

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 11th, 2019, 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: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nick West, Grand Forks County; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; and Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government.

Absent: Brad Bail, Jesse Kadrmas, Richard Audette, Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Nancy Ellis, Jason Peterson, Dale Bergman, Paul Konickson, Lane Magnuson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Mike Johnson introduced Wayne Zacher and explained that he just joined the Local Government Division and he is our new MPO Coordinator so they will be transitioning all MPO duties over to him and he will be attending the MPO meetings and will be involved in Steering Committees and all other MPO activities. He stated that he will still be involved in the background to help with anything that needs a little more attention, but Mr. Zacher is their new person who has been on the job for a week and a half. He said that he will come to this meeting one more time and then he will officially turn it all over to Mr. Zacher.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Williams asked if Mr. Zacher has Mr. Johnson's old phone number or does he have a new phone number. Johnson responded that he has all new contact information – 701-328-4828 is his phone number.

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

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 13TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY KUHARNEKO, SECONDED BY RIESINGER, TO APPROVE THE
NOVEMBER 13TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
AS PRESENTED***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY
REPORT**

Haugen reported that this has been a study that has been in the works for about a year from start to finish. He said that there was a subcommittee of the Grand Forks Downtown Action Plan Steering Committee assisting us, along with Grand Forks staff. He added that they hired the firm KLJ to assist.

Haugen commented that several months ago the actual document itself was reviewed and recommended by the Steering Committee, but it sat until the Downtown Action Plan was completed and then both documents were presented to the Grand Forks City Council a week ago or so and so it has been through the Grand Forks approval process and is now being finalized through the MPO process as well.

Haugen stated that a full report was identified in your staff report; and we did review the full report. He added that included in the packet were the recommendations that came out of the review, and they are divided into short-term, mid-term, and long-term.

Haugen said that staff is seeking approval of the report document.

Halford asked if it is normal. This is a clarifying question, is it normal since it went to City Council which is more of a receive and file thing, is it normal for it to then go to the MPO and then seek approval and not since it did not get approval through the council. Haugen responded that it is. He explained that it is an MPO document.

Kuharenko said that he has a general comment on the long-term section where it ends up identifying that it looks at parking meters and he knows that currently with the North Dakota Century Code there is language in there that prohibits parking meters, so just a general note.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Haugen responded that he thinks it talks about when that legislation is changed, not to say that they are going to do it however.

Williams asked, when it says availability on the second page, the little map, does that mean parking spaces in general or, using City Hall as an example where all of them are assigned parking spaces so they aren't available to the general public, so is it general public parking or all parking. Haugen responded that it is a synonym for occupancy, whether it is occupied or not occupied, it is available or it's not available by being occupied. Halford stated, then, that what you are saying is that it is all of the above, all sorts of parking including reserved and non-reserved. Haugen responded that that is correct and reiterated that it is a synonym for whether it was occupied or not occupied; and instead of using one term throughout the whole document they intermittently switched in available as a term.

Halford commented that they have gotten a question a couple of times where people were wondering how much is available to the public, so you would get rid of all the reserved ones, do we know that number. Haugen responded that roughly 50% are between the private and the public sector there are 3,600 stalls, so roughly 1,800 have no restrictions on them and that combines the private and the public spaces together. He added that there is a table in the beginning of the document that identifies each lot, what type of restrictions are on what number of stalls; including the two-hour limit, twenty-four hour reserved, disabled parking, loading and unloading; there is a table in the front of the document that details each parking lot with the total number of stalls that are somehow restricted, and that is for all three levels: on-street, private options, and public options.

Halford stated that overall she thinks this is a good study; and for a long time we have heard people say there is nowhere to park downtown, so it is nice to see that it is more of a perception, and the ones that we do have control over as a City, we're not using those spaces to their full potential as we could be. Kuharenko commented that he thinks it also speaks a lot to just the culture that we have here, where there is the desire to park in front of their destination, and not necessarily a block or two away.

Haugen said that on the first short-term, and he thinks we have already started on it, and it is marketing information and changing the perception issues.

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL AND PRIORITIZATION OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.
CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Haugen said that before we get to these he would like to remind everyone that December 20th is the due date for the remaining North Dakota solicitations, with the exception of Recreational Trails, and he believes that Recreational Trails may not be due until January. He added that on the Minnesota side all of the programs except for the TAP and HSIP which are due on December 27th.

Kuharenko commented that to follow up on a couple of those he thinks they already submitted the Regional and the Urban Roads and are waiting for a signature from the Mayor's office for the Urban Grant Program and that should be sent over shortly.

a. H.S.I.P.

Haugen reported that one project was submitted from the City of Grand Forks. He stated that the project is located at the intersection of S. 20th Street and 32nd Avenue. He said that the application is to install right turn lanes, and the total funding amount is \$578,000, and there is a 90/10 split so the federal share is just over \$520,000. He added that this project is consistent with the standard of our Transportation Plan, although he noted that neither the Strategic Highway Safety Plan nor our Local Road Safety Program identifies the strategies of the high priority ones which doesn't make it ineligible, it just states that it is not part of the list of high priorities. He stated that staff is saying that it is consistent and is a high priority project for our H.S.I.P.

Kuharenko commented that this is pretty straight forward and it is mostly addressing the number of rear end crashes that we have at this intersection. He said that he believes it is identifying that once the left turn lane realignment project is completed rear end crashes he believes are the second most number of crashes that occur at this location.

Johnson referred to the H.S.I.P. application and said that he has one comment; in the bottom box where it describes the proposed safety improvements he is wondering where you got the project number STM-SUU-986(088)092 because that is a stimulus project number so he isn't sure where you got it from but he has the right one if you want to change it; it is HEU-6-081(094940). Kuharenko stated that he would get that corrected and sent back to the MPO.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE H.S.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstain: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

b. Transportation Alternatives

Haugen reported that again only one project was submitted by the City of Grand Forks. He said that the project involves converting an existing gravel path that exists along 32nd Avenue just west of the on and off ramps of the interstate, and it connects to a gravel path that heads north and connects with the Business and Industrial Parks. He stated that the total estimated cost is \$302,000 and with an 80/20 split the federal share is \$241,600.

Haugen commented that reviewing this in our Metropolitan Transportation Plan Bike/Ped section, there was no real specific mention of converting this from gravel to pavement, nor is it listed specifically in the table that shows projects individually by timeframe, so they are finding sections of the standards and objectives sections that support this project, but it is not found in the data base specifically, but we think that was perhaps just an oversight of gravel trails, and so there might even be a follow-up because there are a couple other gravel paths and we want to make sure that we are identifying future growth status, so staff finds this project consistent with our Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS FOR THEFY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #1 TO WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that as we transition from year one to the second year of the work program we find it necessary to make an amendment to the work program. He said that, ironically, this will be the first amendment to a two-year work program, which is almost a first for us.

Haugen stated that the main focus of this amendment was something that we identified mid-year of 2019, and that was to follow-up on a future river crossing. He said that at that time it was doing both a water hydraulic study and a traffic impact study, but since then it was determined that the water hydraulic study is not an eligible MPO activity so an RFQ was sent out by both Cities to participate in financing that portion of the study, so the work program is being amended to do the follow-up traffic impact analysis on a river crossing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Haugen explained that, as we identified six months ago, there are some items in our work program that could be switched over to finance this:

- 1) Bus Route Study – It was determined that once the CAT/UND Shuttle Service Merger was approved it should operate for a couple of semesters and then once they learn the ropes we would then follow up with a route study but the merger physically won't happen until next fall so the route study was pushed out.
- 2) School Safety Study – this was eliminated as a separate line item but the MPO Executive Policy Board wanted to place emphasis on school safety with the future bridge study so it was rolled into that.
- 3) Traffic Count Program – we have eight intersections that are waiting for the actual hardware to be installed so those are already under contract and will carry over into 2020 and there will be no new intersections done in 2020.
- 4) Equipment – we have zeroed out our equipment line item. As the City of Grand Forks has purchased the Herald Building and are remodeling it and are looking to see if the MPO is interested in renting space there, and there is interest in this by the MPO but we still have to work out details and that will take most of 2020 to work out and the space won't be available until 2021 so we zeroed out our equipment budget to let things shake out before purchasing and new equipment.

Haugen commented that the document itself, he just attached things that were changed, with the exception of the timelines for the 2050 MTP Update, just to remind everybody that this work program is progressing us towards our 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Haugen stated that another thing that has happened is that both Cities have decided that they would like to postpone starting their Land Use Plan Updates until the second half of the year. He explained that the primary reason for that is that they want to make sure that the 2020 Census results are a part of the update process at the appropriate time, so they felt that by delaying the start of the update they won't get too far into the process before the results are available, and it still fits in with the timeline that we currently have identified so there was no need to change that. He added that the counting program you will notice we identify that our current addendum will carry over. He stated that on the Land Use Plans we have it in there that we are now waiting until the second half of the year and so we've split the consultant costs in half and carry them into January of the following year, and the new item is the Traffic Impact at a bridge corridor, although it could be more than one corridor depending on the water hydraulics study.

Haugen reported that one other change involves a document we used to provide called the Monitoring and Surveillance Report, but it was changed to Performance Reports, so we have identified that.

Haugen stated that some minor changes to some of the language and some dates for the GIS.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Haugen commented that for the financial side of the report, unfortunately our revenue stream is not growing so we maintained the same budget amounts and funding sources; and then the detail table shows how the individual cost components are identified, how much is remaining for the consultant costs, etc.

Haugen said that the only other major study that is carrying over into 2020 is the Downtown Transportation Study.

Haugen stated that these are the proposed amendments and once approved by our MPO Executive Policy Board we will send them to our State and Federal Partners.

Williams referred to the Activity Page that has all of the costs and said that Mr. Haugen said that the hydrology part is being removed from the MPO funding; does this number reflect that removal. Haugen responded that it does, adding that the hydraulic study is not being reflected in the MPO budget at all.

Kuharenko referred to Page 22 of the report, under completion dates, and pointed out that 300.52 shows a completed date as December 31, 2017/18. Haugen responded that that will be removed. Kuharenko referred to Page 21 of the report and pointed out that there is a spelling error, Shroeder Middle School is misspelled.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2020 WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO REVISIONS AS DISCUSSED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON US2/US81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY

Kouba reported that the Steering Committee received the final draft document to review and provide input.

Kouba stated that, just as a refresher, we are looking at traffic flow operations and things like that in that very small tight corridor, so there are a lot of challenges. She said that they are also looking at increases in traffic volumes out to 2045, and in 2045 we are looking at higher delays, more blockages mostly due to unit trains, which are longer and will block traffic all the way through that corridor at one point in time as it runs through.

Kouba commented that some of the other challenges are that there are a lot of driveways and access points; and she knows that the City's Planning and Engineering Departments has been

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

working with businesses as much as possible to close some, or share some of them, but it makes things difficult and makes things feel unsafe when looking at it from a pedestrian viewpoint.

Kouba stated that they evaluated signal warrants on all of the traffic signals in the corridor and also for stop signs as well. She said that as things stand today and into the future the signal at 20th and Gateway is not really warranted, and it is kind of a high location for crashes. She added that the signal in front of Wilder at 3rd and Gateway is not technically warranted but there are a few other things that should be considered when we look at that signal. She said that there is an underpass for pedestrians, but it isn't always available during certain situations such as snow, flooding, etc., so those situations should be taken into consideration before deciding to remove that signal.

Kouba said that there are also signals that don't have any kind of pedestrian control, so it makes it difficult and unsafe for pedestrians trying to cross at those various intersections.

Grasser referred to the slide discussing signal warrants and commented that there is a pretty impressive list of crash reductions and such; and if he is understanding it right those numbers are based on removing both of those signals, the ones circled in red. Kouba responded that that is correctly, generally, especially at the one on 20th, but in general overall what it statistically states is that that is what happens when you remove unwarranted signals. Grasser said then, that it is more of a statistical typical analysis, because he was wondering because those numbers, if he understands the conversation, even though you show the signal at 3rd in red, it would probably be more difficult to remove it so what would the resulting anticipated reduction of crashes be then if that one was left but the one at 20th is removed, would it be half the numbers shown or some other percentage. Kouba responded that she doesn't know if they have looked at the exact numbers that could happen if both or one was removed, but overall in an average statistic that is the number they would use.

Kouba commented that one thing to note about the signal at 3rd and Gateway is that it tends to become warranted in 2045, or close to being warranted, so do we want to remove it and then have to put it back in then, plus there is the issue of crossing from that neighborhood to the school. Grasser agreed that his sense is that that would be a difficult one to take out.

Williams commented that the signal at 20th and Gateway, the study did not look to see where that traffic would be diverted to if you are coming north and want to make a left turn onto Gateway, and if you can't do it with not enough gaps, it didn't look to see where that traffic would go to try to find a way out. West said that the next light west would be Columbia. Williams agreed, adding though that that would mean they would have to go through the neighborhood. Haugen asked, though, that it is assuming there is enough gap, or if there is no warrant for the signal because there is sufficient gap for movements. Williams responded that the problem is that the signals are too far apart to do that because once you get more than a quarter of a mile people start to spread out and you have other intervening intersections and that sort of thing so it makes it much more difficult to try to create a gap for vehicles to make left turns.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Johnson reported that, just to add to this discussion, NDDOT has been having problems with signal warrants in a lot of their projects, especially as part of the new Urban Grant Program Project, where they are redoing downtowns and looking at existing traffic signals that have been there for thirty or forty years or more because they were always there, but none of them are warranted; very few of them are still warranted and they are going through a process where they are removing signals across the State and the warrants are pretty black and white, there is no leniency given, the direction was given from their federal oversight that if it is an unwarranted signal it either needs to come out or the other option for the local jurisdiction is to just leave it as is and zero improvements can be made to it, you can change light bulbs and all red light confirmation, but no painting, no rewiring or anything like that can be done to it, so that is something you need to keep in mind when you look at this type of stuff that the eventual control of that intersection may change regardless of maybe what you want to do so looking at other options, for example at 3rd, is that it might be a location for a hawk or a pedestrian activated beacon instead.

Halford said that as you get rid of more traffic signals, for someone to cross Gateway as a pedestrian, it will be much harder because there will be longer spans of lights and be able to do that because there is no way that, you might get lucky and there will be a gap in traffic for you to cross, but if you are able to add Hawks, but then when you are talking about downtown though that is such a walkable bikeable, that is what we want our downtowns to be, but if you take away traffic signals it seems like it is just going to speed up traffic and make it so you can't cross the street. She said that people are crossing in so many different places that it is going to make it very difficult for that to happen. Johnson agreed, adding that thought that that is why you look at interjecting different elements of traffic calming like bulb outs, but the City didn't want bulb outs. He said that as a perfect example, US 52, 1st Avenue or 1st Street through Jamestown, there are five signals there now but only one is warranted, so they are working on a project right now where they are probably going to lose four signals in their downtown, but they are looking at putting in bulb outs, and it is really interesting listening to the public and their reaction, where they almost sound like DOT employees sitting out there, this is a truck route, this is a US Highway, we have to get trucks through here, what are you doing, what are you doing; so it is something that they are battling across the State, it is kind of a newer nuance to this new program that they hadn't really experienced in the past, most of their projects are on the fringe where there is growing and signals are warranted, they didn't do a lot of internal projects prior to that program. Halford asked if Downtown Grand Forks being looked at. Johnson responded that DeMers is done so those signals meet warrants.

Discussion on signals that have been removed or will be removed throughout Grand Forks and the State ensued.

Williams suggested that may this warrants further discussion with a different focus group that, in essence what the Feds have done is they've taken away engineering judgement by saying this, and then the other thing is is that to truly, if you are only going to use one day out of the year, who picks the day. She said that they have a signal, such at 11th and 42nd, that on a day to day basis may not seem warranted but tell you what, we wouldn't be able to operate an event at the Alerus without it, so that is another problem, where some of these may be, like the signal at 3rd,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

if the underpass isn't available and you have all the kids crossing you are going to meet school warrants every single day, so that is another problem as to when the counts are done, so maybe that is something that we need to internally look at as far as how we determine when we are going to do this. Johnson agreed that he thinks that is a good point but he would argue that, and he isn't an expert on this, but good engineering practice is to do it on a normal day, it isn't to do it when the Alerus Center has an event or right as school is getting out, because you are designing the roadway and the infrastructure for a normal day so you have to be careful doing that as well because that falsifies some of the information they are trying to get done for the infrastructure and the money we are spending. Williams said that she is going to tack on the Ms. Halford's comment though that on some of that, when you look at pedestrian and bicyclists trying to cross a street on an unaverage day doesn't help you if the signal has been removed, so it warrants maybe a lot more discussion as far the parameters. Johnson stated that he completely agrees but we just don't have the pedestrian traffic in this State to warrant, there is pedestrian warrants as part of the signals, but it is an enormous number, we don't even come close. Williams said thought that the school warrant isn't, the school warrant for pedestrians is fairly low; and that is for further discussion.

Kuharenko said that one question he is going to have is that since we've got projects in the S.T.I.P. for our traffic signal rehabilitation program, he is assuming that they are going to have to look at traffic signal warrants at every single one of those. Johnson responded that if you have the time and capabilities to do some of that now it might be something you might want to do so you can get ahead of it. Williams asked what year this project is scheduled for. Kuharenko responded that he thinks it is pending 2022 for Urban and 2023 for the Regional, otherwise it would be 2023 and 2024 respectively.

Kouba continued by saying that in looking at the rest of the network they are looking at the ADA crossing issues that are on the corridor. She said that the bicycle network is not as robust along the exact corridor, but there is a trail to the north, but there aren't many good places to cross, especially on Washington.

Kouba stated that through the plan, after they presented all of the alternatives they asked for feedback from the Steering Committee and also from the public, which was done through public meetings, as they were trying to get back as much information as possible. She said that they also attended the Near Northside Neighborhood meetings; and one highlight they got from that is that people are very interested the ability to cross the streets and the closeness of all the driveways and running into traffic from a pedestrian point of view.

Kouba commented that most of the feedback they received supported a realignment of the railroad; we can't remove it all just because of the need for the railroad to serve other areas, but the idea that all the trains can come in from the north and have less interaction with traffic, as well as to some extent pedestrians wanting to cross the tracks as well. She stated that this would be considered a long-term improvement, which they know. She added that they did get rid of some alternatives that weren't very viable, and eliminating the skew is not going to be something that is really feasible, so the suggestions and alternatives remaining show ways to improve safety for pedestrians and to ensure there are fewer crashes along the corridor. She stated that they also

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

eliminated some of the more expensive at grade alignments and non-grade alignments as they would also highly impact a lot of the area businesses.

Kouba referred to a map and pointed out that it shows a footprint where they would improve the sidewalks to allow for bicycle traffic to use it so they can cross properly at the lights; right-in and right-out additions so that we can make it safer. She stated that this is further south so we wouldn't have the railroad as an issue, but we would still have to have a crossing, but we wouldn't need it all the way through if we are going to bring things from the north, but we would probably still need it because they would have to back trains and things like that in order to serve the various businesses in the area. She said that it would move all those trains to 42nd and Gateway, but that location has had an overpass plan on the books for quite a while that is a desired thing, so overall between that and the reduction of conflicts there would be a little bit freer flow of traffic, not blocked by trains.

Kouba stated referred to a slide showing the cost of realignment and stated that this the total cost including the other elements of safety that don't include the rerouting of the rails, so those could be implemented sooner rather than later.

Grasser asked if these costs capture property acquisition and engineering. Kouba responded that it does to a certain extent. She said that they included it in with some of the pre-engineering, but you can only guesstimate so much of the planning of it. Grasser said that the struggle sometimes on these things is having the ability to implement a particular plan; some of those things can be an operational issue, such as with the Mill, or a part of the property that sometimes almost not a deal card, and he isn't sure he is able to understand where that type of, call it a deal card, comes into play. Kouba responded that that is kind of the reason why we understand where it comes into be a deal card is that whole realignment section, which will cost the most out of the whole total cost, but we have put in what it would take to just put in the safety improvements. Grasser said, then, that this slide reflects one that probably doesn't have it implemented. Kouba stated it doesn't include the realignment part which would be working with the railroad; that is how we got the \$5.6 million dollar estimate of the total was reached. Grasser asked if we have the BNSF railroad, then, on board. Kouba responded that there would need to be negotiations held with BNSF as well as with them now because if they are additional. Grasser agreed it would be for both sites. Kouba added that the needs of the various businesses rely on that rail.

Kouba commented that the one that sparked the most interest is the one that, there are implementable parts and there are parts that are understood will take a lot more time to implement, but if you have intersection consolidation when you have rail but its elimination that, it doesn't help to have it if it doesn't do anything to improve any of the traffic issues and pedestrian safety issues, so they eliminated a lot of those types of things.

Kouba stated that for the short-term there are things such as ITS or ways of letting people know that there is a train blocking at various intersections in order to allow them to turn off and go a different route.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Kouba said that at the MPO level our next steps are us working with Engineering to update the City Council, especially because Mr. Weber was at one of our public meetings and he would like an update, so we will do that. She stated that Mr. Johnson had also said that there might be a need to have some upper management involvement as well. Johnson responded that he hasn't had the opportunity to follow up with them, but he is confident that he can just provide any information provided here and just brief them on the study findings.

Kouba commented that the final step will be final approval of the study.

Grasser said, maybe you've done this, but he can't pick it out of the information but it seems like one of our key stakeholders would be BNSF, has anybody given them a sketch of what all that might look like and see what their reaction is to it, it would be interesting to know if they are favorable or unfavorable or where they might be with that. Kouba responded that they were part of the Steering Committee up to the point where we started doing alternatives, and at that point they said that they can't take part in those decisions one way or the other, and they pretty much stopped coming. Zacher added that BNSF does that on pretty much every project; they will be involved up to a certain point and then they back away and wait for the permitting process. Johnson said, though, that they continually stress that early coordination is the best key.

Haugen commented that the documents are available for review, and the Steering Committee has had the documents for a while and will give their recommendation so next month we anticipate that we will ask the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board to complete the study.

Kuharenko asked if a copy of the draft final or final report available on the MPO Website. Kouba responded that it is available on the Website.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that attached is his first attempt at doing the monthly update to the work activities.

Haugen commented that three weeks ago A.T.A.C. distributed out their ITS Diagrams and are asking for feedback on them. He said that there will be some additional information on this before the end of the Holidays and they are asking for feedback so they can finalize the ITS Regional Architecture document.

Williams asked that Mr. Haugen forward the email with that information to her.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

b. Continuing Resolution Update

Haugen stated that we are on a continuing resolution for funding, so hopefully Congress will keep federal funding funded through the holidays at least, and beyond.

Johnson commented that one thing to note on the latest resolution that congress passed they removed the rescission clause of the FAST-ACT; other than just kicking the can down the road they removed that. He said that they don't know for sure exactly what that will mean yet though.

c. ND Federal Highway Announcement

Haugen reported that North Dakota Federal Highway has announced that they have filled their Planner position and the new person will start right before Christmas.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WEST, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 11TH, 2019
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:29 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager