history and then also grabbed, maybe, projects that were programmed in the T.I.P.s, so we're looking at past and future for doing those averages. Haugen responded that that is correct, they are going with projects that are programmed in the T.I.P. as being reasonably expected to be included in our financial forecasting. Mary added that they looked at documents that have been adopted by the MPO. Grasser stated that the question he would have, the concern, if that would then capture the 32nd Avenue South HSIP project which he is interpreting is anonymously large dollar amounts, probably, compared to what we might normally see, so he is wondering if that isn't going to skew that number higher; it makes our problem worse, but 32nd is a big project and he isn't sure that will be repeated again.. Mary agreed, adding that, if you remember, we talked about that at our previous meetings and they removed that project so it is not in the revenue forecast. Grasser said that it is just hard to mentally get his head around what is in and what is out.

Haugen said, just to talk about the Interstate, when we saw the revenue forecast versus the project costs just keep in mind that those project costs are quite a bit less than they were in the current plan for the Interstate Program, or the Interstate Project Types. He added that it is good to know that we have lower costs but it is more humbling to see that the revenue is not reflecting the same good news.

Williams asked if this is total revenue that we are looking at now. Haugen responded that it is. Williams asked if the pedestrian and bicycle projects included in this. Haugen responded that the stand-alone TAP projects are not part of this financial report. Williams said, then that you are looking at all of the bicycle and pedestrian items to be TAP funding. Haugen responded that out of the Street and Highway Program there have not been any bike/ped projects funded so we aren't showing any in this Street and Highway Element.

Williams said she has a question for NDDOT; does any of the work that is listed in here include urbanization. Haugen responded that they do have a discretionary project for the mile between 55th and 69th on Gateway Drive, the rest of the work is basically state of good repair. Williams asked if those dollars include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Haugen responded that he would defer to them, but they are using, there is a sheet that the NDDOT provides for mile costs for typical projects and he believes the one mile cost for an urban, he believes it is called Reconstruction Urbanization, is somewhere around \$9 million dollars, so that is inclusive of facilities. He added, though, that he doesn't know what has all been incorporated of that \$9

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

million. Noehre commented that what is included in that \$9 million; you would have to go back and look at all those projects individual numbers they used because that is the average that has been used across the State.

Williams said, if you were scoping a project today, would it include the pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Noehre responded that he would say it is safe to assume that some of that stuff is in there, but it depends upon how much you wanted to add to it and go over that \$9 million. He said that the answer is “it depends” on if you want decorative lighting, sidewalks, paver stones instead of concrete, and all those kinds of things that will elevate those costs, so at some point you now that the sky’s not the limit. Williams stated that the reason she asks is because it lists separately in the bicycle and pedestrian plan in that same area of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan having a shared use path in there, and so what she was trying to wrap her head around is that she wants to make sure that we aren’t having a project in there twice; once in the Streets and once in the Bike/Ped Plans. Haugen responded that that is a good comment and they will keep track of it and make sure it doesn’t go through separate documents.

Noehre stated, going back to the Interstate, what was it, \$11 million over to 2045, if he remembers right was the forecast; it was \$3 million, \$4 million, and \$4 million. He asked if it would handle everything in the spreadsheet over that same period. Karlsson responded that in the long range does total \$11.30 million. Noehre said, then, that he would suggest that dollar amount is maybe somewhere in-between those two, probably won’t be exactly what is in the spreadsheet, but it is not going to be as low as what you have for an average cost.

Haugen said, back to just the Interstate, what was the short-term total cost estimate; and then the long-term, is that just the projects that were identified in the long-term time-band or is it that the total 2045 project. Karlsson responded that she hears two questions, and the answer to the first is that the short-range total is \$17.2 million dollars for the North Dakota Interstate; and the second question was if the long-range included all of the 2045 projects. Haugen said that the last question was you had mentioned \$11 million and long-term, it must have been just \$11 million on the long-term band. Karlsson responded that that is correct, just in the long-range band, it did not include the mid-range, did-not include the mid-term band, which she does think is important to keep in mind that there were no projects allocated or assigned to the mid-term band. Haugen said, then, that \$17 and \$11 equals \$28 million out of \$10 million revenue forecast, so there is a significant difference.

Haugen commented that part of the struggle with a tool and prioritizing is that there is a lot of financial gaps in some areas but then there is also a thing of performance targets that we’re setting; and trying to decipher the projects that are coming through that help us achieve those targets. He added that some of the targets are at a level where we probably would never get close to having a financial penalty imposed because of the target.

Haugen stated that just on the Interstate system those targets with paving conditions, and he believes, and Mr. Johnson would agree, were set at a point where they felt safe that they would never have to impose a penalty. He added that the only revenue that we have, is there guidance from headquarters on other ways, a difference between 10 and 28 in revenue forecast, using the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

forecasts so far. Johnson responded that there isn't, not really. He said that he isn't sure what the best way is to close that gap, and he didn't hear the entire conversation.

Haugen asked Ms. Karlsson to go over the regional system. He added that the revenue forecasts were the same, based on history. Karlsson asked if he wanted to look at the revenue as well. Haugen responded no, just give us the short-term cost estimates.

Noehre said that before we do that, the question is; what are we calling State of Good Repair, does it include 47th Avenue Interchange, or connect to 42nd. Haugen responded that it is just their pavement preservation projects. Noehre asked even if it is reconstruction, but not adding capacity it is a state of good repair. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen commented that he thinks we are trying to get the financial sum or the cost estimates for the short-term on the regional side. He said that would finish all the rest of the NDDOT projects.

Karlsson stated that there are some projects that could be funded using multiple sources, so some of those are a combination of Urban Local Road and Urban Regional. She asked if she should go over all those projects that can be funded from multiple sources, or do you just want me to look at those that are only eligible for Urban Regional. Haugen responded that it would be the NDDOT projects, the State Highway System, so just the Urban Regional Program.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and commented that for Urban Regional not all of the projects have not been assigned to a time-band so they have not been able to inflate those dollars so what is shown in the report here are uninflated 2018 dollars. Haugen commented that NDDOT did provide us the year for each of their programs. Karlsson said that starting with just the NDDOT projects by time-band, for short-range we are looking at \$8.8 million dollars; for mid-range we are looking at a total of \$31.8 million dollars, and then for long-range we are looking at a total of \$5.3 million dollars. She added that it does appear that there are three projects that have not been assigned to time-bands for regional. Haugen commented that the bottom two are the two bridges and we did have a meeting on how to assign those, both agencies would share half of the cost of both. Haugen said that the third project is a mill and overlay project 8 miles east of Grand Forks to 2 miles west of Columbia Road, so that is 55th Street westward.

Karlsson reiterated that the short-range was \$8.8 million, the mid-range was \$31.8 million, and the long-range was \$5.3 million; and again no estimates with those last three projects. She stated that if we look at Urban Regional we have \$16 million in the short-range, \$37 million in the mid-range, and then \$36 million in the long-range, so if there are no additional projects beyond state of good repair; state of good repair does not max out the funding available if they are in the Regional Program. Haugen commented that was why he asked his urban question of whether we could combine the Interstate and Regional pot, because we are short of projects on this first cut of fiscal constraint on the Regional side, strong on projects on the Interstate side in the timebands. Noehre said to just count on getting more Interstate dollars, and somehow it helped them; but going back to that other one in the spreadsheet it did have a year in there of 2021, but he doesn't remember if he put a cost in for it or not but you have to figure out where the distance

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

is between 69th and where the MPO boundary is. Haugen stated that the 2021 project is in our T.I.P. section so this spreadsheet has a future project.

Haugen stated that, again, we will be sending out this spreadsheet for that one last look. He said that they think they have everyone's list, but there are still some gaps that need to be addressed.

Grasser said he might be jumping ahead, but if he remembers right we are accepting a LOS D on our roadways, and as he recalls we had a number of potential grade separation projects on Highway 2 that would be under the Regional Program and talked about now. He asked how state of good repair relate to LOS, is there a point when you get past a LOS D that state of good repair monies will come into play in order to remedy that capacity constraint or will those dollars have to come out of a different program, or do just assume we run everything down to gridlock. He said that he is just trying to understand where capacity improvements come into the state of good repair. Haugen responded that they come in after we have shown that we have a financial capability of adding capacity to raise the LOS. He stated that this is the guidance we got in our last plan, but they haven't asked if it needs to be revised or changed or if it is the same guidance, but if we are doing a reconstruction then we address the capacity issue with that project; if we are doing just a mill and overlay or a concrete panel replacement, etc., then we aren't addressing capacity and are just doing pavement work. He added that he believes that is what we've heard when we ask about cost estimates; and we've talked about the reconstruction that's cost \$9 million dollars on the urban system because they are counting forward, and it is a bigger project, it isn't just a simple reconstruction curb to curb, it includes those other components that are substandard or missing and need to be addressed. Noehre commented that those are right of way to right of way, not curb to curb, in both directions.

Haugen stated that so far on the regional side you can see that there is a lot of revenue that is left on the table with the current scope of work for the state of good repair, but on the other side we have an interstate system that has a lot of work with little revenue; and they are both almost all of the State Highway System and that National Highway System, with a few exceptions, so those would be the ones that probably would get our first financial resources that are available to make sure that they are state of good repair.

Johnson commented that, thinking about the interstate system, and correct him if he is wrong, and the need that is going out in terms of our not having a lot of projects over the past six or so years that's why everyone is showing a revenue of \$10 million, but there is \$289 million dollars in need because of the life cycle; and while the interstate pavement lasts so much longer it almost takes a long range plan and a half horizon before we have to fully get back into it, so he thinks there is probably a reasonableness to assume a higher revenue number now, how we get to that number is maybe up for discussion yet, but he will visit with their programming staff and show the numbers and the timelines that Mr. Noehre has laid out in his spreadsheet and see if they are comfortable with a higher number that we can use with more confidence. He said that he understands what you are saying, historically the two pots have been separate; Interstate and Interstate funding from the rural side of the program, and Urban Regional is from the Urban side of the program too, so that the desire would be to continue to keep those separate from a programming standpoint, so he will look into this some more to see if he can get a better number for you.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Haugen asked, just to clarify or verify, even though in the FAST ACT is doesn't have a separate Interstate Program, as far as appropriations; NDDOT will continue to have a separate Interstate Program just as you have created your own programs for Regional and Urban. Johnson responded that you're right in that it is still one pot of money, but they internally code them to keep track of them as part of IM verses NHPP verses Urban Regional or Urban Road, it is just an internal tracking and coding mechanism that they use, but you're right there is not a dedicated interstate line item anymore. He added that they are doing that today, he doesn't have any information or reason to believe that they will stray from that process or designation, so that is our best bet to continue that program.

Haugen said that this would be the time to ask Mr. Johnson about the Asset Management Plan and how that might address the timing of projects on the NDDOT assets. Johnson responded that that is a good question, but he isn't sure what the status of that work is at right now, it is being spearheaded and led by their Planning Division, and he knows that they have been working on this but he isn't sure where they are at, what they've shared with anyone at a higher level, but it hasn't working its way down to them yet. Haugen said that the essence of that is that it is a 10-year fiscally constrained Asset Management Plan, which would be helpful for the first ten years of this long range transportation plan at the MPO level. Johnson agreed, but said that he just doesn't know if they have gotten to that point yet, but he doesn't believe they have.

Haugen asked Ms. Karlsson to walk everyone through the East Grand Forks short-term, mid-term, and long-term versus the financial entity.

Karlsson reported that for East Grand Forks, they, again do not have all of the projects assigned to a timeband so there is that caveat. Haugen commented that he believes they did virtually all of them; he knows there is one that wasn't assigned a timeband but he thought they gave us timebands for the rest of them. Karlsson responded that it looks like there are at least two that are missing, and those are the Point Bridge east approach and then the River Road/U.S. #2 to 23rd Street N.W. Haugen said, again, last month they noticed that the River Road project is in the mid-term, they did provide us with that. He said that the Point Bridge project is the one that wasn't assigned a timeband, but that is most likely because they don't have a good idea of the timeframe for that project yet.

Grasser asked if on the Minnesota side do the regional dollars go into East Grand Forks or are we now talking only for local. Haugen responded that we are talking about only local City Subtarget. Grasser commented that for him it would be easier if he could compare interstate and regional on the North Dakota side and the regional on the Minnesota side, so are we going to go back and reconnect on the Minnesota regional side or is their program different. Haugen responded that their program is different. He explained that their Asset Management System is more advanced than the North Dakota side so they have already done their fiscal constraint of which projects they can finance so they basically have a ten year T.I.P. document, and that is what they have given us. He added that for the Kennedy and the Sorlie Bridge projects they have given us an estimate of follow up work to the work that is now being done so for the long range they have given us projects on which to focus. Grasser said that for 2045 then we would not be in line of the next planning horizon on the MnDOT side. Haugen responded that one the Minnesota side, on the Regional System on the State Highway System, they are identified

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

through Asset Management work that needs to be done on their State Highway System. He added that they had a fiscally constrained program at Headquarters so the District Office provides a ten year improvement program, an improvement plan, so we have a number of projects that they have identified in that ten year period, and then to give us some sense of the longer terms, since they don't go past ten years at the District level, they've identified the two bridges in the longer term of our planning document to do work. Grasser said that the reason that process doesn't work on the North Dakota side is because we don't have asset management; because it seems like we are doing a ten year plan on one side and are trying to do a twenty-five year plan on the other. Haugen responded that we are trying to do a twenty-five year plan on both sides, the ten years on the Minnesota side is more defined through their long existing asset management process; where North Dakota is just introducing a fiscally constrained asset management plan because of the FAST ACT. He said that Minnesota has been there and done that for several years so they have a more refined system base to identify the projects, when and where and how they fit their financial resources, so we are doing a twenty-five year plan on both sides, one just has a more informed ten year period, but as we discussed North Dakota with its fiscally constrained asset management plan that is required, they will start having more informed ten year asset plans in the future.

Haugen reported that when we look at the revenue for East Grand Forks, one of the things that complicates things is the every fourth year issue on the Minnesota revenue for these projects, so not only do we have to be fiscally constrained, but we also have to know where the four year cycle hits on the timebands.

Haugen referred to a slide and commented that when we talk about the Interstate and North Dakota Regional Program, and the totals we were using, we need to add in the North Dakota match to those; he thinks we were just identify our discussion total amount, so North Dakota's match is \$2 million and \$5.5 million and \$5 million for a total of \$4.5 million get added to the revenue total for the Interstate and Regional Program.

Noehre asked if they used the bridge dollars to come up with the Urban Regional forecasts; for the Kennedy and Sorlie. Haugen responded that they did not.

Karlsson stated that the project costs for East Grand Forks are; short-range - \$6.7 million dollars, mid-range - \$8.1 million dollars, and long-range - \$24 million dollars. She said that this is compared to 1, 2, and 3 for City's subtargets. Haugen added plus the 2, 2, and 4 for the City match. He said that, again, we have, just like the interstate, more project costs than we do revenue. Bourdon added that there is also \$3 million for the Polk County as well.

Haugen asked for clarification as to how they came up with the revenue for Polk County. Karlsson asked if the question was how they came up with the revenue forecast or is it how that relates to the projects that we just listed, the project totals. Sanders responded that they would like clarification on how you came up with the \$3 million in revenue forecast for the area, and then what projects to you have that are equal to or more than the \$3 million. Karlsson responded that for Polk County they did the State Aid, they took a portion of the State Aid projects, and that was identified with help from the County; and that is how they came up with that revenue forecast of \$3 million for the County. Sanders said, then that you basically are taking a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

percentage of his regular State Aid and putting it in per year to come up with a 2045 estimate at \$3.1 million. Haugen commented that he believes the percentage is a percent of your highways that are in the MPO area versus your entire system. Haugen asked how they came up with the projects. Sanders asked if they had any projects that you show. Karlsson responded that they show two projects for Polk County that come up to about \$500,000. Sanders commented that just so you know right now he has those scheduled for 2021 for an overlay. Karlsson asked if he has the 73 and 76 scheduled for 2021, they should not be 2028. Sanders responded that that is correct.

Sanders asked if they show an overlay on 72 at all from the east limits of East Grand Forks out to Trunk Highway 220. Karlsson responded that they only have the two projects for Polk County. Sanders said, then, that you will need to add one; the 72 overlay will be done in 2023 if the money comes in the way it is supposed to, or whenever the City wants to do their Bygland Road project. Bourdon said that they will send out the spreadsheet as it currently is, but with a line added and ask that you fill it in.

Haugen stated that from here we have the MnDOT District projects defined and fiscally constrained; we have Grand Forks County projects by timeband and fiscally constrained; the one they haven't worked, but do have the numbers for would be the City of Grand Forks, a sense of timeband for the projects that they provided for the Universe of Projects. He asked if there was some sense of timebands for these projects. Grasser responded that they have given timebands for the NHS System projects, which are the ones that they have a general, the feel they have a sense of providing something that may come to pass, but the question is on their collector streets, which he's done an extensive documentation why we can't reasonably put a timeband on those; is the question they keep asking, the question is how do they handle that because they can't reasonably put timebands on whatever they have, 80 or 100 miles of collector type of streets, all in poor condition and all in need of work, so that is their challenge. Haugen said that hearing that they will put them all on short-term and show that there is a big gap between them, and that some of them will be financed in the near few years. He added that we have had revenue dollars that we had available. Grasser said that he isn't sure he has a comment. He stated that it is a matter of timing, to work an unworkable system into the regulations, and he relies on the MPO to figure out how to fit that square peg into a round hole. He added that what he contemplated, that he thought would be appropriate is to write right into the document and having a discussion about basically that number he previously wrote, for the most part the challenge at times to take that system and provide the level of detail in the years and the type of work and the cost estimates that go along with that. He said that you can create a list, the question is does the list have any meaning, and if you create a list that doesn't have any probable implementation strategies, how do you handle that. He added that he is trying to avoid a discussion where they have a list, and then we don't follow the list, but how do we handle that administratively; do we follow a list or do we follow an intent on how to create those lists, and we have had these discussions before, and again, he thinks that if there is a way of identifying that, it is a list, but what do we do, is you suggest putting them all in the short-term, or however we handle that through the process. He said that he would feel better getting everything transparent as to the validity of that list, especially on the local level as he is concerned that if a list is put together, and it appears that its coming out of the Engineering Department, they would hope that their City Council would look at it and if it appears that it has the stamp and sanctioning of the Engineering

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Department, that it has some likelihood of actually occurring, and he is concerned about that from their optics and their relationship with the City Council. He added that if they put their stamp on something they would like it to be something that they feel has a reasonable chance of occurring, and they really don't know which projects they will do next year but they are going to evaluate a number of them this fall, and the question is out of each category, 20 miles of streets, which one or two or three miles are they going to do, they still don't know; so how we translate that into the Universe of Projects, they rely on guidance from the MPO.

Haugen stated that they will work on that, but it seems with the first glance that you have the NHS System, which would be our top system, and then the minor arterials would be the next focus; focus on what projects are identified in the Universe of Projects list that are on the non-arterial system, because that would be the next level of importance as far as traffic is concerned in the metro area, and then we would shake them out and what is left are the collectors. He added that perhaps part of the discussion, we would have to do a functional reclass at the end of this exercise. He stated that just as we saw on the Minnesota side there was some non-classified roadways that were in the past classified so maybe that's part of our discussion, to maybe consider some of these collectors as possible not being part of the federal aid system anymore. He said that it doesn't remove pavement condition and the poor quality of the pavement, but it would remove it from the federal aid process. He added that off the top of his head he would cite the frontage roads being something that may or may not be appropriate. Grasser said that that is a good discussion point, he pondered that himself, but the problem is they never know when there is going to be some sort of windfall program that may show up.

Grasser commented that they actually spent a pretty fair amount of those dollars on collector types of streets. He added that that is where, a lot of times, our biggest need is, at least from the public when they are looking at the rideability, so he doesn't have any good answers. He said that he thinks recognizing the variability of that program would help a lot so that when they need to adjust this in the future we can recognize that what we gave was our best shot, kind of in the dark, not in the dark, its not that unscientific, but we are really struggling with the rapid deterioration that we are seeing in some of these streets that was exhibited this last spring. He added that on some of those streets they thought had another couple three years left on them and all of a sudden they just absolutely went crazy on them, so that is part of what they have to observe this fall, do we think we have something at that time, kind of a tipping point, that might reprioritize that street, it is an evaluation they aren't quite ready to make yet.

Karlsson said that she just want to make sure that she is understanding Mr. Grasser; do we have an agreement that in terms of invested priority of what is shown in the MPO plan for now that we should identify, and she isn't sure this applies to Grand Forks, but to identify if there are any Grand Forks roads that are on the NHS, that that would be the top priority and the second priority would be if there any Grand Forks roads that are arterials, that that would be the second investment priority, and then the third investment priority would be any Grand Forks collectors, do we have agreement on that sequence of priorities. Haugen responded that there might be some State Highways that are minor arterials that we have to include. He added that on the Regional side we show a lot of revenue with less projects for state of good repair.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Grasser commented that if we are talking from a perspective of potential use of federal dollars he thinks that that level of prioritization makes sense; if we are talking local dollars without federal participation, minor arterials may or may not be the priority in that case because they may have better rideability and so, again, if we were potentially accessing federal dollars and federal projects he would agree that we would go from NHS to the minor arterial, that would make some sense that way, but that doesn't necessarily mean we are going to spend our own dollars that way. He added that it looks like they are pretty much going to capture federal dollars on the NHS system, there might be dollars left for one or two large projects after that time period, so that is part of what they are seeing on the local, and he doesn't know if you are seeing the same thing when looking at revenue on the spreadsheet but that is generally how they have been ???

BREAK

RESUME MEETING

Haugen commented that at the agenda discussion we talked about the tool and how we are starting out with it. He said that at some point we do have to come up with a fiscally constrained program of projects and the tool that they started off with is the scoring format we distributed with our T.I.P. solicitation.

Haugen stated that some of the Technical Advisory Committee members may not remember but back maybe ten years ago our Federal Partners reminded us that as part of the requirement we needed to score and show how we prioritized projects in our T.I.P. program. He said they did the reminder with a Federally funded program called TELUS (Transportation Economic And Land Use System) tool that they sponsored and we used that, using the goal statements out of our planning documents, and objectives as the starting point to score projects. He said that as we are working through the transportation plan update it seemed like the logical starting point to make sure that projects that we have on the list at least address one or more of the goal statements and objectives we have in the document. He added that while that is the starting point, we have more that needs to be involved in this process, but it is a starting point.

Haugen commented that, as we go through this, some of the questions we have is how we incorporation performance targets; at some point we have to include a section in this Long Range Transportation Plan that says these are the projects that we are planning on doing, here is how, project helps us achieve those targets but at some point we have to say collectively we anticipate how projects help us achieve or progress towards those targets so some of the information we have in the Universe List of Projects may not give us the information that allows us to achieve those targets, some of that information is yet to be developed, so we still have a deadline coming up so the tool is a work in progress and they are trying to come up with the criteria needed to help us differentiate projects. He added that we do have more project costs than revenue that we can start identifying in some documented fashion, so that projects that we are putting in the fiscally constrained are projects that help us achieve the performance that we are stating we are trying to achieve.

Karlsson referred to the tool and went over it briefly. She pointed out that the Introduction Tap of the prioritization tool. She explained that what it ultimately does is list all of the projects that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

we were looking in the meeting today at the list of projects by funding program area. She said that this introduction tab includes each of the goal areas in the transportation plan, so Goals 1 through 10, and then assigns a weighting to the significance of each goal area, and as Mr. Haugen said, the weighting that they have included so far came from that T.I.P. prioritization tool that you have. She stated that for Goals 1-8; Economic Vitality, Security, Accessibility and Mobility, Environment/Energy/Quality of Life, Integration and Connectivity, Efficient System Management, System Preservation, and Safety they took the weightings that are in that prioritization tool that you have, the TELUS tool, and added Goals 9-10; Resiliency and Reliability and Tourism. She explained that the weighting they assigned to those two goals are half of what is in the TELUS prioritization tool, half what you had identified for local plans, so in that category they had five points out of a hundred assigned to local priority and they took those five points and divided them evenly to Goal 9 Resiliency and Reliability and Goal 10 Tourism.

Karlsson commented that, going from highest percent or share of the point goals to lowest percent or share of the point goals they rank as follows: Goal 3 – Accessibility and Mobility – 15 Points; Goal 5 – Integration and Connectivity – 15 Points; Goal 7 – System Preservation – 15 Points; and Goal 8 – Safety – 15 Points.

Karlsson reported that, going back, in terms of incorporating and responding to performance targets, what she sees is that with this weighting that we currently presented you have placed the highest emphasis on those goal areas that encompass the Federally required performance measures as listed above.

Haugen asked if for the Integration and Accessibility, are those tied to the travel time liability performance targets. Karlsson responded that travel time reliability and freight reliability are tied to the travel time liability performance targets.

Karlsson said that the next tier of goals by significance are those that they've assigned 10 points to and those are: Goal 1 – Economic Vitality – 10 Points; Goal 4 – Environment/Energy/Quality of Life; and Goal 6 – Efficient System Management.

Karlsson said that the third tier of goals by significance are those that they've assigned points to is: Goal 2 – Security – 5 Points.

Karlsson said that the fourth tier of goals by significance are those that they've assigned 2.5 points to are: Goal 9 – Resiliency and Reliability – 2.5 Points and Goal 10 – Tourism – 2.5 Points.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and commented that there are two tabs provided for reference only, and they are the 2019-2022 T.I.P. and then the existing/committed network projects; and, again, those projects don't need to be scored and don't need to be prioritized because that work has already been done through the T.I.P. project selection process, but they wanted to make sure you had access to those lists of projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Karlsson said that what they then want to make sure they do is to create an opportunity for you to identify the project priorities within fiscal constraint; really helping us identify those projects that need to be in the fiscally constrained plan versus those that would be in an additional revenue scenario.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and went over it briefly. Haugen commented that this is the Universe List of Projects that was distributed early, discussed this morning, updated, and hopefully will have its last review and correction soon; so that is the first columns of this tool, and then instead of having it all on one sheet they have separated it by tab or sheet for individual programs. Karlsson added that they divided them into four buckets: Safety and Operations, Multi-modal (or the Main Street Program), Discretionary, and State of Good Repair, so those are the four buckets that they have assigned the projects that need to be prioritized into.

Bourdon commented that they are separated that way, ultimately because as they go through and rank the projects, because the color of money is different, we need to have them segregated so we can say - okay, by agency or program there are this many projects that are available, there are 20 that are on the Universe of Projects list that could get funded in that category, and once we rank them in order we can draw a line so, hypothetically, if there is in one bucket \$20 million dollars of need and there is only \$10 million dollars available we have projects prioritized for that \$10 million dollars already prioritized.

Haugen stated that we still have individual funding programs within these tabs; so like state of good repair we have all the separate funding programs: Interstate versus Regional, versus City Subtarget, versus Urban Local, etc., but part of it is the project description that describes them as pavement preservation versus discretionary which are more capacity and activity issues; multi-modal or Main Street are very specific programs, just on the North Dakota side, and then the Safety projects are very specific to just individual stand-alone safety projects.

Bourdon commented that that is a great further breakdown, so they will have things broken down by category to help us get our heads around stuff and get things into some larger logical silos; and then with each of the tabs there's yet other silos as to what drives that project or what is driven by a certain funding source so there will be a variety of breakdowns based on where the funding can be applied in the program.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and opened the State of Good Repair tab and explained that within that tab we have funding source, and that tells you the eligible funding programs for each project; and there are sub-pots within these the bigger pots. Bourdon added that they also have a breakdown of whether or not it is on the NHS system, a little project description to give you a better idea of what the project entails, and so all those different things help us get a better characterization of the project. He commented that there is also a current cost and then there is inflation applied to that cost based on what timeband is selected, so when we say that a timeframe is a short, mid, or long-range that helps us get an idea of what that cost will end up being. He stated that all that information is part of the piece to the left that helps them rank and go through this fiscal constraint exercise.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Karlsson said that for each timeband they have assumed that projects are inflated to the mid-year of that timeband, so all short-term projects have been assigned the mid-range of the 2023 to 2027 timeframe; and this is true for mid-term and long-term projects as well.

Kuharenko said that we are pretty much going to be filling how it is going for every single project in the Universe Of Projects list, is that what you are looking for. Haugen responded that that isn't what they are looking for. He added that he believes that they will populate these yes or no, and you will review their work and are certainly welcome to score each individual program project yourself, but in the past this has been sort of how they've done the past several Transportation Planning updates, it's what the staff and the consultants have done to then show you how our results are, and then you can gauge if you think what they did is reasonable, if the results are coming as something that you think would be similar to if you did them yourself, and then if there are some projects or a period where there is discussion we will discuss the ranking.

Noehre commented that some of these probably don't need scoring if they go together; for example wouldn't need a score a short Interstate segment because once the larger segment is selected and prioritized that short segment has to go. No need to prioritize it further down the list. Haugen responded that he thinks they will want to show that at least one of the goals is met with that project, and it will be an individual listing because it happens at a different time, maybe it doesn't even happen in the same timeband, but we want to show that at least it meets the preservation goals, so then we can say that all the projects in our plan are at least meeting the goals that are listed in the plan. He added that it might get a score of maybe just a 1, but it's a different level of prioritization; the first cut is what we are trying to do with this. Noehre said that he doesn't have an issue with that, good excellent; can't use that score and then shuffling the list. Bourdon responded that in your plan you've got a set order on the pavement projects, and you're doing it in a specific way to preserve the pavement so it doesn't make any sense to do a mill and overlay before the chip seal and the order of your plan right now is to do them in a certain order, correct. Noehre responded that that is correct, but he was thinking more that it doesn't make sense, and they wouldn't allow doing an overlay and then do a chip seal six years later because that is the way it came out in the tool. Bourdon agreed, adding that pavement management is always very specific based on where you are in your life cycle and where you are in your program, so he understands what you are saying. Karlsson stated that she thinks what she is hearing is that we will want to make sure that we group those projects together, that they are a package of projects even though they may be over multiple construction years. Noehre commented that that is just one example; another example is the interstate construction prioritization numbers that we come up to in the tools say that they probably need to be 25 years apart, and that isn't going to be acceptable, they have to be somewhere around 15 years apart, so you either have to just say they are 15 years apart or work the tool so that it works out that way. Bourdon said that the biggest question becomes, okay the funding has to line up to allow that to happen, if the funding lines up to allow everything to happen in the right order that's great, but if your showing \$30 million dollars in project and \$10 million dollars of funding that isn't possible, so he thinks that you guys going back and talking about the funding will help tie that together. He added that the engineering side of him says we don't go in and flip the order and timing of all your stuff cause that is part of pavement management, it is pretty prescribed, and that is kind of what has to happen or you mess with your whole life cycle and cost of pavement.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Karlsson said that if you can help them by telling them which projects need to be grouped together, and what that timeframe is that is non-negotiable between those projects, that can help them make sure that they include them as a mini-program within the plan and make sure that we can draw the line, as best they can under fiscal constraint, to say that this group of projects can be funded, whereas this group of projects would fall out of fiscal constraint. Bourdon responded that he thinks it makes sense if the DOT comes back and says they don't have enough money for our list of projects, so the biggest issue is to help us sort out the funding; and then if that gets sorted out then some of this should logically fall into place based on the information you provided. Noehre said that this helps, but how he looks at this is that the spreadsheet that we put together, that is the list, and that is what he is going to do everything in is power to ensure it gets funded. Bourdon agreed. Karlsson stated that what they will do is to make sure that they check that either all of the project falls under funded, or all of the elements of that project fall under unfunded.

Karlsson referred to the Discretionary Tab and explained how they scored these projects. She said that along the top they list each goal area and what the goal statement is, and then they also list each of the objectives, and they do that for each of the ten goal areas. She stated that at this point, as they went through and scored this, they said that a project either achieves the goal or it doesn't, it is very much a yes or no. She added that they have not gone through and said that this project achieved this goal area better than this other projects as the feel that with the number of projects there are to score that the level of specificity is not helpful.

Karlsson continued, explaining that, again, they go through that binary exercise to determine that it either achieves the goal or it doesn't achieve the goal, or advances the goal or doesn't advance the goal and then they apply that to the weighting, and we end of with the total number of goal areas met, and then the total points received.

Bourdon referred to the spreadsheet and gave a demonstration on how the tool works.

Haugen explained that, just to describe the project Mr. Bourdon is using for the demonstration, it is an East Grand Forks project. He said that if you were driving up from the Murray Bridge and look straight ahead, that is 2nd Avenue, and it currently does not intersect with U.S. #2, so this project description would be making a road connection between what is 10th Street, by Burger King in East Grand Forks, east. He said that that 2nd Avenue intersection would involve putting in a new roadway and a new connection to U.S. #2 that connects to an existing right-in/right-out left turn in to the northside at that area over by Subway on Gateway Drive.

Grasser asked how this fits with the state of good repair, or is this non-federal funding. Haugen responded that from a fiscal constraint point of view, we want to do the fiscal constraint first on the state of good repair, and in some categories we will have some dollars left on the table, so then this discretionary ranking will help to identify projects that we are showing all of our state of good repair needs in that program are met and we have dollars available for discretionary, so this ranking will give us a starting point on how to prioritize those projects in the discretionary list that are eligible for that program's funds. He added that in East Grand Forks we just saw that we probably don't have fiscal dollars left based on the initial run of fiscal constraint so this discretionary list then becomes, if they want to go after outside funding sources, some of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

State competitive funding sources or national funding sources, to give some sense of the priority or higher value project in the metropolitan point of view to seek funding for it.

Grasser said that where he was going with the question is are we missing a goal area that breaks a project that has state of good repair with a project that doesn't have state of good repair as part of its project; in other words it is kind of outside the normal funding prioritization or desire, as he understands the highway bill, so he is wondering if there needs to almost be another goal like meeting current FAST ACT or something like that. Karlsson responded that that is a great question, and as an example if this project met safety, system preservation, efficiency, and access and mobility, if it met all four of those criteria it would score higher than a project that didn't meet those criteria; so that is how the prioritization tool would work, it would give higher points, or more weight to those projects that meet multiple goal areas as opposed to just one. Grasser commented that to him a new project that is extending into an area that is providing ADA ramps, bike paths, mobility, all of them, they are always going to score higher than a mill and overlay type of project; and in his mind a mill and overlay project doesn't do a whole lot to enhance safety and stuff with it; so, again it is going to depend on how you are going to define all of these things that you are talking about, but to him if you are providing bike and ped safety in an area that it currently doesn't exist, that would have to rank that project very high versus a mill and overlay project in an area in which you are already covering your bike and ped issues, so from a raw number standpoint it seems like you are going to come up with the wrong project list.

Karlsson explained that, going back to what Mr. Haugen said earlier, think of this as a two step process; the first step is just maintaining the state of good repair of your system, and in looking at which project can we afford that just maintains the state of good repair. Haugen pointed out that the scoring on the state of good repair tab is separate from the scoring, it is the same scoring system, but the totals and everything else are on separate tabs. Grasser said then, that this is ranking on different tabs and won't be competing directly with other projects, now it makes sense to him.

Bourdon continued with the demonstration.

Karlsson reported that they think that the results shown are reflective of the importance of your local asset management plans. She reiterated that, as Mr. Haugen discussed earlier that the Minnesota side has an asset management plan where they've been able to go through and really figure out what their priority of projects need to be based on many of the things that we talked about before; which projects need to be grouped together and that they absolutely be done separately; which projects need to be a priority, maybe not because of their functional class but because of the level of deterioration; and of course an MPO plan is not intended to get into that level of detail, in terms of asset management and here we are today, we have scored some of these projects and there isn't a lot of differentiation between them in terms of state of good repair; so they are looking for input on how we draw that line of what is in the fiscally constrained plan versus not in the fiscally constrained plan, particularly for the state of good repair projects.

Haugen said that if you look at what is on the screen right now, it is the Interstate projects the NDDOT submitted; and from this scoring tool, as we currently have it, all of the interstate

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

projects are going to ranked exactly the same so what is the next level of prioritization; if we can't find additional funds to fund all of these, obviously we have to identify which ones will be in the fiscally constrained list. He added that right now they are all ranking/scoring the same so we have to look at the next level, and what should that next level be, that is sort of the spark that they are trying to ignite, and as you look at this how do we make that next level cut, what type of tools do we want to use. He said that this is assuming, again, that we don't have the finances to fund all of them. Bourdon commented that we can't, on some projects, just say that well this happens to work dollar wise so we will put the chip seal after the mill and overlay when obviously it isn't set up that way and it won't work based on the plan.

Noehre asked if the projects shown on the screen are all in the same timeband, currently. Bourdon responded that there is one long-range, and three short-range, so you're right. He asked what he has heard that someone has said it is okay that if you didn't have enough money you do your short ranges before your long ranges, and your long ranges drop out. Haugen said you can extend the timeband.

Noehre commented that the next part would be the pavements; two things we can look at would be age, meaning being longer in the timebands, years, and so those years they can still stay in the timebands but the actual year would a lot longer than the other.

Karlsson stated that what she is hearing is that if we can't fund all of the short term projects and the short-term timebands, that those projects that are assigned to near fiscal year, we would be the top priority in the mid-time band, is that fair. Noehre responded it was. Bourdon commented that within that it looks like you might have some further breakdowns based on year of implementation. Noehre responded that that would be one, and then after you use just years, but in reality once it gets closer you actually use more criteria like condition, cost, and how to reshuffle them, they would still be in the same band, probably, you just have to shuffle them first. He added that it is most critical in the short-term. Bourdon he thinks what is going to be important is to draw bringing those lines of funding with an initial fiscal constraint, as it gets more into the details of asset pavement management we will want look for some data as to how that would go rather than having us on the plane again to decipher all of your plan that somebody is a lot more involved in developing.

Noehre commented that North Dakota does have a pavement management asset plan, the District certainly does and then the Division that works on it in Bismarck does it for the whole State as well. He said that what they are not doing that others are doing is fiscally constraining them out farther in the S.T.I.P., and also incorporating other assets into it other than just pavement, so it isn't like they don't have a pavement asset management plan, they aren't reporting it to the detail that some others are.

Haugen said, again, this is the tool that we are starting from, and we have a lot of work to do before we get to that fiscally constrained recommended plan. He added that there are some additional steps and additional analysis, but this hopefully will allow to sort through to get us to the next stage. He stated that the next stage to him is what is fiscally constrained as far as where the road lines end up with in this, and then often the discretionary one works with discretionary projects that provide where we can focus on which ones really ought to move on that we can

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

have in our back pocket if we get to that level, but we don't spend a lot of resources and energy on projects that are so low on the initial stream or the second stream.

Noehre said that he has a question on that, to follow up on Mr. Grasser's question; in that, is there an opportunity in this to managerially adjust those state of good repair and discretionary projects; like, for example the project that was up for East Grand Forks, although he isn't entirely familiar with East Grand Forks roadways, but say that after the state of good repair there are no dollars left for discretionary, but what if that particular project is truly important to the MPO or the City, is there a way to override these numbers and say that, no that's actually going to take priority over the state of good repair projects. Haugen responded that the challenge there, of course, is we have to show that we are able to maintain the existing system before we start overspending resources outside and adding to the system. He added that there is a difference between both States; Minnesota's got a very strong, their going to have that stance and then create the statewide competitive projects to address those other ways of other things like the 2nd Avenue NE extension, but he thinks, on that particular project, you all know we are starting the 220 North Study, one of the key intersections on 220 North is Gateway Drive/Central Avenue, it is congested and has a high crash rate. He said that some of their early analysis is kind of suggesting that this extended roadway will take the traffic away from that intersection and so we don't have to do a grade separation in order to make it safe and a parallel roadway might solve and not have to do a massive project on state highway, so even though our first cut is trying to maintain what exists, and keep it in good condition, there is still an opportunity to meld the two together to make sense as far as what should really happen in a certain year.

Noehre commented that there is opportunity to share dollars from one to the other, is really what he is asking too; for example, reconstruction can be a state of good repair, but you can also patch it together for another extra so many years and use those dollars somewhere else.

Karlsson stated that she thinks that that is a really important policy discussion that needs to be had. She said that she has helped with the Statewide plan here in the State of Minnesota, as well as the MPO plans, and that has really been the point of the Statewide Plan to figure out where the thresholds are for those policy decisions, of, like you were saying, where there is a regionally significant important project, because it is so significant to economic competitiveness that it has to be right up there in importance in funding priority, with state of good repair projects, so she thinks that that is a fantastic question. She added that it is absolutely it is a policy discussion that needs to be had.

Williams said, so, if we did find that, using Washington Street as an example, we were going to have to do something out of order, would that mean that we would make findings based on that and then to a Long Range Transportation Amendment; to move those would it require we do that or is there enough lead way just to leave it the way it is. Haugen responded that the general guidance would be if there is a significant change in the scope of work and a significant change in the dollar values, and a difference in the timeband would trigger an amendment. Karlsson said that she would add funding source to that as well. She explained that if, for example a project would receive competitive funding and its not in your fiscally constrained plan then it would need to be amended into the plan with that new funding source.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Grasser when you talk about a policy decision, a policy decision to be made by whom, or what group. Haugen responded that it would be the MPO Executive Policy Board. Grasser said that an example of one that he has been struggling with; we talked earlier about the fact,; we will probably see all of our federal dollars allocated on the NHS system, there should be not much left for anything else, but it does appear there might be a few dollars left, and one of the projects that he had in his mind would be, or would have been 48th Street out in the Industrial Park, that road is in really tough shape; yes you can always use some sort maintenance on it but at some point in time those roads get to be so poor that he thinks your investment just becomes poor, we can't just keep doing mill and overlays, and doing short-term fixes and doing shorter and shorter-term fixes and think we are going to build our way out of it; at some point we need to reconstruct to get that longer-term life back into that system, that's his theory and perception. He stated that the question he is getting to is, then, we kind of left it off that priority list, because we felt that maybe reconstruction wasn't meeting the definition of state of good repair, quite frankly he doesn't see that anything short of reconstruction is the best thing to do out there, so what he is hearing today is there may be a way of getting that in under the state of good repair definition, although he is a little unsure how, but if we could figure out how to get it under the state of good repair, then to him that would be one road that he would try to rank into some timeband as a priority. Haugen commented that he thinks reconstruction is a state of good repair project. He added that the NDDOT has several listed in their state of good repair. Grasser asked if that would be the case even if they are going to widen the pavement. Haugen responded that when we get to reconstruction then our guidance has been that they address all of those issues that are in that segment of roadway, so a mill and overlay you are able to just touch the pavement curb to curb; but when we do a reconstruction we are looking at the right-of-way to right-of-way and addressing what needs to be addressed in that right-of-way.

Grasser stated that another example, and again they struggled with extending South Washington beyond where it ends today out to 55th, or even to 62nd Avenue South. He said that if they reconstructed that they would probably put in four lanes, so does that still meet the definition of state of good repair, or would we be pushing that boundary to far. Haugen responded that he thinks that is pushing it down to the urbanization category because you're not reconstructing you're urbanizing, so that is not state of good repair.

Grasser said, going back to the definition; Mr. Noehre hit some good points on ranking projects, and he thinks that when we get into the urban system too, again, somehow you have to massage these within the numbers and categories that we currently have because they aren't separate categories; and he isn't necessarily criticizing, but to him on the urban side we are prioritizing based on, a lot of it has to be how many people are driving that road, what is the ranking of that road, so NHS, and ours ranks the highest, and it seems to him the best intent in the highest volumes, and so, again, as part of a priority ranking they would tend to adjust that into the traffic volume or ranking system into that prioritization, and again, as Mr. Noehre said, maybe by year, but the flip side to that is that we didn't identify our collector because there isn't any way to do it. He stated that he is trying to suggest ways that we would prioritize those.

Grasser commented that, skipping ahead to a little bit different subject, and he is debating in his own mind; but we are still using terms like major/minor arterial, but in his mind he isn't sure that minor arterial is necessary a term that has a lot of value at this point in time. He added that it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

seems to him we are either NHS or we are arterial streets, and he isn't sure that us trying to split the hair; we had that discussion internally, what is minor arterial, what is major arterial, is a minor arterial just waiting to become a major arterial; the difference between minor arterial and major arterial in our minds is getting very hard to differentiate, and now with the new FAST ACT, with the NHS, that to him almost substitutes the major arterial class. Haugen commented that we have minor arterials, principle arterials, are you thinking minor collectors and major collectors. Grasser responded that that isn't what he is thinking; he said that he is thinking that we have simply an NHS System, and we have an arterial system, and then we have our collector system; and he isn't sure he can always differentiate between NHS, Principle, and Minor; to him it's NHS or its maybe Non-NHS, arterials and collectors. Haugen commented that all principles are on the NHS system. Karlsson added that as Mr. Grasser said, they are two separate system; functional classification system, Federal Highway requires that we have it and that every jurisdiction has it, so that is a point of references and sort of a nomenclature that Mr. Haugen and herself are comfortable with, but he knows that a lot of engineers aren't comfortable with the functional classification system.

Karlsson stated that, as Mr. Haugen said, NHS, you can substitute that word in our mind for the principle arterial system, and then as you said the remaining arterials happen to be called minor arterials in that functional classification system. Grasser commented that what he was eventually working his way toward, and he's not sure from a point allocation standpoint, he previously said they should do it by capacity and classification, but he isn't sure he would rank a minor arterial versus a principle arterial that is not NHS much differently from one another when you get into the allocating of points, to him they are very very similar. Haugen stated that he is fairly certain that we have no principle arterials not designated NHS. He added that, for our Minnesota friends, we do have a minor collector system and a major collector system, but we don't have it in North Dakota yet.

Kuharenko commented that, and this kind of goes back to what we have for the ranking; but he sees that what you have on the screen right now is four different sub-categories, and he is guessing that this is one area where it was either all points or no points were awarded and all you needed to do was to get just one of the four sub-categories. He asked, in trying to differentiate these projects out a little better, especially because we have so many of them, would it be beneficial to maybe say if Goal 1 is worth so many points, and you have four sub-categories, that Goal 1 is worth 10 points, and again you have four sub-categories, so each of those sub-categories is actually worth 2 ½ points, that way if you have a project that hits all four of those sub-categories within that goal it is worth all 10 points and you might be able to differentiate more instead of having a whole bunch of projects that are worth 10 points, 30 points, etc., and that is the first point he'd like to make.

Kuharenko said that the second point he'd like to make, because he knows we've got state of good repair and we've got our discretionary projects; and he knows that once we get down to kind of the City only funded projects, they have been trying to split those out based on how fast is the City expanding and how quickly are we developing; and so are we going to end up almost overriding some of the expansion within the City with state of good repair projects, and essentially saying that potentially all the money is scored, or a majority of it is going towards

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

state of good repair and not necessarily, and almost dictating to the plan as to what we should be doing instead of basing it off of anticipated growth.

Bourdon commented that it is finding the balance of letting roads deteriorate a lot versus expanding the system. Kuharenko responded that growing as the City has been. Karlsson said that she thinks, again going back to that sort of policy discussion that we are talking about here; just remember that we did go out for public comment on what the priorities, what the policy priorities are and the two top priority policies that we heard were: 1) state of good repair and tied with that was new river crossings. She added that expansion fell far below state of good repair, and that can be overturned, but you also need to acknowledge that that is what you heard from the public.

Haugen summarized that he thinks we've accomplished what we tried to do today; we introduced this tool to start discussing the fiscal constraint. He stated that our next step is to distribute out this tool, and the first thing we would ask you to do is to look at the list of projects in your jurisdiction and make sure you are comfortable with it. He said that it is missing some cells on some of them, not many, but let's try to populate those cells.

Haugen commented that he thinks that with that we may have all projects scored at initial, or we might send out what we just saw right now to everyone, projects and those cells populated as best we can before we can score all of them; that is what he thinks our next step is.

Bourdon stated that in terms of all the ranking of sub-categories he thinks we will start out kind of doing the digital one or zero on some of them and see how it shakes out initially because honestly, when it gets into every sub-category we are going to likely need some help, and those really close to the projects are going to be able to fill some of them in more; you might see that based on the initial look there are certain areas where we will focus more of that versus others, so he thinks an initial look will help us kind of figure out where to put emphasis rather than putting a bunch of emphasis initially where it might not make much of a difference.

Noehre asked if there was a column then to indicate priority one, two, three, etc.; is there some place to enter that information in on the spreadsheet. Haugen responded that at the end of the scoring it will show that information, it isn't there yet, but we do have a column at the end of the Universe list of projects, there is a column that has notes, and they would ask that if you wanted to add a note on the project or highlight something that would help them with the scoring or the ranking that you would put it here.

Bourdon referred to the Interstate projects on the Universe of Project List and gave an overview on how the tool, and specifically how the note column will work for the ranking of the projects. Haugen requested that the note column be located at the far right of the spreadsheet columns so that after all the scoring is done there will be another opportunity to add footnotes. Bourdon responded that they will add one to the far right, after the number of goals met and points received, and that would be around Column CH. Noehre commented that he understands about bringing in the notes but it is a spreadsheet so he was envisioning another column there so you could keep the chip seal with the overlay because bringing in the notes, those can get lost.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, July 27th, 2018**

Discussion on project scoring methods ensued.

Haugen said that he would like to send out this spreadsheet as you see it today so that those Universe List of Projects can be finalized and then maybe next week we can redistribute it with all of the scoring in place. Bourdon stated that they will need input back relatively soon so that they can eventually continue to meet the schedule for this plan.

Haugen commented that, just so everyone is aware, those tabs on HSIP and Multi-modal or Mainstreet, we are not going to score those yet, they are still working on them. He added that part of the HSIP, his thought last night was, there might be some discretionary projects that are really addressing the safety issue so could be included as and HSIP project, so he will do a review of all the discretionary projects and try to identify if there are any candidates for HSIP funds. He said that the challenge there is, like on the Minnesota side, 70% of the HSIP dollars basically go to the systematic corrections and not the dark spot corrections so most of the discretionary projects could be in another spot or high crash locations, so the money doesn't correspond and it's hard to try to show some of the profits.

Bourdon stated that they will send this out shortly with the notes column and any quick final tweaks, and will work with Mr. Haugen so that next week they can send out ranked state of good repair and discretionary projects as the mainstreet or multi-modal and safety is sorted out. He said that once that gets sent out they would ask that people try to get together as a group among agencies, as needed, to review this and get back to them in a week or so because just getting the project list has taken a lot of time and they are getting to the point where they are going to have a rough time getting the draft report out by the needed timeframe in order to get it reviewed and approved. He added that they are planning to hold a public open house in August, so ideally you are presenting a lot of what people will see in the draft, so he asks for everyone's cooperation, and he knows it is challenging with the variety of things going on with construction and such, but any effort you can make to sit down and get this information to them would be appreciated.

Haugen reminded everyone that we are delaying our August Technical Advisory Committee meeting from August 8th to August 15th.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 27TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 10:52 A.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the August 15th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:31 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Ryan Riesinger, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn and Scott Mereck, WSB.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Kuharenko pointed out that the Downtown Plan Consultant is shown in the minutes as RBG Consulting but should be RDG Consulting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JULY 11TH, 2018,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE
DOWNTOWN ACTION PLAN CONSULTANT BEING CORRECTLY IDENTIFIED AS
RDG INSTEAD OF RBG.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF 2019-2022 FINAL DRAFT T.I.P.

Public Hearing

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a draft document and a public notice identifying that today would be the day for the public to appear in person to give public input as well as for anyone wishing to submit written comments to do so by 11:00 a.m. today. He stated that seeing that there is no one present for such input, he would like to open and close the public hearing. He added that there were no written comments received by 11:00 a.m. today either.

Committee Discussion

Haugen commented that there have been some changes made between the release of the document that is currently being reviewed and commented on by the public versus the one that we are asking for action on today. He added that those changes were not significant enough to cause us to have to re-advertise and delay action.

Haugen referred to the document included in the packet and went over the changes.

Haugen said that the first change is on the North Dakota Project List, Project #1 City Bus Operations. He pointed out that there has been a slight revision in the cost of what the federal share originally was anticipated to be, a drop of about \$50 thousand dollars, as well as a reduction in the State contribution and the Local Share contribution as well. He stated that the new total Operations is \$2.9 million dollars, and he believes that the one in the document was \$3 something million dollars; so there was a decrease in the total cost of the project, and based on this number, which incorporates the new system service that started operating this July, so 2019 will be the first full year of that operation; added service routes, added service hours, added service days; so this dollar amount affected the second, third and fourth year of this project listing in those subsequent years and the were revised similarly to how this one was revised.

Haugen stated that the second change deals with the Highway Safety Improvement Program. He said that in the draft packet there was a HSIP project, Project #10, that's for backplates and traffic signal pedestrian timing, that we have carried for two years as a separate project in our T.I.P.; when the Draft S.T.I.P. came out there was some differences in project description and funding so what occurred was that the City of Grand Forks and the group in Bismarck reached an agreement to consolidate all of these projects into one project listing. He added that because of some of them being on the State system versus some on the Local system the funding splits changed but the S.T.I.P. listing is based off of the summation of all of those individual projects

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

for a cost of \$399,000. He pointed out that they eliminated one project and incorporated into one project that is for the red light confirmation lights on Gateway Drive which has been in the T.I.P. as a separate project for a couple of years, so now you see a bigger project description and a dollar value of \$399,000 with a funding split of 90% Federal and the Local is around 9% or 11%, but in any event it isn't 90/10/10 as there is more local dollars funding it.

Haugen said that for the project listings those are the changes. He added that because of the changes in the Grand Forks City Area Transit funding, in Table 3 and Table 4 there were also some slight changes. He pointed out that it used to say \$78 million dollars total, but it is now showing \$75 million dollars on the North Dakota side. He commented that each individual year slightly decreased primarily because of transit operations.

Haugen reported that the last change occurs in our Annual Listing of Obligations and Project Status. He said that the draft document that was out for public review did not have any transit dollars identified in it and we have since gotten that information.

Haugen summarized that those changes are the ones that have been brought to staff's attention. He asked if anyone had any other changes or comments on the draft document. There were none. Haugen said that since there were no other comments or changes staff is recommending approval.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2019-2022 FINAL DRAFT T.I.P. SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Bail, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Emery, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF PROJECT SOLICITATION FOR THE 2019-2020 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that we are coming to the end of our last two-year work program and are beginning to work on the next two-year work program. He pointed out that the staff report identified that we expect to have roughly \$300,000 available in 2019 and 2020, above and beyond our normal activities that we have to do.

Haugen stated that for the 2019 funding, half of that has already been obligated for some things that we are carrying forward from the start of 2018. He added that the one thing that we haven't started yet, but is already plugged into 2019 is updating our ITS Plan and Regional Architecture.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen said that we are now soliciting our member agencies for work activity suggestions for both 2019 and 2020, and we ask that you go through your governing bodies for their consensus for your activities. He added that at the end of 2019 we will revisit what we identify in 2020 to make sure the projects are still desired and/or warranted or that there aren't any new projects you would rather see programmed.

Haugen stated that this is the formal start for project solicitation and we would like to have your suggestions by the end of September. He added that as you are working on ideas, try to make sure the projects are eligible before we get too far down the road with them; and keep in mind that North Dakota Federal Highway has done a reversal of their policy on not allowing MPOs to do pavement management, so again just double check with MPO staff to make sure that things are eligible, and if there is a question about eligibility we can run it through the process in a timely fashion before we are under our deadline.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Universe Of Projects

Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn, was present for a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Bourdon went over where we are at in the study process, pointing out that a public meeting has been tentatively scheduled for September 12th, but they are still working on that and don't have all the details ironed out, such as location, etc..

Bourdon commented that as a part of that meeting they are really trying to finalize things that they can in terms of the project list and ratings/rankings, which was distributed for various agency input and also just trying to do the forecasts so they can go to the public, and this is their last major public meeting, with information to share regarding thoughts on projects being selected based on the funding and having an idea of where we are sitting from a fiscally constrained standpoint, and that is pretty pivotal in terms of the overall schedule to be able to get a draft done here in September so that we can get all the approvals that are necessary for us to complete the final product.

Bourdon gave a brief overview of the goals, objectives, performance measures and targets update process; stating that he would try not to focus on those things that we have talked about multiple times.

Bourdon commented that we certainly had discussion in late 2017 regarding a variety of targets and goal areas, and in February of 2018 we finalized the goals and objectives and strategy

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

statements. He said that we also reviewed safety targets and the policy board adopted them at their February meeting.

Bourdon stated that in July we talked about draft pavement and bridge related targets and now we are going to talk more about travel time and reliability targets.

Bourdon commented that mobility measures are really the foundation of PM3, and there are three of them; interstate truck travel time reliability which focuses on an index, interstate travel reliability which looks at the percent of person miles traveled on the interstate that are reliable, and non-interstate travel reliability which focuses on non-interstate NHS and their reliability.

Haugen referred to the presentation and explained that, again, as with all targets we have options to adopt but in the case of PM3 that would mean that we would have a maximum of six targets, and even though we don't have interstate on the Minnesota side when we adopt the state targets we are adopting in Minnesota are all of the targets, or we can go with just targets for the MPO, or a combination of MPO and State targets.

Haugen referred to a Mobility Measures and Targets slide and explained that where North Dakota and Minnesota are with their targets, sort of leading into a recommendation from the staff, is that we would adopt state targets specific to the North Dakota side and not adopt state targets that Minnesota doesn't have in our MPO area, so that is why we have for Minnesota a couple cells that identify that they aren't applicable, and although Minnesota obviously does have targets they just aren't applicable.

Haugen went over the table information briefly, pointing out that the information at the far right is what the values are out of the MAP-21 tool, and what they are showing for us. He stated that, as you will recall, we had discussions about a data change from 2017 to 2018, so we are showing you the values from both those years and obviously 2018 is to-date, not the full calendar year. He pointed out that the MPO value is different than what the North Dakota and Minnesota values are. He said that the data comes from the tool and was reported in two ways; the first is just a global graphic showing that if we asked the data to show us a 90% achievement how many months does the tool report that we achieved 90% reliability on our non-interstate NHS system. He pointed out that you can see that at 90% in 2017 there was only one month that it was met but overall there is an 89.2% reliability; and the 2018 data, which most would say is better data, shows us at an 85.5% to-date, and again none of the current months were at the 90% level.

Haugen stated that the next slide is a map. He explained that the first one is just aggregate numbers, the second one shows it by segments and you can see they used colors to explain, and as with most maps green is better and red is worse. He commented that if you really zoomed in at some of our intersections you would see where we start getting into the oranges and reds, but for the most part we are at yellow, which are right around a 1.5ish area of reliability.

Haugen referred to the map and pointed out that he did highlight the worst segment that they had identified so far in 2018; North Columbia Road, and they do have it split by direction, so the southbound from Gateway Drive is at 1.9. Williams asked how they got the counts for that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen responded that it is all from the National Highway Performance Data Input that each State DOT is required to do on an annual basis, so the ADTs come from that data source, and then the actual travel reliability is Probe Vehicle Data, which is a national contractor that has parameters in which they have to drive these corridors on a certain basis. He stated that the Interstate is done at a higher frequency than say North Columbia Road would be done. He summarized that it is done using annual reporting from each State into a data base and then a contractor with their Probe Vehicles driving the networks. Williams said that she finds that very unusual because there is no stop sign or anything there that would impede any of the travel, so she is wondering if the count was right. She added that she did find some problems with some of the counts in places, but that just seems awfully odd. Haugen commented that he doesn't know if there is any work being done there that may have been the impediment that caused these counts because work zones will show up in this data. Williams said that that was here next question, which is why their 2018 data looks like its low but she can't think of any roads that haven't been detoured practically this year. She added that she does have a very recent count from 10th and Columbia that was done by SRF, if that would be any help. Haugen responded that she can provide it to them as he doesn't think they have it unless they have it as part of the study that was done for the campus. Williams said that it may have been in that study, or it may not, but it does warrant a traffic signal.

Haugen said that for the Interstate truck travel time; just to refresh, the non-freight movements are expressed like a percentage of time, 90% of the time, 85% of the time is reliable. He added that the truck travel of freight is a different type of indices. He said that during your worst peak period how much more unreliability are you allowing the system to be, so the mid-point or average of 1.5 means that during a peak period of time 1 would mean travel is very reliable, and at 1.5 you are accepting that at certain times travel will be 50% worse.

Haugen commented that in our case, we are closer to not having a real difference in our peak travel reliabilities, or just the freight movement on the interstate system; and again this is just for truck travel reliability on I-29. He referred to a table and went over the information briefly.

Haugen stated that when we talk about PM2 and PM3, what we are asking you to consider, not necessarily for action today, but to start digesting that in both cases we have facilities that aren't included in the Minnesota infrastructure, so they are suggesting that the approach the MPO perhaps takes is in some cases adopt the States such as bridges, but when there is interstate pavement we can't adopt the State number because if we adopt the States we are saying that we are adopting both States then, so we will adopt a number that is equivalent to North Dakota's number. He added that the same would go for good condition, poor condition; non-interstate it would be the States. He said that for the PM3, again we don't have interstate on the Minnesota side, so we need to have a discussion that if our data shows that we have a very reliable system do we want to set a target that allows for the system to have less reliability than it currently has, and that is what adopting the State targets would imply for our MPO area.

Haugen commented that for the non-interstate system we are fairly close in the 2018 data with what North Dakota has for a target, slightly better, though we also have a very high construction year in 2018, so the data might actually be better than the 85.5 it is showing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen stated that the truck travel, North Dakota adopted a rather ultra-conservative in this number 3; and the State of Minnesota is at 1.5, hard data is showing right around 1.2. He added that the States around us, beside North Dakota and Minnesota, Kimley-Horn did some research, and they are all down below 1.5 for their truck travel. He asked Mr. Johnson if he had gotten any more information for us on why North Dakota went with 3. Johnson responded that he hadn't gotten any directly, and he needs to visit with them a little bit more but he did talk to them a couple times about it, and posed the questions you have, and the only response he has gotten he already shared with you and that was that they believe that the number that they are sitting at works for them and moving forward they are in a comfortable position.

Haugen reported that what the 3 really is representing is that we will allow our reliability for freight moving down the interstate to be 3 times worse than what it typically is; and whether that is a target that the MPO wants to identify as what we want our interstate system through the MPO area to have is what we have to determine.

Kuharenko commented that in looking at this, and for the percent of reliable person miles, you have 85% there, but previous slides were you going with 90% reliability. Haugen responded that the 90% is just the default of the reporting system; he took the easy route because he knew we haven't officially set a target yet, and 90% is the default of the system and he just wanted to get these tables out; but 85% is the real number we are using right now.

Haugen stated that on the PM3 there is no direct penalty clause as there are for safety and pavements and bridges.

Williams asked if this was a situation that once we adopt these that is it, there is no going back and forth between which State we are using or is it reviewed with every Long Range Transportation Plan Update. Haugen responded that each target, each PM has a different timeline, unfortunately; so safety is annual, pavement and bridge there is an opportunity after two years to make adjustments, but every four years regardless, and PM3 is also four year targets, but again there is an opportunity for adjustment after two years.

Bergman asked what is the reliability factor, what are they actually measuring when they say reliability. Haugen responded that a classic example is Gateway Drive; 90% of the time we can travel it without getting stopped by the mill railroad crossing, or the Glasston railroad crossing, but every once in a while you get stopped and your travel time and reliability is out the window because you've got a unit train that keeps you stopped for twenty minutes, so your travel time and reliability goes down considerably, so that is what reliability is trying to capture.

Bergman asked if signals cause unreliability? Haugen responded that we have signal coordination so a lot of times it isn't too much of a traffic signal issue, it can be but it isn't always. Bergman asked if traffic signals aren't put in for safety purposes. Haugen responded that that is one reason. Bergman stated that that is what he is trying to get at; we are coming up with these ridiculous targets over something that, we haven't even worried more about what our roads look like instead of other measures like we have been. He said that to him that would be more of a liability. Haugen commented that certainly road condition makes a road unreliable, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

that is factored in the reliability, but one of the public comments we get all the time is how can I be sure that I can leave five minutes before work and still be to work on time. Bergman said that he just doesn't get why they put in some ridiculous targets, it just doesn't make sense to him. Haugen commented that you also have to remember these are from a national perspective, so what might be 100% reliability on the interstate doesn't seem to mean a lot here in Grand Forks, but if you were in Chicago and you could say you had 100% reliability on the interstate system that would mean a lot more than it does here; so one size fits all is kind of what's being captured here. Bourdon added that he thinks that something else it is trying to do is to avoid maybe what is happening in other places or at least being conscious of it. He said that when he drives up here, coming from Minneapolis, it is pretty nice, and he thinks things are really reliable, but when you visit us you probably go a little crazy during the peak time because their reliability is really bad, so it is being conscious of how that reliability changed when we weren't necessarily aware of it 20 years ago and it keeps ticking away and then you have a mess and you're not going to fix it. He added that it is having some things and metrics at least monitor things and be conscious of what is happening, so some of this is macro and some of it is competing interests, for sure; you do one thing and add signal safety but it is also trying to get people out through an intersection and it can only process so many people that come to the intersection, it is a capacity issue.

Haugen commented that he thinks that we are to the point that next month we will be asking you to take action on PM2 and PM3, make a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board.

Financial Forecast

Mereck reported that he won't delve too deep into this as you have seen it several times. He stated that in the Spring they worked with all of the agencies in developing functions through interviews for the various funding sources; and in May and June they developed some draft revenue forecasts and are positioning for the public meeting in September to kind of roll out the final forecasts they will use for the plan.

Mereck stated that, putting this into context, if recall we have this big universe of all the different projects types; state of good repair, safety, multimodal, capacity expansion; so all of those different project types need to be assigned a funding source so these are basically funding silos; HSIP and Safety, Interstate, Urban and Regional and Urban and Local, Mainstreet is your multimodal streetscape and then you've got your local funding sources; County, DOT matches, so they came up with forecasts that they work with you on, and assumptions tied to each of these forecasts over the 20 year planning horizon, broken down by timeframe; short, mid, and long term.

Mereck commented that one thing he will point out with the interstate, they have had some dialogue with NDDOT recently, and through the uncertainty and discomfort with where they are currently at with the interstate forecast, they need to have further dialogue to kind of zone in on what that number should actually be, but he thinks that all the other numbers on the North Dakota side have been tentatively approved. Haugen added, if you recall our discussion is that the universe of projects has interstate projects that are considerably more than the \$10 million

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

that we have totally forecasted; and they were talking with the NDDOT on some guidance, and they are suggesting that the \$10 million is probably too small, and whatever that number was, say \$100 million, was too large, so there is a number in-between but they aren't sure what it is, so whatever you put in this document is how you will get to it.

Mereck stated that one thing to keep in mind with all of this, the big picture, is that we have in round numbers about \$900 million dollars of documented projects for all the different project types, and if you gather up all the different funding sources on both the Minnesota and North Dakota side we are roughly at \$415 million, so we have roughly about half of the funding identified for all the projects identified, and within that we still need to program within each of the funding pots so there will be just a fraction of the overall projects identified in the universe of lists that will ultimately make it into the constrained plan, and that is kind of the key thing that he knows Mr. Haugen is working with everyone on, to really rolling up your sleeves and helping them decide our priorities for all of those different project types and what is important to all the agencies and communities and what you would ultimately like to see in that constrained plan that will fit within these different funding silos.

Mereck commented that, just a mere shot again on the Minnesota side, there aren't quite as many funding pots, but the same concept of allocating projects to these different funding types; and he believes these numbers have been pretty much solidified.

Mereck stated that they also have operations and maintenance costs. He explained that these are numbers that he believes are not required in the plan, but we are ultimately gravitating towards at some point having these numbers also solidified in the plan, along with the capital costs.

Mereck said that they do have some data on the operations side for North Dakota, although there are some holes in the data that they are trying to fill; and similarly on the Minnesota side as well. Bourdon added that they took what the existing operations revenue was, and adjusted it to get into the federal aid system, so they weighted that up to come up with totals.

Haugen commented that the earlier slide says that this information is coming from the T.I.P. document, and some of you might recall that many years ago Federal Highway put their foot down on our T.I.P. document saying that we had to show our operations and maintenance costs, besides the projects that were listed in the T.I.P., so we worked with the Technical Advisory Committee and agencies and came up with this way of showing the ratio of the total miles that are actually federal aid, they aren't showing all of the maintenance and operation dollars spent by all agencies, just a ratio of what we are informed is the total miles are times the ratio of total federal aid miles compared to the total miles available each year

Mereck stated that the total capital revenues are roughly \$443 million through 2045, so that is the constraint we will have on the \$900 million that is in the master of universe of projects list.

Mereck commented that you have seen this information several times, so this is just an update. He added that they are just zeroing in on the interstate forecast on the North Dakota ??, it is kind of the last piece of the puzzle and we hope to get that ironed out in the next month or so.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen stated that Mr. Kadrmas has some work to do on the District list of projects. He added that at the last special meeting there was some possibility that Grand Forks might revisit some of its project scopes as well; 48th Street came up as one possibility; is that still the case. Kuharenko responded that they are looking at some of their projects to see if they might be able to get a better definition, possibly get some things, but right now he thinks they ended up identify that there is a need for pretty much a lot of it and he thinks there was a discussion of putting it in the short-term, some of the streets they are looking at are 48th Street, possibly Cherry Street, possibly some work on 47th and getting those into a mid-range time-band. Haugen said that the sooner they get this information the sooner they can get that matched to revenue for fiscal constraint and really start identifying the projects that are within fiscal constraint, so they would ask that that list be submitted as soon as possible. Bourdon asked if it would be possible to get something yet this month because if they are going to go out and present something to the public it will be pretty tough for them to turn something around if they aren't getting it to the public and maintain the project schedule otherwise we will start running into issues in terms of overall scheduling and how they present information.

Bridge Analysis

Bourdon reported that we will get a lot more into some of the cost estimates, calculations of what the benefits the crossing will provide, and also look at what some of the B/C ratios are, so some of that will be new information.

Bourdon commented that based on direction they are looking at additional information that wasn't reviewed back in February regarding Elks Drive, and the 47th Avenue crossing.

Bourdon stated that it is the five river crossings; looking at what happens and the impacts and kind of compare them side-by-side since the review was to kind of revisit what had been done in the past, and the past had been focusing on 32nd Avenue South and Merrifield Road.

Bourdon reported that all crossings were assumed to be two-lane bridges, all connections on each side are two lane roads so it they are all consistent with a two lane facility, and they aren't adding additional through lane capacity and there was no new connections with I-29 or U.S. #2.

Bourdon said that they basically looked at some daily volumes and level of service from a link perspective, and they got some level of service from a Synchro analysis.. He stated that they have alignments that they reviewed, which really haven't changed. He added that they did meet back in June on the 47th Avenue connection on the Minnesota side so they did some revisions to that.

Bourdon commented that what is included in the report for the river crossings is a look at what is the level of service today, what is the level of service under no build conditions, and obviously out in the future to 2040 things get worse; it isn't really unique that we see where there is more traffic and the community is growing, that is what happens throughout changes in the roadway network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Bourdon referred to slides showing link level of service for each of the proposed crossings and explained that they then, for each of the analyses, generated some information regarding some of the key corridors, so the existing three river crossings were basically impacted some of the link level of services; in terms of B/C ratio and that is presented on the left of each slide and then the volumes are presented for each of the crossings as well so you have your existing, your no build and understanding what it would be like without a connection on the link and then what the anticipated river crossing would do.

Bourdon went over each of the crossings briefly and explained what some of the improvements could be:

1. Point Bridge operates better under 17th Avenue South, Elks Drive and 32nd Avenue Crossing scenarios.
2. Gateway Drive operates better under all crossing scenarios except Merrifield Road.
3. Washington Street operates better under 17th Avenue and Elks Drive crossing scenarios although all scenarios have segments with undesirable operations.
4. Belmont Board operates better under all crossing scenarios based on link LOS but Belmont Road/4th Avenue intersection LOS shows mitigation is required under Merrifield Crossing scenario.

Bourdon stated that just in terms of where things are from a volume perspective, when we look at what the anticipated volumes are they found that:

1. 17th Avenue is a two-lane facility and there is roughly 3,000 to 10,000 vehicles forecast under the 17th Avenue Crossing scenario, depending on where you are at with most of the volume being more to the west of Washington Street.
2. 24th Avenue is a two-lane today and the volumes are shown under the Elks Crossing scenario and range between 4,000 and 7,500 just west of Belmont and east of Washington Street respectively, so again the volumes are higher closer to Washington.
3. 32nd Avenue is mostly a two-lane facility between Belmont and Washington and the volumes are higher, ranging from 10,500 to 13,000.
5. 47th Avenue is in the 8,000 to 9,000 range under the 47th Avenue Crossing scenario.

Bourdon referred to a slide showing roadway planning capacities information and stated that if they look at rough capacities at a planning level they found:

1. The two-lane urban roadway can typically handle between 8,000 and 10,000 so, this is planning level stuff, if they go in and look at individual intersections it is kind of a different world but we are doing a long range transportation plan and so 17th Avenue is at the higher end of that threshold on the west end without a conversion to a three-lane the east end tends to be fine, and when we say three-lane that generally would involve adding some two-way left turn lanes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

2. On the three-lane urban roadway capacity ranges from roughly 14,000 to 17,000 vehicles per day and 32nd Avenue would require a three-lane section; with segments between Cherry and Washington that would need some restriping; and between Cherry and Belmont there would be some minor widening required although it appears that 3 11-foot lanes would fit in most cases. He added that 47th Avenue would require a three-lane section so no changes would be needed between Washington and Belmont, but east of Belmont a three-lane section could be added with restriping only.

Williams asked if these are all assumed not to allow trucks correct, all the scenarios. Bourdon responded that that is correct.

Bourdon referred to a slides showing River Crossing Intersection LOS for each crossing and went over the information briefly. He then referred to slides showing the alignments for each of the crossings and went over them briefly as well.

Bourdon reported that in terms of the 47th Avenue Crossing there were some changes based on the June meeting with the various Minnesota Agencies. He said that some of the punch lines in terms of what they walked out with after discussing with the various agencies were:

1. Rhinehart Drive south of the dike could be converted to County Road or County State Aid Highway.
2. Rhinehart Drive between 13th Street S.E. and the dike could be converted to a City Street and likely would be reconstructed as an urban section.
3. 200th Street would be converted to a County Road or County State Aid Highway between the Red River and County State Aid Highway 58.
4. Improvements could be phased (i.e. Rhinehart Drive and 200th Street would not all have to be completed at once).

Bourdon commented that one thing that is a little bit different, and this is new information; they did get into probable cost. He explained that this had been done back in 2002, with more detail related to the Merrifield crossing done in 2004.

Bourdon referred to a slide that shows their opinion of probable costs and went over it briefly, pointing out that they used the 17th Avenue Low Bridge as an example; and came up with an estimated cost of \$38,448,133.00. He added that they did add some engineering and construction costs and for every one of the crossings they did this same thing, where they had impacts to the dike structure they included the cost of that, so there will be details in the report that will cover all of those crossings, but there will be differences in what is included for each crossing.

Bourdon stated that bridge costs have gone up, there has been a lot of time that has passed and that goes into the impacts of time and dollars, so the cost summary on the top they tried to grab relatively similar crossings so 47th, for an example is an exception because it wasn't looked at in the past so there is no number on the top to compare the costs to, but the costs on the top range

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

from roughly a half to even a third in some cases to the costs on the bottom. He went over the costs differences for each bridge crossing.

Bourdon commented that there was an exercise to go through and A.T.A.C. worked through it and gave us some changes in vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled; and WSB went through some calculations to give us some benefits in terms of what the benefited travel time was for each of the river crossings; the benefitted operations, crashes and air quality; and the benefits, as you look are in the neighborhood of ranging from \$15,000,000 to roughly \$25,000,000 with the highest benefits being at 32nd Avenue South and Merrifield Road with both being above \$20,000,000; where the lowest was 47th Avenue South at a little under \$3,000,000.

Williams asked if Merrifield Road included trucks. Haugen responded that it did not include a separate truck travel; and again they are trying to compare these all the same and the focus was supposed to be sort of like the Point Bridge. Williams said, though, that in reality we the Merrifield Bridge would be built so truck traffic could use it, and 47th Avenue South is the only one, in her judgement, that could be used for truck traffic because the rest all go through neighborhoods. She asked how difficult it would be to add a truck component into those to get a realistic look at it. Haugen responded that it wouldn't be too difficult, but the question would be is the benefit worth the calculation. Williams said that she thinks it might give a little more realistic look at it from the standpoint that; she knows that you are looking at probably no truck traffic, but in reality there would be truck traffic, so if you are going to look at just non-truck traffic that is okay, but the other way to look at it is, in reality you can look at it from another standpoint. Mareck stated that he will have to double check with their analyst, but he is pretty sure that they just made a generic assumption about percentage of truck traffic because any major roadway, any river crossing will all have a certain percentage of trucks whether you intend for them to be there or not, so, again he will have to check with their analyst but he believes they assumed 15% trucks for Merrifield and 5% for the other crossings, just as a generic default. Williams stated that she is still tying this exercise into the downtown area, where if we have a bridge that we can't get the trucks to use, they can't use it then we are still impacting the downtown with all the trucks running through the downtown all the time and she knows that that is one of the things that everyone is concerned about, downtown traffic and congestion and trying to get people to their destinations and a way to remove a certain percentage of trucks from that whole mix, so that is why she asked how difficult it would be to take a look at it.

Bourdon reported that the next slides are identical matrices that were presented back as part of the 2002 update; so probably these are the metrics that ended up going into the cost/benefit ratio. He pointed out that the construction costs they took from the slides before so there is an estimate of construction costs in 2018 dollars. He added that they have traffic flow and congestion, so that's vehicle hours traveled from the travel demand models so you have a value for that; and they have vehicle miles travel statistics and based on that they ended up with a benefit/cost ratio for each of them. He went over each of them briefly.

Bourdon commented that that is the benefit cost summary and comparison between the two. He stated that that is really kind of where they are at the end of doing the analysis. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

they will be making some final tweaks to get the modification put into a power point into the report and that will get wrapped up in the next few days.

Haugen stated that the report itself will be distributed when we get a draft and then you will be able to see all the details that are in the report. He added that this power point is on the web-site so you have access and information that they are sharing already.

Haugen said that, back to the Universe of Projects; they need to have those projects signed off on, and they also need to converse with NDDOT a little more about exactly the interstate revenue.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

- b. MN 220 North Corridor Study Update – Oral Update

Haugen reported that when he put this on the agenda early last week he was under the false assumption that the MN 220 North was due this week, it is not due for another couple of weeks so there isn't any thing more to report on this item at this time.

- c. Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan Update – Oral Update

Haugen reported that the RFP for the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan Update was due yesterday at noon. He said that we did not get our minimum of three proposals so if Mr. Johnson is still on the phone can you authorize us to proceed; he did send a request to be able to proceed as well. Johnson gave authorization to proceed.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 15TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:46 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the September 12th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmass, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Paul Konickson, MnDOT District 2; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Nancy Ellis, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Ryan Riesinger, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mereck, WSB; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 27TH AND AUGUST 22ND, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE JULY 27TH AND AUGUST 22ND, 2018 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE SKEWED
INTERSECTION STUDY**

Kouba reported that we received a request from the City of Grand Forks to do a study to include the US#2/US#81 intersection, the US#2/Gateway Drive intersection, and the US Bus#2/Mill Road intersection. She explained that the purpose of the study is to try to find ways to improve safety, reduce existing and future traffic congestion, provide efficient access for existing and future development, and improve mobility and connectivity for all transportation modes.

Kouba stated that they did put together a request for proposals to do this study and are looking for alternatives that can help alleviate some of the issues seen in the study area. She added that we have a budget of \$60,000 for the study.

Kouba commented that the Grand Forks Engineering Department did submit some grammar corrections as well as some corrections to the maps, so she will make those changes before the final document is submitted to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval.

Williams referred to the first page of the Background and Scope-Of-Work, and pointed out that Number 7 says “structures”, and she is wondering if that is referring to the review of the existing traffic signals and railroad and everything to make sure that there are no deficiencies and recommendations as far as replacement or such. Kouba responded that it is included.

Haugen commented that previously it has been identified that the railroad signals and the Mill Road signal were one above the other, so that has been pointed out to do that again. Williams added that there are also no gates, there are several things; one of the signal poles is a little too low because trucks keep hitting the back plates, so that is kind of what she is looking at.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING
A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE U.S.#2/U.S.#81 SKEWED INTERSECTION
STUDY SUBJECT TO THE PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED CORRECTIONS/COMMENTS
BEING IMPLEMENTED.***

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Bail, Gengler, West, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

***Absent: Lang, Emery, Halford, Brooks, Audette, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson,
Yavarow, Rood, Ellis, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.***

Haugen reported that this is one of those studies that we have received approval from the NDDOT that they will provide 10% of the cost.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

MATTER OF EGF ADA TRANSITION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that this year we have been working with SRF Consulting Group on the East Grand Forks ADA Transition Plan, and Ms. Kouba will walk us through an update on this study.

Kouba stated that we hired SRF back in April and at the end of June, beginning of July, they were out collecting data for the self-evaluation portion of the plan, and have been doing a quality control check on the data collected to make sure that the slope and the run and all of that is correct for those intersections and making sure that there are truncated domes and whether things are compliant or non-compliant. She added that they are also entering some of the sidewalks and making sure that they are flat and meet ADA requirements.

Kouba commented that overall East Grand Forks is pretty much where everybody else is in terms of compliance for ADA so they haven't found anything unusual. She stated that the next steps will be to move forward and they are now in the process of putting together a presentation for a focus group meeting with members of the community most affected by the impending improvements. A public meeting will be held the same day as the focus group meeting, a date will be set soon.

Williams asked, just out of curiosity, on the compliant, is it compliant based on current standards or compliant based on the standard of when it was installed. Kouba responded that it is compliant based on current standards. Kouba added that where the focus group and our public meeting will come into play, prioritizing everything, so things that were compliant when they put in but aren't right now might have a lower prioritization.

Haugen asked if this was broken out yet by agency. Kouba responded that it is not.

Information only.

MATTER OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that we received one proposal to our RFP for the Downtown Transportation Study. He said that the submittal came in as if we were going to do the whole RFP that we originally drafted, so in working with the City of Grand Forks, the NDDOT and the consultant, we reached a scope-of-work that focuses just on updating the downtown parking standards to get a sense of what existing parking is there, what the proposed developments that might be coming from the Downtown Action Plan would change the parking, and to see if the parking is based on the proper land use type.

Haugen commented that another thing they will be doing is to create Event Management Plans. He explained that this past weekend there were several activities going on in the downtown that changed how people could arrive and how they were able to park, and this would come up with some of those event management plans to try to help ease the pain of getting information out and assigning where people can go to park.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen said that they are also then looking at the ride hailing areas that police and the City have designated already and doing a critique on them.

Haugen stated that the last piece is looking at the potential vacation of 3rd Street, where the Water Treatment Plan redevelopment is.

Haugen reported that what was removed from the RFP were the review of the one-way pairs through 4th Street, and a study of University Avenue connection between the downtown and UND, those are the two significant things that we dropped. He added that we also make a decision to drop the whole scope-of-work to look at the traffic network and trying to address that, we decided not to put that in the RFP, but the consultant did have it as a part of the submittal, so it was removed.

Haugen said that this maintains the budget of \$60,000; the work schedule is still on the same timeline as the Downtown Action Plan; and KLJ's subconsultant is still RDG.

Haugen commented that the Executive Policy Board authorized the Finance Committee the ability to executive that contract, and they are scheduled to meet tomorrow to do that. He added that, assuming we get concurrence from the NDDOT on the selection process authorization to proceed should be done by the end of the month.

Information only.

MATTER OF MN 220 NORTH STUDY RFP UPDATE

Viafara reported that last month the MPO sought authorization from the Technical Advisory Committee to engage a consulting company to advance the MN 220 North Corridor Study. He added that we also asked the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve this as well and a Request For Proposal was issued.

Viafara stated that August 31st our MPO received three proposals and a committee of seven people was established to review and to help in the selection process of hiring a consultant, and the firm they selected was Alliant Engineering.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Performance Measure/Targets

Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn, was present for a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Bourdon commented that some of this will just be a review, but they are going to talk a little bit about some specific performance measures and targets and they do have final revenue forecasts that they would like to discuss.

Bourdon stated that there has been some new information develop in terms of where some draft investment direction and scenarios are starting to look based on what they had for revenues and some of the project prioritization information they received, and they will provide an update on the river crossing analysis.

Bourdon referred to the project schedule and said that there is an open house tonight at the Alerus Center from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m., with a presentation at 5:45 p.m. He stated that that will be the last public meeting and added that they will be working on getting together a draft for review on the 5th of October.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and pointed out that PM3 are three targets. He added that last month we discussed where both States sit on those targets and also the fact that some of these facilities aren't located in Minnesota, and if we adopted by default the State targets we would formally be adopting MnDOT's targets for the interstate system even though there isn't an interstate system, so we are suggesting that we use some of the information from both States but not necessarily adopt the State targets as a default.

Haugen pointed out that, based on the data for the Truck Travel Time Liability, North Dakota went with an ultra-conservative index of 3 and Minnesota went with a 1.5. He added that he thinks that last month we discussed where some of our surrounding States were with their information, and when we look at the data that is available through the MAP-21 tool we see where the Grand Forks MPO area is at, and that is at the 1.2 or so area. He said that we also discussed that there has been a change in vendor of the data collection between 2017 and 2018, with the 2018 data being more informed data, so for the draft target for consideration we are suggesting that we consider going with 1.5.

Haugen stated that on the regular interstate travel reliability, again our data shows 100%, North Dakota's shows 85%, and Minnesota shows 80%; and we are suggesting that we go with 90%. He said that this give us a little room for forgiveness, but not a lot so that it would be less valuable.

Haugen commented that for the non-interstate travel reliability, again we see a difference between 2017 data and 2018 data. He said that we also know that North Dakota went with 85%, Minnesota went with 75%, and we are suggesting something similar as North Dakota's 85%.

Haugen stated that we show these PM3 proposed targets for the MPO but the we are also back to the PM2, the pavement and bridge conditions. He said that, again we discussed this last month; in some cases, because of the data availability and the inconsistency we are pretty much going to recommend that we adopt the State's targets. He added, though, that in some cases, again because there are no facilities on the Minnesota side, we default then to the North Dakota

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

number, but we aren't saying that we are adopting it as a State target, it will become an MPO number and an MPO target it is just the same as North Dakota's target.

Haugen said that the MPO column is what they are asking the Technical Advisory Committee consider recommending to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they consider adopting. He added that we do have, technically until the middle of November to make these decisions, but as you heard we are trying to have a draft document ready for review in October reflecting what these targets are. He said that they think they have enough information to make this recommendation for our consideration ahead of that 180 day timeline, so with that staff is asking for a motion to recommend forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve these targets.

Haugen commented that you will notice that on the State's side, after two years they have to make a report to the feds about their progress and at that time they can make a decision to adjust a target or keep it as is. He added that on the MPO side we just have four-year targets that we are adopting. He pointed out that there are nine total, and of the nine four are State targets and the rest are MPO targets, and that is what staff is requesting the Technical Advisory Committee approve today.

Kadrmass asked what the benefit of using 1.5 instead of 3 for the truck travel time reliability is. Haugen responded that the benefit would be to make a better argument if we are having 1.7 index, if that is a real truck freight mobility reliability issue in our MPO area versus saying we will wait until we hit 3 to raise it as a concern. He added that that is why Congress gave MPOs the ability to adopt their own targets to take a statewide average and make it more specific and local, which is sort of similar to the discussion we had with Safety Targets.

Kadrmass asked if this is what the other MPOs and Bismarck are doing as well. Haugen responded that Bismarck is currently adopting the State targets because they are just in the process of preparing to update their Long Range plan, and they expect that when they adopt their plan a year from now that they will be adopting some of their own targets. He added that Fargo/Moorhead, because of their change in directorship are adopting the State targets for now as well, but they have not officially adopted the PM2s and PM3s yet.

MOVED BY KADRMAS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MPO TARGETS, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmass, Bail, Gengler, West, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Emery, Halford, Brooks, Audette, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Ellis, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen reported that the next few slides discuss environmental measures. He said that our current Long Range Transportation Plan adopted a performance measure for tailpipe emissions, so this information is to tell you that when you look at the 2015 numbers compared to the numbers that we were working off of in the 2040 plan we had, between 2006 and 2010, a significant reduction in vehicle miles traveled; between 2010 and 2015 we had a significant increase in vehicle miles traveled. He explained that between 2006 and 2010 the gas economy did not change, and we saw an improvement on gas mileage that the average vehicle was achieving. He stated that for the actual emissions, even though we saw an increase in vehicle miles traveled we actually achieved a decrease in the fuel consumed, which also then led to a decrease in our emissions, so our trend continued going down, but our rate of trend didn't continue as fast as of right now as it did in the past.

Williams said that in the 2040 plan we had talked about basing this on population; because our population is increasing it makes it difficult to continue to have a downward trend if you are just using straight numbers, so was population taken into consideration at all. Haugen responded that it hasn't yet on this calculation.

Haugen commented that this is just to bring everyone up to date on where we are standing with that current target in our plan with the 2015 data, and the trend is still to be planning from this point of view but next month they will show the actual target and the way they worded it.

Bourdon reported that the next few slides discuss investment direction. He explained that they are in the process of getting input on investment direction; and they have gotten public input on issue areas and investment priorities, have considered State and local plans, and have included input from all areas to make sure that they define the available revenues.

Bourdon commented that they talked about goals, performance measures, objectives; really some of the things that we reviewed back in August when they went to the public and got input and asked where are your biggest areas of concern, and this diagram shows the results of that. He went over and said that there was a focus on safety and pavement condition, but there were also concerns with signals, congestion and access. He said that they then, at the January public meeting, did an activity asking where people would focus your investment priorities, and the results of that are shown on this diagram as well. He pointed out that the highest priority was maintaining infrastructure with state of good repair projects at 30%; new river crossings at 29%; new freeway interchanges at 16%, etc.

Bourdon stated that taking that information, and working through the Technical Advisory Committee members, they were able to define the current revenue scenario, and they went through, based on the periods buckets, where the total revenue sits. He referred to the diagram and pointed out that they included Safety, ND Main Street, State of Good Repair-Interstate, State of Good Repair-Non-Interstate NHS and minor arterials, and Local Projects. He said that the percent share is shown and they are at basically \$436 million dollars, with the bulk of that tying in to the State of Good Repair for the Interstate, NHS and minor arterials; and a good portion to Grand Forks local projects that don't fall into some of the federal aid categories and sales tax.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen reported that we distributed this out, and each of the agencies received this ahead of time, how that pie chart, and the projects are distributed within the pie charts, so for the Minnesota side, they gave them a fiscally constrained list of projects already, so there wasn't a whole lot of work that they had to do there; on the NDDOT side all the projects they identified they found funding for, but they did have to shift some of the regional dollars over to the Interstate System to fund it; but with the fiscal constraint there are a couple million dollars left on the table, but not enough to really play with.

Haugen stated that on the East Grand Forks side, with their City Subtarget available every fourth year, it make their list of projects a little more tricky as they had to work with the project ranking from the tool that they distributed at the end of July and came up with a list that shook out with East Grand Forks.

Haugen said that on the Grand Forks side they started with the City's request on the NHS system. He added that Grand Forks also did request that we consider a 60/40 match ratio with the federal funds, and when they did that there was some remaining federal funds still on the table, so they shifted those over to the minor arterial network; and using the tool that ranks projects they identified minor arterials to fit with the funding. He stated that they are still working on the other two agencies, the counties, and are also still working on the other two categories; safety and North Dakota Main Street.

Kuharenko stated that he saw the spreadsheets that were sent out earlier this week and he is wondering what is being used for the base, are they using 2015 as the base or 2018 as the base. Haugen responded that it is 2018 and 2023 is sort of the first year of the general fiscal plan. Kuharenko said, then, that 2023 is the target that you're inflating to, the short-term timeband; so what are the mid-term and long-term years. Mereck responded that there are three timebands; the short time band starts on the out year of the T.I.P. Haugen added that 2023 to 2027, and so our year of expenditure is at the mid-point of that 2024/2025 time-frame so the mid-term is 2028 to 2038, and so whatever the mid-point of that band is what they gave the year of expenditure to. Kuharenko said that he would assume then that 2039 to 2045 is the long-term. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that, so they didn't say that a project had a year of expenditure of 2024 versus 2027, everything was on the same year of expenditure. Kuharenko asked what they ended up using as a rate of inflation. Mereck responded that NDDOT and MnDOT recommended they use factors, and he can send that out. Bourdon said that he could send that and then just make sure that all the time-banks are mostly clear. Haugen added that those two things didn't change between 2040 and 2045. Kuharenko said he just didn't know what they were off-hand. He added that as he was going through the document he wasn't sure, he saw that there was a factor in there, and he took whatever the estimated value was and multiplied by 1.132 for the short-term, but he wasn't exactly sure how that related back in inflation rate or what years they went over. He said that he knows that in the costs that they sent over had an as bid estimate based in 2015 dollars so it sounds like it might be a couple of extra years of inflation that they might need to shift in there as well. He added that he knows that in our previous discussions, where we ended up talking about the 60/40 split, that is more in relation to if they end up looking at total project costs because there is your engineering; whether it is designed construction, if you need to do right-of-way acquisition, utility relocates, or other

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

project incidentals; whether it is impractical or eligible for federal funding, they end up covering those entirely as a city cost and so the cost that they end up providing the 2015 dollars, and those are for construction costs only, so they probably need to figure in some kind of a factor if they are going to go with the 60/40 split versus the 80/20 split.

Haugen said that he knew that but they didn't do the calculation. He explained that they took the construction costs and added contingency, admin, and then construction if that raised it 50%, then split that 60/40. He said that they just took what was there, 60/40. Kuharenko said that if we are just taking that; what they gave was a construction estimate, and do that 60/40 that isn't capturing all the costs. He stated that if you are going to do it on a 60/40 basis, typically they end up using 15% for design engineering, 15% for construction engineering, and 3% as a token amount; and he thinks that the federal expenditure; if it is 80/20 under construction, should still be the same if you are at a 60/40, so that should help clear things up.

Mereck asked if they were going to recommend what type of inflation adjustment they want used for those other considerations. Kuharenko asked if he was talking about inflating the construction dollars to projects costs. Mereck responded that he believes they gave them construction estimate for all the projects; and he thinks the suggestion is to add on some administrative and contingency costs to that, so the question is whether or not they have a recommended additional percentage that they would like them to add for those types of things. Kuharenko responded that they would like to just have it multiplied by 1.33.

Grasser commented that he thinks that when we originally had the 60/40 discussion we were trying to determine what we had available for local dollars for matches and things like that, and they wanted to recognize that the local match is more than 80/20, and they were talking about it on a macro scale, that was the discussion for the 60/40; and maybe it should have been 80/20 plus another 20% local or 25% local, maybe that would have been a better way of stating it, but he is a little concerned, even on this conversation, that it depends on what roadway or what type of project that we are actually doing. He explained that if you're doing a project on Highway #2, we don't have those kinds of local match inflators with that, where we get into higher local contribution is where we are responsible for the engineering and things, so it depends somewhat on the project and we might have to have a memo or something that defines which project you add what kind of inflators to; because, again, work on Gateway Drive, while there is zero percent City contribution on that but like Washington and some of the other State Highways we have a ten, and those tend to remain fairly well under control, there might be a few extras in there depending upon what they are, but when we get into the Urban Program, that is where we run into things like bikepaths, and those types of programs have a way different ratio because of how the engineering interplay comes into that so we might want to be a little more thoughtful and define what those are. He added that just so we are all producing the same estimate, if we are doing an estimate that doesn't include engineering, 80/20 is fine because those costs are usually project eligible, and then the City portion would be those non-eligible items so it may be better to come up with a different percentage like 80/20 plus because we have to be careful about the percentages and using them in the right way for the situation being dealt with.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Bourdon stated that he agrees that it is important that we make sure we are on the same page, but he also thinks we have to keep in mind that we are working on the Long Range Transportation Plan and are trying to maintain some level of consistency. He said that he has been doing quite a few of these, and we want to do what is right and make sure that the local funding is properly accounted for, but he thinks this is more tied to the big amount of local funds you have so it is more something they have to get on the page with and talk about what is reasonable given this is a Long Range Transportation Plan, and when he says that he isn't ignoring what you're saying, he just thinks this is an issue that they need to work out with Grand Forks because that is more tied into that local funding level. Grasser agreed, adding that that is why he thinks we need to probably establish in writing what those ratios are that we agree with because they always struggle a little bit when they see a number, did it include the engineering, didn't it include the engineering, because that makes a big difference on the local side. Mereck added that one important thing to keep in mind is that this is a planning study so all of the cost estimates in the plan are going to be planning level cost estimates, they aren't going to be preliminary engineering types of estimates that he knows a lot of you are accustomed to working with on a regular basis, so it is going to be an increment of accuracy a little bit higher than you would deal with with the preliminary engineering estimate, and with that there is a little bit more generality that goes with the estimate, and that doesn't mean that they aren't trying to be as accurate as we can be but we also want to be as consistent as we can be across all the agencies that we are estimating costs for because it ends up working better for their methodology to compare back to our fiscal constraint.

Mereck commented that obviously when you go through the planning process the next step after the project is selected and put into the T.I.P., you go through a more detailed more rigorous pre-engineering environmental review process that gets into more detail of what those regular costs are, and the contingencies, and all the other factors that go into the overall project cost. Grasser said that he doesn't know if he cares what is in your number, it is just that once we arrive and understand what went into that number we apply the right percentage to that number, we can't take a percentage of an inappropriate number and expect to have a reasonable result. Mereck stated that he might be coming up with that percentage to apply relatively equally based on the type of cross section of your project so they aren't writing three pages of different numbers. Kuharenko commented that he thinks that is kind of what they are saying, if they are going to go with the 80/20 then the numbers they ended up giving you work quite well with that, but if we are going to be looking at splitting it out at a 60/40 basis we need to just incorporate into that factor to take into consideration that extra engineering. Grasser added that it might be a better approach, when we get down to the project level, to maybe leave it at 80/20 with the numbers that everybody is generally generating and then just recognizing at the local level plus another 20%, he thinks that will help keep the federal and local flow closer to reality.

Bourdon stated that he thinks that with this conversation he thinks we can get where we need to be, it is just making sure that we are on the same page, so he will follow up on this.

Haugen referred to the list of projects that was distributed earlier and asked that everyone please look through it to see if there might be some projects that might be justified as safety funding, instead of normal state of good repair project. He stated that on the North Dakota side you can't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

install a new traffic signal, but you could, perhaps, revise traffic signals or at one time Stanford Road and Gateway Drive and North 36th Street Alignment might be a project that could be classified as safety. He added that in East Grand Forks there are a few recommended round-about locations, which could be identified as safety improvements; and that would be the other thing that is one reason why we haven't addressed the safety yet because they made a request, got little feedback, and are making the request again to see if there are some projects that we can try to make an argument that there should be a safety consideration and fund it through the HSIP process. Grasser said, then, in that light they've got traffic signal upgrades proposed in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., and a lot of the traffic signal things that they are doing are going to be pedestrian oriented such as push buttons and heads, so could there be an argument made that some of that is safety related, or is that too far down the trail already. Haugen responded that it is on the illustrative side of our T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. currently so it is still seeking funding so it is a question that should be asked, but at some point different staff people communicate as to what is eligible as part of HSIP and that wouldn't be so there might be an argument that possible could happen, so yes you should make the request to see if there is a part of those applications that could be considered.

Grasser asked if Mr. Johnson had any guidance in relation to this; if they went through some methodology and came up with the idea that 10% of those traffic rehab projects are safety related, has anybody done that or would that be a path that would be very difficult. Johnson responded that he hasn't had any experience with that, it would be something unique, and he isn't sure how you would figure out what that potentially would be for the baseline.

Haugen commented that the one thing that he thinks is clear is that in the past they don't like to mix safety funds with other funds so if it is a standalone safety project it needs to be justified as a stand-alone safety project, so if you part out some of those components you end up having two separate projects instead of two funding sources for one project. Johnson agreed, adding that Federal Highway has directed to separate safety improvements out as stand-alone safety measures. Kuharenko added that, if memory serves, just the general timeline for the HSIP program, as well as the T.I.P. going into the S.T.I.P., those are programmed different years as well because they are typically four years out whereas the HSIP is typically two or three, so you also have that gap as well, that tiny gap that can be problematic if you were to try to line up two different funding sources. Haugen stated that this plan is the first plan that is planning out safety to the 20-plus year horizon. He added that there are a lot of projects that aren't being recommended or assigned in the fiscal constraint side of things, so if you can find projects that might justify the safety side we are encouraging you to let us know.

Williams asked what category the Washington Street Underpass project falls in. Haugen responded that it is a T.I.P. project that is already programmed. He added that it isn't really part of the work that we have been working on for 2045. Williams said she asked this because that project certainly has a lot of safety items involved with it. Haugen responded that it isn't a project that we use as a project to base our forecasted revenue because it is such an outlier, and it is already programmed in the T.I.P. so we aren't trying to plan for it in this 2045 timeframe.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen commented that the Main Street is just seeing how we are going to address those utility locates and if there are replacement projects or not on that list.

Bourdon stated that the next few slides show a list of potential discretionary projects. He said that most of them have been discussed in the past. He pointed out that the Point Bridge approach on the East Grand Forks side has been added to the list, and stated that there has been a lot of discussion on river crossings and 32nd Avenue and Merrifield are potential discretionary projects.

Kuharenko commented that under our potential discretionary projects he isn't seeing anything regarding an I-29/47th Avenue Interchange. Haugen responded that the bulk of this list is coming from that tool, again, the priority ranking that was in that tool that we asked you to review, and they got little feedback on, so these are the output of that tool. He added that they didn't rank the river crossings in the tool, so review the tools to see how it shook out and where we can make the improvements.

River Crossing Analysis

Bourdon stated that we have been looking at five river crossings, and we actually started this process earlier in the year, and there really aren't many changes except to address the discussion we had at your last meeting, specifically whether or not trucks were considered as part of the crossing and there were some adjustments to how they presented costs, so he will give a brief review of the next few slides.

Presentation continued.

Williams asked, when we are talking low and high, is low like the elevation of the Sorlie and high the elevation of the Kennedy, or in-between there. Haugen responded that the low; politicians always talk about the Point Bridge, so it is floodable approaches is what the low is, so it isn't really like either the Sorlie or the Kennedy, its like those other types of bridges where the approaches are not meant to be safe from flooding.

Haugen commented that he did make a request to the Polk County Commissioners to see what their stance is on the potential 47th Avenue Bridge, and the MPO Executive Policy Board had a question of Polk County on where they stand on Merrifield, so those were two questions we raised for Polk County. He said that they haven't responded back yet, so he will follow up on those two issues. He added that he also made an offer to all of the Grand Forks Council members whose wards would be impacted by these crossings to attend their ward meetings if they wished.

Johnson stated that, and this is more of an observation than anything, but in regard to the information that was e-mailed earlier today, he finds it very interesting that the lowest ranking potential river crossing also coincides with the quote/unquote I29 Study identified highest interchange need along I-29. He said he finds the two things to be interesting. Haugen responded that he thinks they have been saying all along that there has been a disconnect between interchange and interstate traffic with the river crossings in our travel demand model.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

He commented that in the I-29 Study we specifically added tasks to the consultant to delve into that issue and they found that there was, even at a more refined level, still a disconnect. He added that the exception to this is the Merrifield crossing, which has more connection to I-29 than the other locations have shown in our model in the past, so he thinks this result is kind of reflecting the consistency with those past reviews. Johnson said that he does remember that part of the I-29 Study, but it is still an interesting dynamic that wouldn't ever push or guide you to that decision.

Bourdon reported that there is a public meeting tonight at the Alerus Center, and they will continue to have some back and forth between now and October 5th, and there will be some separate outreach to it together on the main street and safety and some of those projects on ?? just because the draft is only as good as we have the time to incorporate it into ??? He said that another thing they will do, some way or another, is to touch base with Grand Forks folks on those ?? to make sure we are all on the same page.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

b. UPWP Project Solicitation

Haugen reported that we do have an open solicitation for our next two-year work program so if anyone has any projects they would like considered, please make sure they are eligible before we get too far into the process and then we find out they aren't.

c. T.I.P. Project Solicitation

Haugen reported that we are getting to the point in the year where we will start opening up solicitations for our next T.I.P. cycle, 2020 to 2023.

d. 2045 Land Use Plan Update Discussion

Gengler stated that he would be in touch with Mr. Haugen soon to try to get together to talk about the various options for the 2045 Land Use Plan Update.

e. T.I.P. Amendment

Bergman asked where we are at with the T.I.P. stuff for the Bus Barn project? Haugen responded that we have to amend the Transit Development Plan first, so where are you at with that; Ms. Kouba has been working with you on it. Bergman commented that the project has already started so we better figure out how to do this because if it gets held up, which it is now

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

because they are closing out the federal grant website, that could be an ugly business, and it won't be on his side, so he would suggest we get something done with it, and pretty quickly. Haugen stated that he thinks that has been their message since you got the award.

f. MnDOT Autonomous Vehicle Study

Haugen reported that he sent information concerning that MnDOT has a connected vehicle, autonomous vehicle study going on so there is a bunch of different sub-committees. He asked that if you didn't get that e-mail let him know and he will get you connected to that study link.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:56 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the October 10th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:31 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Paul Konickson, MnDOT District 2; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Ryan Riesinger, Dustin Lang, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Brad Bail, Nick West, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Jane Williams and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2018 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Kouba reported that we are updating our Transit Development Plan. She explained that back in July 2017 we adopted a five-year Transit Development Plan, however Cities Area Transit recently received a 5339 Competitive Grant which now needs to be amended into the Transit Development Plan, as well as some other projects that are either new or have had some changes made to them, some have been funded and others are candidates for funding.

Haugen commented that this amendment triggers the inclusion of a section outlining how performance-based planning and programming is taking place. He pointed out that attached is a three-page section documenting the Transit Asset Management Performance Measures. He explained that this followed the framework that we have been provided when we were inserting the Safety Performance Measures, TAM is the next performance measure that we have to insert, and then in mid-November we will have to insert the other performance measures as well.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FINANCIAL CHAPTER, SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.

Kuharenko asked Mr. Bergman if everything is correct. Bergman responded that from what he saw when he read through it there weren't any changes that he hadn't seen yet. He did add that the TAM plan is not totally complete because there are some more changes coming about from the State, but that will be an ongoing issue.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

Haugen commented that as noted on the agenda the actual public hearing will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday at noon.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2019-2022 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this amendment to the 2019-2022 T.I.P. is related to the previous agenda item; it is incorporating the 5339 Grant awarded to the Cities Area Transit.

Haugen pointed out that there was a blank opening for Project #10 for the year 2019, and this new project is being inserted there and has a total of \$3.6 federal funding going toward the Public Transportation and Maintenance Facility for updates, renovations and expansion to the facility.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

Haugen commented that, again, because this amendment is being done after October 1st, we have to include Transit Asset Management into our T.I.P. document.

Haugen pointed out that, just as the previous agenda item, the public hearing for this amendment will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday at noon.

Bergman asked of the Performance Based Planning is supposed to have MTP in it as well. Haugen responded that this is for the T.I.P. so it is T.I.P. He added that they are very similar but there are some slight differences.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2019 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR FTA 5339 GRANT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that, as you know we did this earlier in the year, but there was a second round of solicitation for the 5339 Grant in August with a submittal deadline of October 19th to the NDDOT. She stated that applications needed to be in to the MPO by October 3rd and the Cities Area Transit was the only agency to submit an application.

Kouba referred to the staff report and pointed out that it lists the Cities Area Transit 5339 project requests and their priority ranking.

Bergman commented that because of the change, now, with the University we would probably ask the State to consider moving #9 up to #5. He said that they are waiting on the final signed documents from the University for that project. Haugen asked if staff is asking; he knows that there was discussion last week and they were encouraged to have it reprioritized by the City Council. Bergman responded that he visited with their City Administrator and he said he isn't taking it back to the City Council because they would look at the whole document and what you're going after, and that is how he put it, so he is mentioning that now. Haugen asked, then, if Mr. Bergman is asking the MPO to move #9 up to #5. Bergman responded that that is correct.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 5339 GRANT APPLICATION REQUEST, SUBJECT TO SHIFTING PRIORITY #9 TO PRIORITY #5, AND SHIFTING THE REST DOWN ONE SPOT EACH.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

Haugen asked if City Staff was going to have communication with City Council on this action so that when it goes to the MPO Executive Policy Board the Council members aren't confused. Bergman responded they would.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY
ELEMENT DRAFT PLAN**

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the staff report, as well as some additional information. He added that the project list was e-mailed out a couple of weeks ago for review as well.

Haugen referred to the staff report and noted that, as indicated, we are still trying to make a December 2018 approval deadline, and we need to start the 60-day approval process in October.

Haugen commented that we do have a draft document, and access to it was provided to you on Friday, via e-mail. He explained that this is a technical document and staff is asking for comments from this committee by October 23rd, and once those are incorporated, in order to meet the participation deadline 10-days prior to the first Planning Commission meeting on November 7th in Grand Forks, we would have a cleaned-up draft posted on the website on October 29th. He said, then, that that draft would be the one that would be available during the month of November. He added that they also have presentations scheduled before the NDDOT Upper Management in mid-November; and before MnDOT in mid-November, and then we will make adjustments to the draft as needed prior, again, to a 10-day review period before the December Planning Commission meeting.

Haugen stated that we are seeking preliminary approval; and added that it is a draft that is subject to change and not etched in stone.

Haugen commented that since there are some projects that aren't listed in the LRSP exclusive, they included the HSIP in the packet that went out last Friday. He added that as this is our first real integration of the Safety Planning documents into the Metropolitan Planning Documents there are some mixed matches going on. He said that there are still on the North Dakota side, during the short-term a list of projects that are still identified in those documents that essentially fulfill the funding forecast that we have for this program; beyond that short-term there are really no projects left in the safety plans, but there are projects and they have been asking and having discussions for the last couple of months of projects that we have identified from corridor studies or other studies that have a strong safety component to them to see if those should be shifted over, but they didn't receive and feedback on that so he identified a couple of projects just to sort of plant a seed, but the big thing they note is that the Local Road Safety Program needs to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

updated. He added that he knows that both States are updating their Street and Highway Safety Plan and Polk County is currently updating their County Safety Plan, and that will help feed, then, the rest of the outer years of the document, and give us an opportunity to revisit some of the projects in the short-term.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side there is a greater discrepancy, there are a lot of project identified with costs attached, but there isn't any revenue forecasted for those projects.

Haugen reported that really the timeframes that are identified here are because these are, again, district plans or county plans, and they are shorter-range documents and don't go out twenty-plus years so they are all identified in the short-range; and then East Grand Forks has a couple of projects that are in the possible long-range timeframe, they are roundabouts that are eligible as HSIP funded projects, so again, just as we were commenting about North Dakota, we need to work to develop this integration of these safety plans into the MPO Planning Process.

Haugen stated that, lastly, just highlighting where the plan is at with the financial constraint issue, and how the projects shake out. He referred to a slide, which we have seen before, and explained that it shows that over the course of the time horizon our purchasing power erodes because project expenditures are rising faster than revenue is rising. He added that one thing to note is that we are forecasting more revenue than we did in the 2040 plan, but as we go out to the outer years that gap still gets larger; and this is particularly true for the City of East Grand Forks, they significantly increased the revenue coming into the City, and that has helped quite a bit on the cost erosion factor, but from a Metropolitan Plan point of view it is still a large gap.

Haugen continued with the slide presentation, noting that many of them we've seen before. He referred to new slides and pointed out that they try to graphically show the project lists. He explained that the first graphic shows the Interstate State of Good Repair. He stated that all of the projects that the State identified for the Interstate System were funded with the exception of a stretch of I-29 to the north. He explained that that stretch of I-29 is having a mid-term project done on it, but then it's the last project in the Year 2045, which is tiny bit on our fiscal constraint edge, so we couldn't fiscally constrain it in with other project on the regional system so we decided that 2045 was enough to move it out and still be fiscally constrained with all the other projects.

Haugen said that the same thing happened on the principle arterials for the rest of the NHS system; the red lines here, all of those projects are being recommended. He stated that there are a couple on 32nd Avenue, that again the State identified in the Year 2045; in the mid-term 32nd Avenue is programmed for reconstruction, so the 2045 project was a follow-up concrete panel repair type and it was right at 2045 as the year it was identified, so again for fiscal constraint by pushing those out beyond the planning horizon, these two segments, we were able to fund all the rest of the projects that were identified for the NHS system.

Haugen reported that they then went to the Minor Arterial system, and many of them are identified with the remaining funds, after the Interstate and NHS system are programmed, and you can see that those are highlighted in yellow. Grasser asked what the funds that are identified

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

there are available. Haugen responded that the red are all federally funded projects; the yellow are a mixture of some federal funds, but mostly local funds. Grasser commented that, again, they went through, back in May the City of Grand Forks sent a list to the MPO on what they thought the federal dollars should be focused on, which was basically the NHS system streets, and their estimates were that they would probably be expending all of the available federal dollars basically on those NHS system streets, plus the Point Bridge and couple of those critical features like that, and so, even though we have exchanged a couple of e-mails, he is still unclear really on how many federal dollars are left. He stated that, again, the MPO produced a new list of streets and from what he gathered it appeared that the latest list shows about \$14 million dollars of federal dollars and \$28 million in local dollars and he isn't sure what that list is incorporated that way. He said that he thinks the list they had, and what he thinks we should be doing and is requesting that we do is have our list, that basically incorporates only federal dollars, and not try to have the MPO account for all of the local dollars.

Haugen reported that the list identifies projects; the total percent of federal participation in the list of projects is not 80%, it is at 74%, so all of these projects have a federal aid component to them. He said that the total local dollars available, those that we identified in the short-term, so they applied the match to the federal, plus then you identified last month that there were additional local costs to add to the project, so they account for those as well. He added that to show fiscal constraint they have to show the match plus the additional local costs, and then there are remaining dollars left.

Grasser commented that they talked about the; again, it depends how you do your cost estimating, but the normal federal participation is 80/20, and you said the more anticipated local representation will probably be more like a 70/30 or sometimes even a 60/40; he isn't sure how that argument balances against \$14 million in federal dollars against \$28 million in local dollars on that short-term list. Haugen responded that there is still a bulk of those local dollars not assigned to a project on that list. Grasser said that he thinks that goes to the point that that list should only represent those federal dollars that we will be matching and moving forward, he doesn't believe that they should have the MPO trying to allocate their local dollars to projects that the MPO is creating, they are creating projects and techniques out of that. Haugen responded that every project on that list has a federal component being assigned to it, there are no 100% locally funded projects on that list, to his knowledge.

Grasser asked if the projects are all basically 80/20. Haugen responded that they are about 74% of the year of expenditure cost, and then there is another column of added City costs that are all 100%. Williams asked if that includes the projects shown in yellow. Haugen responded that some of the yellow projects are from the federal aid project list. Kuharenko commented that some of that, too, looks like it is 100% local, kind of like the 32nd Avenue project. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko stated that that is just as a point of clarification. Haugen explained that when we had our late July meeting, the City staff said that they would leave it up to the MPO to shake out how to fit a square peg into a round hole; and the remaining dollars they took what was left and they used the prioritization tool and those are the minor arterials that rose to the top and are shown as the projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

Grasser said that he thinks that what they are struggling with is that the result of all that came back as a project list and he doesn't know that this group has ever had a philosophical discussion about what happens to the local dollars. He explained that they have a City Council, they have a budget, and they have a six-year CIP, and they allocate all of their dollars within various categories of work and there are certain dollars that go towards matching federal funds and some that go towards 100% local costs; and that has to meet the needs of the local streets as well as the collector and minor arterial streets, again, essentially they viewed that they were out of money by the time we got done with their NHS system and their original list.

Kuharenko distributed copies of the original list of projects that the City of Grand Forks submitted to the MPO.

Grasser said that he is struggling with how do we rectify how we set up budgets and represent how we are going to move forward with their City Council; with the MPO list that is now reallocating dollars in other streets and in other manners that they haven't yet talked about with their City Council. Haugen commented that the list that the City submitted for federal aid, it appears was shorting you on the short range federal aid bill; and he isn't sure why or what the difference is, but it appeared from their analysis that there were not enough projects taking care of the federal aid revenue to the urban system, and so that is where the additional projects moved in because there were no other projects identified and we went to the prioritization tool and tried to fit the projects into that fiscal constraint.

Kuharenko asked, if there weren't enough projects available in the short-term, and they had a project in there, that was Columbia from 8th to Gateway Drive, that got moved from the short-term to the mid-term on your list but you just said that there weren't enough projects in the short-term. Haugen responded that that is correct and added that he explained why that was shifted; the first thing they did was to coincide with the Point Bridge, they moved the Point Bridge up from your list of mid-term into the short-term and moved the project that was the next one up on the list to the mid-term, and then after they made that change they discovered the federal availability of fund remaining so they didn't go back and shift that project back up they instead just filled in the short-term gap that they saw. Kuharenko asked what the short-term time-band years covered were. Haugen responded that it covers 2023 to 2027. He added that there were a couple of projects that were in the T.I.P. that weren't in there. Kuharenko agreed that they had the North Columbia, 8th to Gateway, project in 2027 and the Point Bridge in 2028, so you moved the 2028 up to 2027. Haugen responded that they did switch those two projects around, one from mid-term to short-term and one from short-term to mid-term. Kuharenko said, though that based on what you are saying there wasn't a need to do that because of the available funds. Haugen responded that afterwards, yes, there wasn't a need to do that and he mentioned that in his response yesterday morning to you that we can shift that North Columbia project back up, and then you will create a funding gap in the mid-term so we have to fill projects in the mid-term, and we would just be shifting the ones from the short-range to the mid-term to another slot back; so the first iteration is.

Grasser asked how big of a boundary is that between the time lines; he believes those timelines, short, mid and long term are meant to be guidance so we can generally characterize that; he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

doesn't know that there is a brick wall, is there, that prevents you from having that money that may migrate between say the short-term and the mid-term. Haugen responded that there is a fiscal constraint brick wall with each time-band otherwise we would load all of our stuff up in the front of each.

Grasser commented that he doesn't think that that is a proper characterization of the way we would handle that. He said that he guesses what we are talking about is if we have one project that may bleed a million or so between one program or another, is that a reason to totally take a project out of one band to another. He added that maybe he might be asking Mr. Johnson that question; that those mid-term may be that part of a boundary that we can't deal with that flexibility. Johnson responded that he has been following along here, but it cuts in and out sometimes so could Mr. Grasser please repeat the question.

Grasser said that the question is; the argument he thinks is there is a shifting of projects because one can't be fully contained within one time-band versus the other, short-term versus mid-term, and is that boundary between, in this case mid-term, short-term such a brick wall that a project can't migrate between those two bands. Johnson responded that, well it is a brick wall he thinks in terms of what Mr. Haugen is referring to for fiscal constraint analysis, and trying to determine how much money you are getting for these five years to these next ten years to these ten years or whatever it may be, you have to have some sort of limiting boundary so that you can get through the top list and go through the analysis. He said that as the plan gets developed, and as the plan goes forward then it becomes a discussion of, maybe we need to do an amendment to move some things around; priorities change, ideas shift, and maybe money becomes available; but he wouldn't say a brick wall is the appropriate term, but there is a line in order to note that, well typically the amount of funding based on the information that they have written out today that we think we will have available in this time-band, these are the prioritized projects within that time-band, if something doesn't fit then it gets moved to the next time-band, the other option is if you don't want to look at that, and it is primarily a local decision, then you keep it in that short time-band but it is an illustrative unfunded project.

Grasser commented that even if that action has us come up short, then, in the mid-term because the project is showing up in the short-term. He explained that if they were going to do a project in the year 2027, which is the end of the short-term time-band, if we put it in as an illustrative, and expect to spend the money, that's going to, then, goof up our mid-term because we would be taking it out of the mid-term and putting it into a short-term illustrative project. Johnson responded that that is potentially true, but it would depend on what money are you using to fund it; if it is a priority change and you wanted to fund it with known and expected dollars, then yes it would mess up even the priority of your short-term and the early end of your mid-term; the other case it could be is you get a non-expected funding source like a grant award that comes out of nowhere and isn't part of your fiscal constraint then it wouldn't necessarily affect that.

Grasser said, then, that conversely if we wanted to take that short-term and put it in the mid-term, but wanted to do it right away in the mid-term can we have leftover dollars in the short-term to make sure we cover it right away in the mid-term. Johnson responded that that would be a local decision, there is no oversight guidance that you have to do this or you have to do that, it would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

really be a preference on how the local jurisdiction is working with the MPO to determine your fiscal constraint analysis.

Grasser stated that what he is hearing on the list is that we need to do it that way. He added that it feels like; what he thinks he is hearing is that we have a certain amount of flexibility to do certain projects within a time-band, but then after that we have to find projects that fit the cash flow instead of what they think is the fiscal and local community need and desire. He said that he might be misinterpreting that but he thinks that that is the end result; if we have a five-year time-band and we have to try to line up our dollars perfectly at the beginning and the end we are going to be pretty restricted as to what kind of projects we can do. Johnson responded that that, in general terms, that is the essence of planning and fiscal constraint, it goes through all those analyses to discern how much money we have available based on trends and projected future revenue, and that that is what we can afford to spend and plan for.

Kuharenko said, let me ask you this question; and given the list that the City had provided initially; Mr. Haugen ended up mentioning that we are short on projects, essentially; are there any issues with kind of leaving money on the table, in the plan. Johnson responded there wasn't. He added that you can show that you have more revenue than projects in a time-band, again that is a local decision, and he knows that the Bismarck MPO has done that in the past, although he doesn't remember what the reasoning behind it was, but that is what they did. Grasser asked how does that local decision reflect in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan, when we are doing project lists. He said that he is trying to figure out; if we go back to our original discussion Mr. Haugen said we had left over money so he is proposing filling in projects that take that money towards projects, and which dislocates a project that they had been planning on doing, maybe a couple; and how does that local decision then enter into the Long Range Transportation Plan when they are doing lists of projects; you said it is a local decision but how do we reflect that in the Long Range Transportation Plan, do we simply locate projects. Johnson responded that what he said was that it is a local decision working through the MPO; the MPO takes the lead and develops a plan but it is a plan of its jurisdictions from a transportation perspective, including all elements, so through that process, working through revenue and providing projects.

Haugen commented that he has already stated that they can move that project back into the short-term and then we would be moving projects out of the short-range to the mid-term. Grasser stated that he is still struggling with \$14 million dollars in federal dollars and \$28 million dollars of local dollars, it seems like we are capturing local dollars into that timeframe that the City has represented to its citizens some of these dollar resources that we have available, they have to serve 100+ miles of local streets plus our classified, so we have to make sure there is enough dollars in there to cover things just on the classified street system, and that is why when representing that and we know we are short of money, we did that list of projects, with 150 projects, and we said that if we have federal money we would do reconstruction but if we have local we can't afford to do a reconstruction so we would have to do maintenance activities, so the way the MPO is generating a list that calls for reconstruction, he doesn't know how we can afford those; again it isn't clear to him how the fiscal constraint works and the concern is that we are capturing local dollars that need to be applied and controlled locally under the MPO's umbrella, that is really what the crux of this is. Haugen said, then, that you have moved off of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

the federal aid list to the rest of the federal aid projects and which ones they've prioritized through the prioritization tool we would show on the list of projects that are 100% local funded.

Grasser asked if Mr. Haugen was asking a question or making a statement, he asked for clarification. Haugen responded that they provided two spreadsheets; the first one was the one federal aid, and for the federal aid they accounted for the federal revenue coming in, and all of the City match available to the short-term, mid-term, and long-term bands; and then they costed out what those federal aid projects were, plus the additional City costs, to say that we have this much federal funds, we are giving right around 73% to 74% match to the year of expenditure costs, and we still have all these City, and we aren't going to get a perfect 80/20 or 70/30 split with a five-year band so we came up with 73; and that left about \$15 to \$16 million dollars in the short-term of revenue available that was 100% City Sales Tax dollars, and we still have to show that our federal aid system is being maintained, and we had a list of projects from the tool that were prioritized, so we used that list to show the projects that fit the fiscal constraint available in these time-bands.

Grasser said that he thinks that the issue is; you're going through a detailed explanation of how you arrived at what you did, but the issue is that they submitted their list based on the understanding or the philosophy of what was going on back in May; then three weeks ago they basically get a new list generated from the MPO without their understanding of how it arrived and they tried to get some clarification; quite frankly he still isn't clear, you're talking 74% but he is still, the bottom line on your spreadsheet had \$14 million dollars in federal money and \$28 million dollars in City money; he can get to about a 70/30, but its 70 local and 30 federal, so he is still confused as to how we have that extra money available because he doesn't believe they have the federal dollars; and that is what he would like to see a more detailed layout, where are the federal dollars when you can match those with local dollars, but if there are other project that are basically 100% local then those should be on a different list, and his preference is that they shouldn't be on an MPO list at all; they have explained in a memo how they go through their decision making in finding local projects. He stated that, again, the problem is that they have many many more needs than they have dollars so they have to be flexible as to how they react to those; Washington Street is a good example, this spring no one predicted that it was going to fall apart the way it did in that short of time-band, and kudos to the State in moving that up, but it is an example and they have other streets like that and they will have even more streets like that next spring, unfortunately he can't tell which ones they will be, but he knows there will be some, so, again, they have to be able to react to that at a local level and make those local decisions and those pots of dollars have to be left to the local to decide how they should be used. Haugen responded that that is why there were two spreadsheets; one showing projects with federal aid and the other spreadsheet was showing what is left, and these are projects that came out of our prioritization tool.

Grasser stated that he is going to apologize; we will just simply stop this conversation because nobody knows what we are really talking about, they don't have most of it, but again you are submitting projects we haven't going through, philosophically, and in more detail where the dollars; again, he hears what you are saying but he still goes back to the spreadsheet that says we have \$14 million dollars of federal money available, we've got \$28 million dollars of local

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

money applied to it; he can't rectify that in his mind how that is a federal aid, federally funded project at 74% federal dollars. Haugen responded that it is because there is unassigned, left-over \$15 to \$16 million dollars out of that \$28 million that isn't listed on any of the projects in the spreadsheet, that is why there was a second spreadsheet to show how that \$15 to \$16 million could be prioritized for projects to use.

Grasser said, then, that the question is, with City staff not understanding or being able to validated exactly what is going on here, he doesn't know how we move a document forward that has the questions that he still has in his head; he can't validate, from his position the City Engineer, that the plan that the MPO is producing is basically going to fit into, at least from a philosophical mode, that the City Council has gone with their six-year CIP Plan. He said that there are dollars that have to go towards expansion, there are dollars that are going to have to go towards local projects, not all of those dollars, and he isn't sure if you did this, but his concern is that they can't allocate an undue amount of dollars only to the federal aid system, and only towards reconstruction, when he is short of dollars and he can do a mill and overlay project at 1/7th or 1/8th of 1/10th of the cost of reconstruction, we aren't going to be able to do reconstruction, and that is what they reflected back, and that is now shown in the illustrative list, that they have been doing locally with the maintenance, if they have federal dollars they will do reconstruction, but if the federal dollars aren't there we shouldn't be mixing that argument in that they become reconstruction, it isn't capturing the argument correctly. He said that he is afraid that that is what he is seeing in the lists, and really preceding the lists there should have been probably a more detailed philosophical discussion about how we capture those local dollars into that, and how do we do it consistently throughout all the jurisdictions. He added that, quite frankly he would still be more comfortable, as this is going to move through the system, and he thinks that in your document you have the MPO list, and quite frankly he would rather, if it has to be changed it has to be changed, but he would rather start with the base document using the original list that the City of Grand Forks submitted, and he thinks that is a better basis in which to move ahead, he would rather understand and document why we are changing that as opposed to us arguing why the MPO needs to change their plan back towards ours, so he would ask that that be considered, as a starting point for us to have the ability, because, again the philosophy that they put into that document he thinks we can support and move forward and keep this document moving forward otherwise he doesn't know if; in his mind he can't say that the document can move forward in its current form.

Haugen said that that is an option that is certainly available to this discussion; another one is that the Technical Advisory Committee is making a recommendation and we have seven days to meet and work out and identify that federal aid list and give you the opportunity to understand what is all behind it. Grasser stated that he would rather have that meeting from a basis that we are starting out with their list and then we can see what needs to change, and how much money may be left over in the time-bands and have some of those discussion, he would be more comfortable doing that than moving the document forward because, he has to be honest, that as a staff they have been simply overwhelmed lately as they have lost some key people and they are simply overwhelmed with being able to respond to project lists from the Urban Program, HSIP, and others, and he isn't sure that they are necessarily against all of them, they just don't always understand them and they aren't able to react, so hopefully they have some of that understanding,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

but in the end we have a document that we are trying to move forward. Haugen commented that if they use the City's original list we would have a mis-match of the Point Bridge, so it would seem silly for them to produce a document that shows Minnesota funding the Point Bridge in the short-term and North Dakota funding it in the mid-term, so that is one small problem. Grasser said that he thinks that can be corrected, but now that we have a better understanding of the constraints and rules that are going into these lists that we maybe didn't understand earlier, he thinks we may be able to do some other shifting within our other projects and that we can deal with it but in a manner that is probably more consistent with their original list.

Grasser stated that they are certainly going to do the Point Bridge and coordinate it with Minnesota, that is going to happen, it is a matter of how, then, we shuffle projects to meet the financial rules as we think we understand them today.

Haugen commented that the second thing that will happen is if you move that North Columbia project up to the short-term range, you have now created an unallocated funding revenue in the mid-term on the North Dakota side Urban Road Program. Williams said, though, that that is allowed, correct. Kuharenko said that that is something he asked Mr. Johnson earlier so that isn't necessarily an issue.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GIVE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE DRAFT 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO MODIFYING THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS' URBAN ROAD FUND ALLOCATION BACK TO THE CITY'S ORIGINAL PROPOSAL, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF MOVING THE POINT BRIDGE PROJECT IN LINE WITH MINNESOTA'S PROJECT TIMELINE.

Haugen stated that as we move the Point Bridge again a project has move out, there will be some rescoping of the project that needs to be done on the short-list. Kuharenko responded that there wouldn't be if we go back to what they originally sent over because you ended up having those six or seven projects, which was equivalent to that Columbia Road project, so there will likely be unallocated funding in the mid-term; which may be something that will be up for discussion.

Bergman asked how this relates back to the sales tax funds that they are going to use for roads, because that is the question that if you turn around and do projects that are outside the scope that you told the public you were going to use it for; he would hate to be on the short end of that stick because somebody will probably club you; the citizens won't go for it; that is what he is curious about.

Grasser commented that that, philosophically that is kind of where they are leading to with this thing, that they have to make sure that they haven't tied too many of their local sales tax and other dollars into these specific projects that leave other projects unaddressed, because Mr. Bergman is right; and that is his big concern too because they made a lot of representations with the sales tax as far as being able to get to various roads and to the local roads and they need to make sure that they don't create a document that conflicts with that. He said that he agrees

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

100% with Mr. Bergman that that is part of the issue, that the local has to stay as a local allocation because they made a lot of representations to the voters and to the City Council, so we need to make sure that those things are not in conflict with each other. Kuharenko said that that is one of the reasons that he was asking whether or not we should end up just removing that list of projects that are local funding only, just because of that concept. Haugen stated, though, that in order for the federal funds to flow we still need to show that the federal aid system is being maintained, so in order to get the federal funds we spend them on projects and then some federal aid systems won't be maintained; the feds want to see that their investment is being maintained, so that is where some of those local dollars get rolled in to making sure that the rest of the federal aid can still come in because we are maintaining the federal aid system.

Williams asked what would happen if we didn't have the sales tax, and there weren't any dollars there. Haugen responded that there would be a lot more projects off the list. Bergman commented that that was what he was thinking, because the citizens voted for the sales tax to do their roads, they didn't say you could take those funds and use them on rebuilding an overpass or anything like that, they want their roads fixed, and they don't care what the federal dollar portion of it is, that's what he is getting at, you can't be making a list guaranteeing that we are going to take "x" amount of dollars off of the sales tax because he thinks you are going to have a real problem with the citizens. Haugen responded that there is a significant part of that sales tax set aside for operation and maintenance. Bergman asked what is the operations and maintenance though, they had it before in their plans. Haugen stated that it is significantly increased now with the sales tax. Grasser said, though, that again, philosophically, if he understands what you're telling him, if we are going to get federal dollars we have to first prioritize all of our local resources towards that pivotal system after you spend nothing of the local system, is that what Federal Highway is telling us. Haugen responded that that isn't what they are telling us because some of your federal aid system is in that State of Good Repair already, it doesn't need investments, so there are still local dollars available to invest in the local system. Grasser stated that he isn't sure there are very many left with, and we haven't really talked about the second list, but there is one list that addresses what they think should be federal eligible projects and there is another list that the MPO has identified to get to all those projects in yellow on the map; and again those are reconstruction activities which, again, they haven't had a chance to go through, nor will he have a chance to go through it and agree on what what the other allocations are going to be, but, again they can't be in a position where all of those dollars end up on just those few streets.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Johnson.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson

Grasser said that he thinks that with this there was reference to that other list of local dollars; again, without going through it all again, he is uncomfortable with that list representing more resources; than what would be left to address the rest of their system. He stated that his

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

preference, quite frankly on that one is to delete that list at this point in time and rebuild it as opposed to trying to modify it as it sits, and then at our upcoming meeting we can talk about how they are going to do that, and, again, he would rather build that list from the ground up as opposed to debating which ones; there are some processes that are represented in that list.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE REMOVING THE SECOND LIST FOR REBUILDING PURPOSE,. AND DISCUSSION IN THE FUTURE.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Johnson.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson

Johnson commented that he apologizes because he usually participates in these over the phone because he isn't able to get there all the time, and he doesn't necessarily catch all the comments and all the questions, but he has been involved in enough of these to know that all of this stuff with funding and projects and what is going to go where has come up several times at these meetings and there seems to be a common comment and discussion on; well we're not sure if we've really dug into that enough or whether or not everything is clear or everything is understood, his concern is that we've gotten to the very end of this, and there is a reason he abstained from both of those votes, is because he doesn't think that we're done here. He said that the bottom line is that if the MPO doesn't get this plan approved in January your TIPs are frozen and no projects are getting done, whether its transit or roadway, so, wielding whatever oversight privileges he does have from afar, you guys need to get in the same room and figure this out; having these conversations at the Technical Advisory Committee meetings now is too much information to go over and it sounds like its too late and there needs to be some sort of effort from all parties to make sure that this gets ironed out; he has heard the same thing over and over again, and we're not getting anywhere. He stated that he is being very direct, and probably a little harsh here, and he doesn't know if there is hope here, but we need to get moving.

Grasser stated that he thinks from the City's side they agree, and not to point fingers everywhere around, but we tend to get to this eleventh hour thing, he thinks we had it with the last Long Range Transportation Plan also; and we need to figure out a plan that does not leave some of these things until the end. He said that, again, from their standpoint they find themselves pretty much overwhelmed delivering projects and bids and things like that, which shouldn't be the best excuse, but it is the reality of where they are at, so they are having an awful time reacting at this hour, but they are certainly willing to meet and get through it and try to understand what it is. Haugen agreed that it is likewise for the MPO.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

Haugen stated that you did have a request, originally we wanted to have your next two year work program to the MPO by the end of September, now after today's meeting if you can get in a request to us we can get the next two year work program out. He added that that also has another deadline that if we don't get our draft document to our State and Federal partners it starts to stop the flow of federal funds, so we have a request out for those next two years of some project ideas, and we need them documented and showing how our work program is fiscally constrained as well.

Bergman commented that transit already said that they needed that one study moved up, do you need an actual written document stating that. Haugen responded that it does need to go to your council and show that there is a full political support behind doing that study, and that the local match is being provided.

Haugen suggested that Mr. Gengler and Mr. Grasser may also have some projects that they would like to see included, and the council would probably rather see one staff report with all three departments' requests instead of three separate ones so you might want to get together to discuss this.

b. Solicitation Of Transportation Alternative Projects For Both States And SR2S In Minnesota

Haugen reported both States have their "TAP" program solicitations out. He added that each State has a slightly different process, and slightly different timeline, and a slightly different year of funding availability. He said that the major change that he is aware of is that North Dakota has two years being solicited for for the first time ever, normally it is one year at a time, so that is the major change on the North Dakota side for the TAP program.

Haugen commented that Minnesota does have a State funded Safe Routes To School program outside of the TAP funding, and that is also open for applications.

c. Railroad Crossing Solicitation

Haugen stated that since the agenda went out the Railroad Crossing on the North Dakota side solicitation has taken place.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

d. Urban Grant Program

Haugen reported that just yesterday we received access to a website for the Urban Grant Program. He asked Mr. Johnson is that means it is now open for solicitation. Johnson responded that it is open for solicitation.

Bergman asked if this was FTA funds. Haugen responded that the Urban Grant is the “Main Street” program.

Haugen said that they are still waiting for the regular Urban and Regional Roads solicitation. Johnson responded that he believes those will be out either later this week or early next week.

e. CAV Workshop

Haugen commented that we notified you via e-mail of an October 22nd opportunity here in East Grand Forks on Minnesota’s Connected and Automated Vehicle study that is taking place. He stated that there is an RSVP link that you can register individually for, and if you are able to attend it will be in the Training Conference Room at 5:00 p.m.

f. Electric ?? Corridor Nominations

Haugen stated that there was also an e-mail sent out for Electric Charging Stations or Alternative Fuel stations) Corridor Nominations, so look at your e-mails to find out more about getting a corridor designated for electric vehicles or other alternative fuels..

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KKHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE
OCTOBER 10TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:40 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the November 14th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); Allen Grasser (Proxy for David Kuharenko), Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Brad Bail, Nick West, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Jane Williams, David Kuharenko, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Brandon Bourdon, Kimely-Horn; and Scott Mereck, WSB.

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

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that Mr. Bergman is on his way, however until he reports present we do not have a quorum, thus he would like to suspend the agenda in order to discuss those agenda items that do not need action.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON MN220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY

Viafara referred to the staff report included in the packet and pointed out that it indicates that the purpose of this presentation is to provide information on the Steering Committee and how it was formed. He stated that these members of the community and businesses on the corridor have indicated their desire to participate as members of the Steering Committee. He added that the committee will be meeting at 4:30 p.m. tomorrow in this room to present a presentation from the consultant to discuss the existing and future conditions of the corridor.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Viafara commented that we know about the boundaries and the extent of the corridor, including the nine intersections that make up the entire corridor. He said that items that the consultant has been discussing and reviewing are venues, because most of the new development patterns are kind of gearing towards north of 23rd, or at least in this particular quadrant of the City. He added that they like to understand more about the roadway conditions, each of the crossings with traffic lights, with access to the service roads, and then an analysis of the configuration of the infrastructure, how is the pavement and all of the indicators of the quality of the infrastructure.

Viafara stated that if we notice roadway access is something very important because in this particular corridor, based on the comments by the consultant, roadway access is kind of irregular in the sense that the access points are not really regular, so that is something that we sense some kind of a challenge in terms of land use and also in terms of access to the service roads and also to the neighboring or abutting communities.

Viafara said that one thing with the assessment, it is important for us, a number of intersections are completely uncontrolled; we have a couple of the schools related land uses and from a safety point of view, and also considering the high volume of heavy trucks; we have recently the City of East Grand Forks built a multi-use path around one of the medians on the north side of Center Avenue.

Viafara commented that the last point that the consultant are studying is the forecasted traffic demand. He said that this is important because as values and volumes increases and new households and new businesses and new activities are being now fostered around these particular areas the consultant has made available a tech memo that in case.

Viafara stated that the overall background and objectives of the study are the ones that review the land uses; and particularly mobility, access and safety. He said that there is the need to evaluate the corridor, review the kind of geometrics of the roadway on 20th Street and north of 17th Street; and also consideration to see what exactly what kind of treatment will be given to Central once it crosses north over 23rd Avenue to reduce the number of lanes.

Viafara said that one of the other objectives is access and the last is the treatment of multimodal pedestrian activity, safety or related to that.

Viafara reported that at the end, what the MPO and the City of East Grand Forks and MnDOT expect to have is a report that will address a number of infrastructure recommendations, what kind of improvements, the cost of those improvements if they were to be advanced with the demands, and kind of an implementation and programming for that particular kind of recommendations.

Viafara stated that these are some of the issues that they have been discussing; the presence of heavy trucks, particularly during the harvest season. He said that if we take into account now the numbers are in the percentage of 8%, so in theory when we do kind of forecast in theory, it is becoming closer to the outer limit because when we compare the capacity and volume then the issue of public streets and private access, what kind of volumes are we expecting in terms of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

levels of congestion and a number of intersections, 17th is one of them, US #2 is another; so what kind of deficiency, most of the deficiencies appear to be located around the intersection of US #2, that's where we find a number of accidents and more congestion.

Viafara said that another analysis is the type of safety in terms of the analysis of the numbers, the type and seriousness of the number of crashes and traffic accidents that appear in these intersections.

Viafara commented that, important for us, as you can see these are the parcels where most of the plan, we may call them sub-areas, that is where future development will most likely take place around the corridor, so the corridor has quite an impact on access to this space. He added that they will also look at lane reductions north of 23rd and frontage road access.

Viafara stated that there is something that sometimes can escape, but is also the locations, has been an analysis of the locations of some of the bus stops; because some of those are on the road, and impede movement.

Viafara reported that this is basically what the consultant will be discussing tomorrow, and most likely then we may have some kind of public outreach through the Herald tomorrow inviting people to attend public meetings that are scheduled for the month of December.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON US 2/US 81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY

Haugen commented that this item is for discussion/information purposes. He said that they did do the RFP for the U.S. #2/U.S. #81 Skewed Intersection Study and Ms. Kouba will give us an update.

Kouba reported that they put this RFP out towards the end of September and received the proposals in October. She stated that they received two proposals and held interviews on November 1st. She said that the Selection Committee did select KLJ to do the study.

Kouba explained that KLJ introduced a lot of smaller scaled options in addition to the larger, move the entire road kind of options. She said that they seemed to want to be able to give us a scalable idea of alternatives throughout the whole corridor, and they stuck pretty much to the tasks we requested, although they did introduce a couple of options that the Steering Committee just wasn't interested in, but we are going with what we requested through the RFP.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet was the detailed Scope of Work with the timeline and the hours. He added that this will be going forward to the MPO Executive Policy Board for execution of a contract with KLJ.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Grasser commented that he likes the idea that we are looking at a host of alternatives instead of just going with the Grand Slam one that has a low probability of happening, so he is glad to see that.

Information only.

Bergman reported present.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared that with Mr. Bergman reporting present we now have a quorum.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 10TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 10TH,
2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2019-2020 UPWP

Haugen reported that this is our next two-year work program, so we aren't finishing up the last year of our last two-year work program, we are starting with a new two-year work program.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that a complete draft was included for your review. He said that he will kind of go in reverse order and begin with the identified funding availability by year.

Haugen commented that generally we are getting about half a million dollars in appropriations each year of our targeted funding grant, which is made up of federal funds that come from both the Minnesota side and the North Dakota side. He added that we typically also have some carry over from the previous year; just with the last two studies we just talked about, we just started them this year, we will finish them next year, so the previous year's consolidated planning grant funds are going toward those projects primarily. He said that we do also get a small amount of regular Minnesota State monies that is used to match the federal funds we receive, and then for the Mn220 North Study, MnDOT has agreed to provide local match towards that effort and on the US #2/US #81 Intersection study NDDOT is offering some local match funds as well; so that would be our 2019 revenue.

Haugen pointed out that for 2020 we do not show previous year carry-over, but we do show that half a million in funds; and then since we are not formally asked for or reached an agreement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

with either state for special studies to help with local match we don't have those additional local match options coming in as well.

Haugen reported that with that funding we do have categories of regular required MPO work activities that we have to do on an annual basis; including program administration which keeps the office open and the lights on, getting our work program and finances managed, etc; and then we also do our program support where we have our coordination activities taking place; public participation, education and training, and some of our equipment. He stated that when we get into individual studies, that is the largest part of our budget, and in 2019 we are basically finishing up on our 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, and there are some performance targets that we will have to visit; and in 2019 Safety is the primary one, so we did set aside some dollars, but again not as heavy as we have been in the last several years in making sure our transportation plan is updated because after this year we should have an up-to-date transportation plan.

Haugen stated that more funds were available this year to look at corridor studies; we've already had a couple start and they are underway; the downtown parking plan is a carry-over; US 2 US 81 and the Mn 220 North Corridor ones are carryover studies. He added that we do have the ATAC Traffic Counting Program where we are looking at our video systems and then counting traffic, so this category is maintaining the cost of those performance items.

Haugen commented that the one new item that we are identifying to start in 2019 is the Downtown Transportation Plan. He said that they have had a lot of discussion on this as we went through the RFP, and it ended up being the Parking Plan last year. He stated that they are being asked to take a look at the issues along DeMers Avenue through both Grand Forks and also in East Grand Forks as MnDOT has done, as part of last year's work, a mobility study statewide and this segment of DeMers Avenue was one of the locations in Northwest Minnesota that they have identified as having mobility issues; and that brought it into a position where they have some special funding that could come up with solutions. He said that there is a pot of money that we could quickly get some program taking place in the area of the Minnesota Side of East Grand Forks, and so the work program is essentially setting aside the information that we are going to work on the transportation issue between the downtowns, we've set aside a budget and the details of what the actual RFP will be and all the other things involved with this study will be worked out as we go through the RFP process, so they are setting the budget amount and will iron out the scope of work for the project through the RFP process.

Grasser asked, you said that a request was made to do this plan, who made that request. Haugen responded that the Grand Forks City's Administration Office, and then MnDOT on the Minnesota side. Grasser asked if he could get that correspondence sent to him. Grasser stated that he knows that there were quite a few e-mails going back and forth, looking at trying to get the downtown thing going, and there were a lot of open-ended questions like what you are talking about, kind of the same ones we've had since the original scope of work was done six or eight months ago, and he thinks with those open-ended questions; he knows that that hadn't gone on to the City Council for approval, so he is a little confused as to what the approving mechanism is for some of these projects, he thought they had to be City Council approved.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Haugen responded that generally the answer is yes, they do have to have City Council approval, but this particular one they had MnDOT already on board, and the administration; even talking with Mr. Feland, he saw the e-mail and he wasn't sure if that was something that he was supposed to get onto a staff report, or if someone else was doing the staff report, but in the end he said that they want to move forward with doing this transportation portion of the downtown planning activity, so that is why you are still seeing it here. He stated that this is based on the last communication that was exchanged; it wasn't on the staff report that City Council approved.

Haugen reported that also, under Special Studies, Cities Area Transit has asked that in 2019 we take a look at the UND Shuttle System, and the potential for them to operate it. He stated that the other thing we put some funds toward are further implementation of performance measures and targets, and even though we have some funds in the plan update, there are still some rules and activities that are coming out of FAST that we are trying to address and capture in this area.

Haugen commented that in 2020 we shift the focus away from that true transportation component and are starting back up under the land use component, so you will see that a large portion of our funds are reserved now in our Land Use Category, and we do have East Grand Forks and Grand Forks starting their 2050 Land Use Plan updates. He said that the believe is that we will probably be able to complete East Grand Forks' plan by the end of 2020 but the Grand Forks plan will probably move into 2021 for completion.

Haugen explained that the body of the text kind of goes into those things, and a little more information but still not enough for a lot of these to issue out an RFP or contract someone with a scope of work on. He stated that the other important piece is; even though we are just now finishing up our transportation plan for 2045, this work program needs to show our federal partners and state partners how we are progressing toward our 2050 update, and so in here; he didn't mention the one piece of Regional ITS Architecture, so in 2019 we will have ATAC so a Regional ITS Architecture update. He added that one of the big updates that will happen this go-around will be the beginnings of the integration of connected automobiles, connected and automated vehicle component of the ITS, and in 2020 we will start the Land Use Plan updates and in 2021 we will do our Bike/Ped and our Transit elements, and in 2022 and 2023 we will focus on Street and Highway and wrap-up so that by the end of 2023 we can give our state and federal partners up to 30 days before the end of our 5-year cycle, so that is why you see January 31st, 2024 as the end of the 5-year cycle.

Haugen commented that we also have to make sure that we are covering the emphasis areas of Federal Highway and Federal Transit. He said they are continuing to emphasis the ladder of opportunity; also performance based planning and regional planning cooperation so you will see language in our work program kind of identifying how we are addressing the emphasis areas. He added that these emphasis areas were established in 2016, and typically they are annual renewals of new emphasis areas, but since 2016 the agency did not release any new emphasis areas, and are just saying to continue to use the latest released emphasis areas, so that is what this document is doing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Haugen stated that this has been a brief overview of the work program, the major activities that are taking place during it, the financial components on it; the local match has been fairly consistent, around \$60,000 from both communities, so that should remain the same, but there should be a little bit more state match coming in for those specific studies discussed.

Grasser commented that he is trying to understand; when he looks at the document there is a lot of work products in it, many of which have not gone through City Council; and he understands where a lot are probably more of a routine type thing, but he is trying to understand what are things that aren't approved by City Council ahead of time, he thinks ultimately, one way shape or form this document will get approved back to the Executive Policy Board, correct; but he is just trying to understand what things actually need a specific council action, and maybe which don't, which are considered routine or operational, is there a way of clarifying that for the future; which ones actually need specific City Council approval on. Haugen responded that for us to put them in the work program that would be specific corridor studies that the City wants initiated. He added that we do also have State Agencies that can make requests, those probably wouldn't; like MnDOT seeking East Grand Forks' concurrence on the Downtown, he doesn't know if they are required to, so a State Agency can ask for us to do a study.

Haugen stated that the components like ITS Regional Architecture, that is a routine thing that the MPO is required to have so we wouldn't seek City Council approval to do something like that; the T.I.P. is the same thing. He added that the counting program was approved many years ago and it is a continuing program, so similar things to this program would not be approved by the City Council; nor would the Bike/Ped or Transit plans, they are required elements.

Haugen said that the Land Use Plans are an example of what we would ask each City whether or not they would like our assistance in updating, so they would go through their City Councils. He added that special studies for Cities Area Transit would go through the council for approval, which is what we have done for the UND Shuttle project. He said that after 2020, if we do take over UNDs shuttle program we would look at the route structure as well.

Haugen asked if there were any other questionable documents or projects that Mr. Grasser would like verification on. Grasser responded that he would just like to have something, again maybe there is a list or something that we could produce showing those that are routine type things, or where they might come from that otherwise don't need council action. He stated that he is looking at this and there are a lot of work and studies in here and he is just trying to differentiate which ones need council action and which ones don't and where they come from. He said that, again, he doesn't have a big problem with most of them, all of them make sense, but he is, again, just confused as to which ones; sometimes you articulate it verbally, but he needs a piece of paper or something at some point to show which ones need council action and which don't just so he has clarity and they can talk to staff if something is on the list that they hadn't talked about before, or if it is considered a routine type item.

Ellis asked if Mr. Grasser has issue with the studies that are in the work program currently. Grasser responded that he has a concern on the Downtown Transportation Plan study, that is probably the only one that he really; again there are a lot of studies on here that haven't gone

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

through City Council, so he is just kind of asking the question, where did they come from. He added that it sounds like there are a couple of different categories; kind of routine or other agency requests, and sometimes it is hard to tell when you look at this just where they came from to see if they are just work products that don't have an apparent source that goes through their city council, so that is what he is looking at. Ellis asked if Mr. Grasser would like to have this item suspended and brought back in December, or to give it preliminary approval provided that you get the list that you are asking for, because she is just wondering what type of a motion he would prefer so that we can move this forward. Grasser responded that he doesn't need a motion on it necessarily, he is just looking for clarity and maybe a follow-up, again, just kind of listing how these things end up in the work program, not necessarily even a line-by-line, but what instigates work products that show up in here that didn't go through city council. Ellis responded that she understands that, but she is just saying that in order to move this matter along because Mr. Haugen is looking for approval of the work program, so do you want it suspended to the next meeting. Haugen commented that the ramifications of suspending this and moving it to December is that it impacts our cash flow in January because the Feds still have up to 30-days to comment on it, so if we don't submit anything to them until December 19th when the MPO Executive Policy Board would next meet, if the Feds wait the 30-days allowed, from January 1st through the 15th we would have no federal funding ability to off-set those costs, so that is why we are seeking approval today, to allow that 30-day review and if there need to be adjustments made in December there is time to do so and hopefully there are just small things to tidy-up. Grasser responded that it isn't so much about this one, but he is looking to understand this better for the future so instead of being at the 11th hour like we are, and having questions about where things come up and not having time to really go into them like we are just articulating right now he is trying to get ahead of that curve, and so he just thinks some clarity about how that works because they are going to have some new staff members on the Grand Forks side, and if we can clarify some of these things for our staff in the future; he isn't suggesting that we should not move forward with this, but, again he is just trying to clarify in his mind, the downtown one is the one that he is kind of concerned with because he knows there were a lot of e-mails ahead of time about getting council approval, and council didn't approve it, so that is the one that he is a little bit concerned about and he thinks that probably the reason for that is some of the terms are a bit ambiguous, but if we can work through that in more detail through the scoping process then he thinks we are probably okay.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2019-2020 UPWP, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIST EXPLAINING WHAT DOES AND DOESN'T NEED CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WORK PROGRAM.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Williams Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2020-2023 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this is the next round of project solicitation for our 2020-2023 T.I.P. He stated that they announced pretty much all of the North Dakota programs, and this month is when we will initiate the Minnesota side. He added that there are a lot fewer programs on the Minnesota side so it is really impacting MnDOT State Trunk Highway and also if Polk County would ever want to use federal funds in our study area, which they never have yet to-date, they are on notice of those candidate project solicitation timelines.

Haugen stated that there was a deadline on the Transportation Alternatives on the Minnesota side, there were none submitted from our MPO area so we are off the hook on having to review them any time soon.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side there are two programs that are being announced; one is brand new and it is another round of FTA funding toward transit, and yes it does seem like we are doing a lot of FTA solicitation for transit, and it is unusual that we are doing this much as this will be our third solicitation when we normally have just one solicitation per year. He added that the other solicitation going on is the Recreational Trails program. He stated that it isn't formally announced by the North Dakota Park and Rec yet, but it officially starts December 1st, and the Technical Advisory Committee doesn't meet again until December so we are announcing that solicitation of the rec trails on the North Dakota side, and the applications are due the first of January.

Haugen reported that yesterday the MPO Minnesota Directors met with MnDOT and he thinks there is a solicitation that MnDOT Transit will be doing as well, so it seems like Transit is getting its share of funding.

Grasser asked, on the regional side, are they not taking applications for a particular year, or are they just not taking regional projects period. Haugen responded that they are not taking regional applications because of the four-year period ending in 2023, but they do like, and they still want that plus-one sense of what the 2024 project would be, it isn't formally being submitted for consideration, it is just kind of a heads up kind of what we are thinking might be our 2024 project a year from now; but otherwise they are not accepting applications for the Regional Program.

Grasser stated that they are actually are planning on getting a regional list approved at the local level, at the Grand Forks City level with the idea that we can then present something, perhaps, in the outyears, and/or if a decision comes later to request a project they won't miss the City Council's approvals, so they are kind of doing that just on a come, more or less. Haugen asked if this would be leu of, or in place of the traffic signals, because those are on the illustrative list. Grasser responded that they are still on the list, this would be a list for the regional and a list for the urban projects just like they would normally do, and so whenever we need to provide information of council approval of a document, it can't be submitted, but at least he wants to make sure they have the city council requirement covered, and so just to be proactive on that they are just going to create a list that their City Council has looked at and approve it makes

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

sense. Haugen asked if they were including the signals on this list because they aren't technically programmed. Grasser said they would be on the list, he just wants to be in the position that they have a list that all the other things that they have previously programmed are basically on the list, they are just adding to it.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT

Haugen reported that Scott and Brad are here today to give a brief presentation but first, in your staff report they have had some preliminary approval occur already at various agency levels; both planning commissions have given preliminary approval, Polk County Board of Commissioners have given preliminary approval, and it was presented at the East Grand Forks Working Session and the Grand Forks COW. He stated that they are moving things forward on to both City Councils on Monday and Tuesday evenings, so it is progressing through the month of November on schedule.

Haugen commented that they do have some new information for some Technical Advisory Committee members that haven't been able to attend or participate in those presentations, and that is what Mr. Mareck will go over now. He added that it has to do with the investment end of things; if you will recall at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting there was action taken, and this is sort of cleaning up what resulted from that action.

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

Presentation ensued.

Mareck commented that there is a federal rule that says the following projects are included in the transportation plan so the MPO must be financially constrained. He said that that means that we have to do a projection of all reasonable revenues at the federal level; both DOTs, North Dakota and Minnesota; both Cities, which have a variety of different revenue sources, Grand Forks obviously has the new sales tax and also at the county level where there is property taxes and other revenue sources; so doing kind of a baseline of what is currently being brought in from those sources and then projecting that out with some collaboration from those various agencies to make sure that the projections are reasonable. He referred to the "What Is Our Financial Plan" slide and explained that when they did all this they come up with an overall pie-chart showing those different sources in terms of what is available for the MPO plan.

Mareck referred to the Revenue Forecast slide and explained that this is a summary of the result of the process they went through. He stated that there are different funding sources that are tied to different programs; for instance for Safety there is a projection of about \$18 million in funding; for North Dakota Main Street, which is kind of the Downtown Urban Program that includes streetscaping, multi-modal, transit, bike/ped types of projects there is a projection of about \$19 million; for Interstate there is a projection of about \$10 million; for Other Federal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

there is a projection of about \$210 million; for State there is a projection of about \$20 million; for Local there is a project of about \$140 million; which gives us a total of about \$417 million in Highway Revenue funding.

Grasser asked if, and he knows it is late and it has been shown and articulated a number of times, but could they get the background of how the \$139.9 for local was arrived at. Haugen responded that Chapter 6 of the draft document details all of that. He added that that chapter isn't in the TAC packet but has been available on the website for the last month. Mareck added that there is a pretty detailed accounting of how all of those numbers were arrived at, so if there is something that isn't in the report that your interested in he is sure they could probably drill down further and get more information.

Mareck stated that we have that overall revenue projection that all of you were a part of developing, and they appreciate that participation; and the investment direction really kind of ties back to the goals, objectives and performance measures and targets that were established earlier in the process so a lot of that is detailed through federal law on certain things that the MPO has to invest in, and then we have specific measures and targets that are established for project areas, bridges, pavements, etc., where we have to meet certain performance targets for the overall system.

Mareck said that part of the investment direction also is obviously driven through public input; what elected officials, staff such as yourself, and citizens and what they want to see the MPO invest in. He stated that they did have a number of public meetings, website input, and other opportunities where people could provide input through this process.

Mareck commented that also looking back as State and Local plans, they've had comprehensive plans, State plans, County plans that set investment direction vision that the MPO is integrating into its overall process.

Mareck gave a little bit of an executive summary of what some of the emphasis areas are; again, at the federal level and also both DOTs, there is a real strong emphasis on preserving the exiting system, and a lot of that is just simply tied to the fact that there isn't enough revenue to do a lot of the fun expansion things that we would like to do and so maintain our bridges and our pavements in good condition so they are safe and are what our citizens expect is number one. He continued that we are also looking at maintaining the actual facilities themselves, on a national and regional system, which would be the Interstate System and the State Highway System; and then your high level County and City roadways. He stated that all of this is set forth federally by the FAST-ACT, which sets the federal framework and federal law that the MPO's follow.

Mareck referred to the Financial Planning Activity slide and explained that this is an example of some of the input they received for the investment direction at one of the public meetings. He went over the information briefly, and explained that they also had a methodology that kind of got into a little more detail tying our goal areas to the actual projects; and they attempted to assign scores to the projects and grading them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Mareck stated that another big consideration is inflation, so a dollar today will buy a lot more than a dollar will in the Year 2045, so there is a very significant decrease in the buying power of what we have today moving forward and that reduced, unfortunately the amount of project that we can include in the plan.

Mareck referred to the Current Revenue Scenario slide and explained that it is a screen shot of what ultimately came out of our planning process; the investment direction; the scoring of projects; the input from citizens, the TAC, and the MPO Board; and it shows that we have \$266 million of documented projects that are in the current revenue scenario which is what we also call a constrained plan, projects that we can afford to build. He added that, as you will recall he said earlier that we have a revenue of \$417 million, and he will explain in a minute why there is that discrepancy. He pointed out that there is \$5 million in Safety projects; \$39 million for the North Dakota Main Street program; \$29 million for the State of Good Repair – Interstate Program; and almost \$200 million for the State of Good Repair – Non-Interstate, which is your minor arterials and your State Highway System.

Mareck referred to the Current Revenue Scenario-Fiscal Constraint slide and explained that this is a pie chart that shows the discrepancy between the revenues on the left of \$417 million and what he just described on the previous slide of what is currently documented as far as actual projects for investment. He stated that there are two reasons for the discrepancy: first there are \$55 million of unallocated City of Grand Forks' local dollars that will be programmed through the City's CIP process; and second a big chunk of the discrepancy is tied to the Safety Projects, so on the North Dakota side there is a five-year safety program and this is a plan that goes out to the year 2045 so you have a discrepancy of what is committed on the safety program versus the horizon of the plan, so the MPO will be working with NDDOT and the communities on the west side of the river to, in the future, identify what safety projects there are that will utilize those revenues. He said that similarly, on the Minnesota side, we do have a State Safety program and a Polk County Safety program, however there has not been enough discussion to get to the point of actually documenting what the safety projects are for the East Grand Forks/Polk County MPO area, so those two factors are the reason for the gap in the investment versus the actual revenue.

Mareck commented that another big thing that we need to include in the plan, and this is intuitive, but we need to make sure that we are integrating the existing projects that are funded and programmed in the MPO T.I.P. into the plan; it is a requirement at the federal level that your existing T.I.P. program be consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, that is the reason we put the plan together, to build the projects. He referred to a slide that lists some of the projects that have recently been constructed that were part of the T.I.P. in 2017 and 2018, and some of the bigger projects that are coming up and moving forward in 2019 and 2020 and explained that all of the MPO's T.I.P. projects will be integrated into the new Long Range Plan.

Mareck referred to the Key Projects in MPO 2022 T.I.P. slide and explained that these are just a couple of projects that are coming up in the out-year of the T.I.P.; the US 2 and US Bus 2 Intersection Improvements project in Minnesota; and the Washington Street Underpass Reconstruction and the North Columbia Road Reconstruction in North Dakota.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Mareck stated that they also include in the plan kind of an executive summary of some of your larger investment projects, those that are \$5 million and greater, just to get a feel for where those larger investments are taking place. He referred to the next few slides and pointed out that they indicate where these projects are located in both Minnesota and North Dakota, and went over the information briefly.

Mareck explained that, drilling down just a little bit further into the actual program itself; at a very super high level the way that the investments were allocated again was; first allocating to basically the Interstate and the State Highway System, which would be the red roads on the following maps. He pointed out that on the Minnesota side those major improvements were on US #2, Bygland Road, Sorlie and Kennedy Bridges. He stated that on the North Dakota side, again focusing on the red roads, which would be I-29, DeMers, Washington, 32nd Avenue, Gateway Drive and the bridges on DeMers and Gateway Drive.

Mareck commented that there are a couple of projects that they wanted to bring to your attention that did not make it into the constrained or current revenue scenario; 32nd Avenue and also a State of Good Repair project on I-29 north of Gateway Drive. He stated that they do have some improvements on 32nd Avenue in the plan but there was a major reconstruction along 32nd Avenue in the Year 2045 that was scheduled but was not able to be included. Haugen added that the reconstruction of 32nd Avenue is in the mid-term in the plan. He said that there was a follow-up maintenance project that was identified in 2045 that didn't make the fiscal constraint, and it was at the last horizon year. He added that that is the same thing that is going on on Interstate, north of Gateway Drive, there is a project to maintain the interstate in the plan, it was that second project that was identified in 2045 that just got pushed down to the fiscal constraint, and that is what the two black lines are saying; that otherwise we were able to fund all of the requested State of Good Repair on the NHS system on the North Dakota side, except for these two 2045 identified follow-up projects that we just couldn't fiscally constrain.

Mareck said that, to that point, one thing to keep in mind is that the plan is required to be updated every five years, so that doesn't mean that these projects will never be able to be funded, federally, it is just that for this snapshot in time, at this point, there wasn't enough revenue to allocate funding to them.

Mareck commented that the other element of the plan that they would like to talk about are the local roads; the North Dakota Urban Local Roads Program got \$130 million dollars that was included in the investment of the current revenue scenario; so there is a variety of projects sprinkled around Grand Forks. He referred to a map showing where these projects are located and stated that he would like to thank the City of Grand Forks for providing a lot of the investment direction on those projects.

Mareck stated that, as we discussed earlier, the \$55 million on the local side that we will get from sales tax, is currently unallocated in the MPO plan, so those projects will be identified through the City's CIP process moving forward; and again we have documented about \$300 million dollars of potential projects where those monies could be utilized, so there is a large pool

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

of need out there, it is just a matter of working through them locally to determine how the community wants to invest their funds.

Grasser said that they are having a meeting on Monday to try to decipher some of the language that needs to be in this plan; but he is wondering if they can't also, on that slide, recognize that plus the unidentified, all of their local streets, are also unidentified need, correct. Haugen responded that they are trying to do it with the statement "additional dollars on the City Local System". He said that they have documented on the federal aid, but they haven't done anything on the local side, there aren't any dollar amounts, so that is why it just states "additional dollars". He asked if that was sufficient or do you want more language added. Grasser responded that maybe they can talk about some language options on Monday. He added that he would like that statement beefed up somehow, but he doesn't have the exact word right now, but he wants to really make sure that they emphasize that the shortage that they have in there, it isn't just on the State system, but it is also on the local system, and he doesn't know if we are talking about strictly project money or if there is maintenance money mixed up in some of that discussion too. Haugen referred to the slides and pointed out what each one is showing.

Grasser commented that he kind of understands all of this, but he isn't sure how firmly that comes across; like if they gave a number on the local streets, if you could just plug in a number or do you have to go through some complicated process. He said that a number of years ago we identified that we thought we needed a budget in the nature of about \$10 or \$12 million dollars a year on the local side to eventually bring the whole system up; and that would be like at least a twenty or thirty year cycle to do that, so if you start looking at that \$10 or \$12 million dollar need that they identified locally over the planning lifetime, you start getting a really really big number relative to emphasizing the short-fall. He added that his concern is that people may look at the unallocated dollars as being more freely available than probably what they are, and that is why he is looking at language change. He said that he understands what you're saying, he isn't disagreeing with that, but he wants to do as much as he can to emphasize that we are still very very short of dollars.

Mareck stated that he thinks that lateral, we have the \$700 million that we talked about earlier, the needs for the region that have been documented for a variety of different programs; so the \$700 million versus \$400 million of revenue; that would give you roughly \$300 million dollars of unmet need, but yet there are a lot of other local system needs that are not completely contemplated as part of the MPO plan, and how do we tell that story without getting into the gory details of trying to develop that number.

Mareck explained that in addition to the overall capital program, there is also an ongoing need to document operation and maintenance needs of the system, and this is a federal requirement that this be done to make sure that we are being comprehensive in our view of the overall needs. He added that we have documented some of the operation revenue and needs on both the North Dakota and Minnesota side. He referred to slides discussing these issues for both North Dakota and Minnesota and explained that they aren't probably as comprehensive and complete as we would like, but it is a work in progress and so over time they hope to make it a more robust element of the MPO plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Mareck referred to the Potential Discretionary Projects slide and commented that we also do want to recognize, as part of the plan, though there is \$300 million of unmet needs; that this plan is really kind of a marketing tool that can be used by the MPO and all of the communities to talk to your legislators, your congressional delegations, Governor's, etc., to kind of champion some of those unmet needs that they have documented in your community. He went over the discretionary projects listed and stated that these are all very high profile, high impact projects for your region that have a very strong purpose and need that we would definitely like to get included in the plan, so if there are opportunities, some leverage or some special revenues through congressional earmarks, or state funding costs that aren't contemplated in the plan, those are things that can be worked on.

Haugen stated that this was really just the major modifications that they had from the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, for this section of the plan. He said that they aren't going to go into the River Crossing portion, unless you want to, so, referring to the November and December calendars, he said that this is where they are going to end the presentation.

Haugen referred to the November calendar and pointed out that they will be attending the City Council meetings next week for preliminary approval, as well as the MPO Executive Policy Board. He added that they also have a presentation scheduled to give to North Dakota Upper Management the following Tuesday afternoon.

Haugen referred to the December calendar and pointed out that December 19th is when we hope to have action from the MPO Executive Policy Board; some clean-up work so that we can formally submit the document to our State and Federal partners on December 28th. He said that at that time they will have their 30-day review period, and that allows us to meet the January 31st drop-dead date of our current five year cycle.

Halford stated that she was not at the last meeting as she was on maternity leave, and preliminary approval was given to the Street and Highway Element, and she is wondering of that includes the Transit and Bike/Ped Plan under it as a whole, or are they separate. Haugen responded that they are separate. He added that there is a meeting scheduled for this evening on the Bike/Ped Plan.

Halford asked when the Bike/Ped Plan will be approved; is that going to screw with our funding since it is not going to be approved. Haugen responded that it is still coming. Halford asked if it needs to be done by January, or does it affect our funding. Haugen responded that they have had some discussions with the lead State Partner on this, and so they are working towards that. Halford said, then, that it is possible, but hopefully not. Haugen responded that they might be asking for a 30-day extension; just as they did with the TAM Plan, they asked for a 30-day extension. Halford said, then we will be asking for approval at the end of January. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen said that they needed to show progression on this piece of the plan and this gets us to our 2050 cycle.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER
14TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:50 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the December 12th, 2018, 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: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer.

Absent: Darren Laesch, Paul Konickson, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KADRMAS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN ELEMENT

Haugen reported that this is for final action of the Technical Advisory Committee on the Draft 2045 Street/Highway Plan that has been out for review and comments since the last meeting.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it does list the action taken by our partner agencies on each side of the river. He stated that Grand Forks Planning and Zoning has taken action and their City Council will meet on Monday; and East Grand Forks' Planning and Zoning has taken action and their City Council will meet on Tuesday. He added that both Polk County and Grand Forks County have taken final action as well.

Haugen stated that they did give a presentation to the MnDOT working group; and talked about the comments that we received on those drafts, the concern about getting the current T.I.P. better recognized in this draft, and that was done; and they also gave a presentation to NDDOT upper management and Mr. Johnson has provided some comments that were incorporated into the document as well, so with that we have a resolution for consideration of the MPO Board at their meeting next week.

Haugen said that staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Board that they adopt the Draft Final Street/Highway Element as presented.

Kuharenko pointed out that, he believes it is the fifth "whereas" in the Resolution, it talks about the bicycle plan, and he is wondering if that is something that we have to be concerned about since the Bike/Ped Plan hasn't yet been adopted. Haugen responded that this is just listing what the three main elements of the Long Range Transportation Plan are, it doesn't give the dates of their adoptions, so when we adopt a resolution for Transit it will have the same language, it will just have "transit" at the top instead of "2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan".

Kuharenko pointed out that Ken Vein's name is misspelled on the signature page.

Williams said that she doesn't see where MnDOT is listed anywhere in this document, do they need to be. She pointed out that we do talk about the NDDOT but not MnDOT. Haugen responded that because NDDOT is our lead agency, that is what it states, that NDDOT is the lead agency. Williams said, though, that there isn't any mention of MnDOT anywhere in the document at all, and that is what she is asking, do we need to have them in there somewhere. Haugen responded that we haven't included them in the past, we only identify who our lead state agency is.

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR 2020-2023 T.I.P.

a. Transportation Alternative Projects

Viafara reported that there are two projects that are being submitted for consideration by the City of Grand Forks to the Transportation Alternative Program. He commented that this is a highly competitive grant, therefore support for these kind of initiatives is very important.

Viafara stated that the City is submitting two shared use path projects; one is located adjacent to South Columbia Road from 40th Avenue South to 47th Avenue South. He explained that this project will provide a safer walking and bicycling environment for school children, commuters and recreational users, and also provide access and mobility around the school in that area.

Viafara said that the second project is adjacent to University Avenue from the Mobile Home Park to North 48th Street. He explained that in this area there are a number of low income families and people that we may deem to be within the Environmental Justice criteria. He added that this is part of the existing and proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to afford that people from this type of neighborhood have accessibility and mobility, and also to improve the comfort level when they are either walking or bicycling around the neighborhood.

Viafara commented that these two projects incorporate a number of traffic control devices that help us to decrease fuel consumption and also address the last segment of linking around the corridors and also enhance safety for the public, particularly for non-motorized users.

Viafara said that, overall, the two initiatives improve user safety and comfort, they also help us to increase the existing bicycle and pedestrian network by adding new segments, and enhance access and mobility around the neighborhood.

Viafara stated that the MPO staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee approve forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the Transportation Alternative projects submitted for competition, and give them priority ranking.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROJECTS SUBMITTED AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

Haugen commented that just as a reminder on the North Dakota side the Recreational Trails Grant is still open for added projects through January 5th.

b. HSIP Projects

Haugen reiterated that this program was open for candidate projects to be submitted, and they received one from the City of Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that the project is for Red Light Confirmation Indicators for the Intersections of South Washington Street and 40th Avenue South and South Washington Street and 47th Avenue South, and is for materials only. He commented that the total cost is \$10,000 with \$9,000 in federal funding, and is consistent with our proposed safety plan.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE HSIP PROJECT SUBMITTED AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

c. Urban Grant Projects

Haugen reported that this is the second year of solicitation for this program so it is still a work in progress.

Haugen stated that they received one application from the City of Grand Forks to reconstruct 3rd Street between DeMers and University Avenue. He said that the total project cost is \$3.5 million with a federal grant request of just short of \$2.5 million.

Haugen commented that this project includes possible treatments such as curb bump outs, ornamental street lighting, street scape amenities, etc. He stated that the project is working with the Downtown Action Plan activity that is taking place, there are still some details being work on, as far as the streetscape theme to try to connect all of the downtown. He added that in the 2045 Street/Highway Plan element we do have this stretch of the downtown identified as one of the Main Street Urban Grant Projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN GRANT PROGRAM PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

d. Urban Regional Roads Projects

Haugen reported that as indicated in the staff report, and in the solicitation letter, the NDDOT was not opening the 2023 year for candidate projects; however there were instances such as urgent issues or phase construction that was allowed. He stated that outside of the 2023 year the current years of the T.I.P. are fiscally constrained, but the City and the District still submitted a worksheet for a 2020 request, and that was the NEPA document for 32nd Avenue Congestion.

Haugen said that there was also a 2022 chip seal project on North 5th Street; they are already going to mill and overlay that so this would be a follow-up project to that work being done in 2020.

Haugen referred to the summary sheet and pointed out that you will notice that they are still showing a regional traffic signal upgrade project for 2022; that currently is listed as an illustrative project in the T.I.P., and it can remain illustrative in the 2022 year or a request can be made to consider it for a later year we can probably consider it with the next T.I.P. cycle since 2023 is closed.

Kuharenko stated that it shows it in the S.T.I.P. that it is a pending project, and so they ended up including it just as a reverification more than anything, and that is part of the reason they didn't include a new scoping worksheet because the year didn't change and the dollars didn't change. Haugen commented the pending and illustrative are the same, just different terms, there is no money attached to it and to get money attached to it either money either has to be found somewhere for that year or else apply for a subsequent year and then prioritize it versus all the other projects for that year.

Haugen commented that on the regional side the State always want to have that plus-one year as sort of a heads up that a project is a possible candidate for that year, however it isn't a formal submittal for our consideration. He added that in the document we received are two projects; one is for an interchange that addresses congestion on 32nd Avenue, and we just note that it is not in the Transportation Plan and is beyond our fiscal constraint; and the other is the reconstruction of South Washington Street between Hammerling and 8th Avenue South, but that is identified in the short-term of the 2045 Street and Highway Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Bergman asked if the intersection at 32nd, is that South Washington Street. Haugen responded that it is an interchange that addresses the congestion on 32nd, that is how it is identified. Bergman asked if it is an interchange on I-29. Haugen responded that the documentation identifies 47th Avenue as a possible location, but that is still up to the NEPA document, etc., so it isn't an intersection, the best guess is that it is an interchange, but that isn't a for-sure decision.

Kuharenko reported that they essentially set it up as a construction project to follow-up the NEPA document.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of other projects that were shown on the summary sheet; those are the ones that we are taking care of prior to the adoption of the next T.I.P. so they will be addressed with a different action, hopefully next January, because they are tied in with some other T.I.P. amendments that we have to do next January.

Haugen said that as Mr. Johnson is here he would ask him; since we've got a closed solicitation on the Regional Program from the State, we got a submittal for a NEPA project and a Chip Seal project for the year prior to the one announced as being closed; and he knows that the chip seal is no big deal, but the NEPA is a bigger deal, so what is NDDOT's thought. Johnson responded that he would agree the chip seal is not a big deal at all, you can submit that one; but the environmental document is a little different as they typically don't line item those in the S.T.I.P. unless it is like an EEA or EIS level type document, and even then it is rare as they have preliminary engineering identified in the S.T.I.P. in our District 9, so if it is determined that we should move forward with any project, whether it be this interchange or another one, we kind of just move forward with the PE in terms of timing for funding so identifying this funding as part of this process he doesn't think needs to be done right now.

Johnson commented that the other element that is tied to this; this feeds right into the Urban Interstate Priorities Process that some of you are aware of that they work with the counties and the districts and the cities on to identify Urban Interstate needs across the State. He said that the local government division has been tasked with doing a decision document with all of those nearer term priorities to determine how they want to proceed with them, if they should proceed with them, and how many they should proceed with and this is on that list, so that is controlled by that decision right now and they haven't reached that point yet. He added that he doesn't know of the timing for when it is going to happen, but that's the more appropriate spot for it because if they don't get the green light to move forward on that project, there is no need to identify funding for it right now.

Kuharenko stated, though, that if it is green-lighted they would still have to submit documentation to get it into the S.T.I.P. correct. Johnson responded that they would just authorize engineering funding, they don't line item each project in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., there would be way too many.

Haugen commented that part of the decision, if you do go with the decision to do the preliminary engineering; is we have to identify another phase, which currently isn't identified in the documents, so it is his understanding that Federal Highway can't sign off on a document unless

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

there is a shown fiscally constrained plan of implementation, so we simply can't just do the PE without any additional actions that have to be done. Johnson added that you can start it, they just won't act on it if there is another level of authorization.

Haugen stated that it seems like we have one candidate project and that is the Chip Seal project for consideration during the actual next T.I.P. years, and then we have two projects in the plus-one year with one being identified as being consistent and within fiscal constraint and the other not.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN REGIONAL PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECTS SUBJECT TO THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES PER DISCUSSION.

Kuharenko stated that for him, he is looking at this from the City side, and he knows the City Council's approval was based on list that they submitted; and so even though it may not be considered by the MPO to be eligible for this program, he would push more for the list that the City Council approved be moved forward. He said that that way it will be moved forward to the MPO Executive Policy Board, and there are two members from the Grand Forks City Council on that board, so that would be his preference.

Haugen asked what the motion is stating. Kuharenko responded that the motion would be to move the recommendation and the priority ranking as approved by the Grand Forks City Council to the MPO Executive Policy Board for further consideration, something along those lines. Haugen asked if we are finding it as being consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan as part of the motion. Williams asked if we could do a plan amendment to make it consistent. Haugen responded that we could not do that within today's time constraint.

West asked who made the request for the NEPA project. Kuharenko responded that it was a request made by both the City and the State; and approved by the Grand Forks City Council to bring forward to the MPO. West said, then, that the City Council has already heard it and thought it worthy to move forward. Kuharenko responded that that is correct and added that that is how it was moved forward to the Technical Advisory Committee. West asked if the DOT is okay with that. Haugen said the District may be yet the HQ may not.

Johnson commented that that is the other issue on the table; there is the full gamut of this is a locally funded interchange or this is an interstate funded interchange; we don't know that yet either, and that is part of that decision making process. Kuharenko stated that one of the reasons they ended up pushing this forward is because if there are congestion issues at 32nd Avenue South, 32nd Avenue is a State Highway, and so what do we need to do to address that, and so whether or not it is an interchange or something else, we would have to see, and that is what the purpose is of the NEPA document going through engineering, it is to determine what is needed, or if anything is needed at all, that is also part of the reason why for the local funding they are looking at, instead of the typical funding split, they are looking at the City putting forward about half of the cost of that project just to get it off the ground.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Bergman said, though, that we just heard from Mr. Johnson that a NEPA document isn't something that is needed. Johnson reiterated that we don't typically identify those line item by line item in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. Bergman said, though that they can still do the document right. Johnson responded that you can make the request to get it going; typically they won't start unless we have funding identified for the construction project, and in this case we don't have that money identified. He said that in other instances where this has happened it has been a management decision to move forward and start the document anyway, and worry about the construction money later, or it has been a locally funded effort completely. He said that, again, he goes back to a decision document that management has to review and sign off on to determine; one, should we go forward with this at all, and two, who is going to pay for what and when.

Johnson stated that, speaking candidly, there are a lot of concerns in Bismarck with where they are at in the season, the Legislature is going to be starting, and with funding the way it is and the initiatives set forth by our governing bodies, that a new interchange in the rural part of an urban area is not going to be supported very well, but he can't make that call, that is what management has to do.

Haugen asked for clarification on the motion; are you trying to address the 2020 NEPA document as part of the motion. Kuharenko responded that he is so that it can be further discussed at the MPO Executive Policy Board level.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN REGIONAL PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Halford, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

Voting Nay: Kadrmas and Johnson.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

e. Urban Local Roads Projects

Haugen reported that this was not frozen, just the regional side was. He said that for 2023 the City did submit a scoping worksheet for the Columbia Road Overpass fix, and included in the packet was a draft report from the consultant that identifies necessary corrective action. He stated that the cost estimate is 45% higher than the cost estimate that we had in our Street and Highway Plan.

Haugen commented that just as we discussed on the regional side, the traffic signal update, there wasn't a scope of work worksheet done for that so that will still be listed as a pending/illustrative in 2022, is that correct. Kuharenko responded that that is correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Haugen stated that the Columbia Road Overpass project is in the short-term and this is a 2023 application so staff recommends priority ranking for the project.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN LOCAL ROADS CONDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2020-2023 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT

Viafara reported that MPO Staff is asking the members of the Technical Advisory Committee to please provide comments and support and preliminary approval of the 2045 Bike/Ped Element. He pointed out that the draft report has been submitted for your consideration.

Viafara stated that this was submitted to the Grand Forks Planning Commission and to the East Grand Forks City Council, and so far comments and preliminary approval have been received from the Grand Forks Planning Commission and the the East Grand Forks City Council.

Viafara referred to the packet and reported that you will find an Executive Summary that is more or less outlining all of the activities that have taken place, and gives a background on the development of the plan. He said that it includes the goals and objectives, and also the analysis of this information, and at the end provides some idea of the type of recommendations that we are planning to make for your consideration.

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

Presentation ensued.

Williams referred to the Executive Summary and pointed out that in #9 Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes it discusses pedestrian and bicycle crashes; and then in #10 Pedestrian and Bicyclists Accidents it discusses pedestrian and bicycle accidents. She stated that crash(es) is the correct term, they no longer use the term accident(s) as they are all crashes. Viafara asked if she wanted that change made in the slides or in the document, he said that he can go over it and certainly heed your advice. Williams responded that that is up to him, she is just letting you know that “accident” is not the correct term. Viafara asked if she would provide some findings for the reason for that. Williams said that she would refer him to NDDOT for that. Johnson stated that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

he doesn't know the full reason, but they no longer use "accident" as the defining an instance of a crash because they are not all accidental, but they are all crashes regardless of the severity.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT REPORT.***

Halford said that currently the document is incomplete, when will they see a complete document. Viafara responded that that is what they are working on. He said that by the end of next week you will see a complete document. Halford asked if a link to that would be e-mailed out to everyone. Viafara responded that he would have to have his supervisor review it and provide some comments and guidance, and then he will make it available to everyone.

Halford pointed out that the targets in the first section say "still to be determined" on a lot of them, will those be addressed as well. Viafara responded that they are to be determined. He said that she had asked that question before. Halford agreed that she had. Viafara stated that, basically, if you look carefully at the tables you have the performance measure; what is pending is the performance target, and there are a couple of documents that we review that Department of Engineering indicated that they would like to have the performance targets that are flexible, that are doable, and that are onerous, so because of that those are really pending for us to discuss later and at the moment he has not received any particular feedback on that so his suggestion, at least for now, is for him to submit a report to you, a response, leave them how they are, and then convene through the different stakeholders, somebody that will help us, even engineering or planning, that will tell us exactly how they feel about the few targets that are missing.

Halford stated that she did not get that from past conversations. Viafara responded that it is stated on the report. He said that if you look at the report they submitted the performance measures and the targets for you guys to set, there is some indication that the department would like to have a level of flexibility, and because of the conditions of your staff, and internal issues you don't want them to be onerous. Halford said, then, for clarification if she hadn't brought up that question would it just be left to be determined and we would approve the document and then it would have gone on like that and we would have made up our own targets on the side. Viafara responded that whenever there are targets; there are a number of targets that have already been assumed; there are some targets that do not belong to the MPO because we don't have the means to track them. He cited that the MPO doesn't have the means to track the number of citations that are issued for snow removal, or the number of feet or miles of sidewalks so he has to ask the Department of Engineering to tell us every year what has happened, so because of that they are to be determined. He added that there are also some that are coming from transit as the MPO doesn't track the number of bike licenses or the number of permits a day issued for people who bring their bikes so we need to use the baselines. Halford asked why there aren't baselines shown in the plan then. Viafara responded that he can ask them to provide the baselines if that is what you want, but right from the beginning that was the understanding, the MPO is bringing something to the departments that they unfortunately don't have the information for; that is transit, engineering, or planning; and the few that you see belong to the MPO, so we will do them through the use of the travel modeling that we have and through surveys.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Haugen commented that Mr. Viafara and himself briefly talked about this yesterday morning and his understanding was that there are some targets that are yet to be identified, so he asked Mr. Viafara to put all of the language of targets in the plan into one place so we can see them all concisely; there were some that were going to be lined out because they are no longer desired, so he was going to do that; that is what he anticipated to be distributed by Friday of next week. He added that there would be a suggested target that the MPO would put in there for those items that we understand are still desired, and that is what would be distributed next week. Williams said, then that the MPO is going to identify a target and then we are going to go from there. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko commented that the last time he was aware of this they were given a number of, and this was probably a year or year and a half ago, they were given a list and they ended up divvying them to whomever was responsible for them and then worked on figuring out what the appropriate language would be, but he doesn't think there was a discussion as to what the actual target would be at that point in time. Viafara responded that that is correct, and that is why they are in the column to be determined. Kuharenko said that the reason he is a little concerned with that is because it sounds like what is being thrown out there is that they haven't been responsive. Viafara responded that that isn't what he wanted it to sound like, but we need a cooperative effort so for the MPO it is not really appropriate for to tell you what to do because you are the ones that hire the contractors so rather we would prefer that you tell us every year, this year we built this number of sidewalks, etc.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that the big takeaway from this study is that we can't really compare this update to the 2011 studies as the survey boundaries are slightly different, but some trends are similar. He explained that there is some less occupancy with this study so fewer vehicles are parking downtown so there is more parking available. He added that the other item is that observed overtime parking has increased since 2011. He stated that they did get some parking enforcement information and it is relatively flat and is not consistent.

Haugen commented that for event management; they observed the recent holiday parade that took place and they found that it was a poorly attended event due to weather; so they were unable to get good event parking information, thus they are trying to use the experience of staff to do that, plus the video capture that we get from the signals around the area downtown to get some idea of how traffic is building up during those bigger events to get a better sense of the event piece.

Williams asked what was left to do on this study. Haugen responded that a future demand needs to be identified, and there are management recommendations to consider to help improve the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

City's management of the parking lots. He added that there is more redevelopment being proposed in the downtown area so they are trying to assure that there is enough parking to accommodate it and then possibly identify; if you look at the occupancy with the supply there is right now one might surmise that there is more supply than demand, and then perhaps some redevelopment can take place with some of surplus lots

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

Johnson pointed out that the report shows that the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan has a completion date of August 2018; shouldn't it be 2019. Haugen responded that it isn't correct. He said that the Grand Forks Transportation Plan shouldn't be on this report, it doesn't begin until 2019.

b. East Grand Forks ADA Draft

Haugen reported that the East Grand Forks ADA Transition Plan draft is available on the MPO website and the review and comment period ends December 21st and approval is in January.

c. Mn220 North Study

Haugen reported that the Mn 220 North Study has a website link on our webpage and there is an open house scheduled for December 18th.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE
DECEMBER 12TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:36 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager