

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020
Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 9th, 2020, 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 via Zoom: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Steve Emery, EGF Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; and Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2.

Absent: Steve Emery, Brad Bail, Ryan Brooks, Jesse Kadrmas, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, Patrick Hopkins, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Hally Turner and Scott Schaffer, MnDOT.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 12TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 12TH, 2020 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

**MATTER OF MNDOT STATEWIDE MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the reason Ms. Turner and Mr. Schaffer are here today is because for the last several months we have been hearing from the NDDOT on an update to their Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan; as we have been going through those we have noted that MnDOT would be starting a similar process and that begins today, so to give Minnesota equal time we have invited Ms. Turner, and she invited Mr. Schaffer, to attend today's meeting to give us an update on the Minnesota Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan.

Haugen pointed out that in the staff report it is noted that, again the similarities between the MPO's Metropolitan Transportation Plan and these planning documents, but also point out the differences, with the main difference being that we also have to consider North Dakota with our planning considerations, much more so than Minnesota does, however, whereas in North Dakota they have less reliance on fiscal constraint and specific project identification; MnDOT does identify projects through their planning process beyond the T.I.P. years., so with that he will turn the screen over to Ms. Turner and Mr. Schaffer for a brief presentation.

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

Schaffer gave an overview of the plan, explaining that the Minnesota Go Vision guides all of their work, and it is the long-term vision for transportation in Minnesota. He said that they aim to deliver a multimodal transportation system that maximizes the health of people, the environment and our economy. He added that the vision answers what they are trying to achieve and how to get there, which is through a family of plans that include the Minnesota Go Vision, the SMTP, and their more detailed Modal and System Plan, which gets into more detail on how to implement the vision.

Schaffer commented that the SMTP broadly answers how they are going to achieve the Minnesota Go Vision, and the Modal and System Plans include planning for people walking, bicycling, taking transit, as well as those using freight, airports, and waterways and ports.

Schaffer stated that most of these plans are updated every five years; the Minnesota Go Vision is expected to be updated beginning in 2023. He added that the SMTP plan translates the Minnesota Go Vision into general policy direction for MnDOT and other transportation partners; the plan is for all users, all modes, and any jurisdiction that has a role in Minnesota's transportation system. He said that it was last updated in January 2017 and is due for an update every five years by Minnesota State Statute, but we are going to ask their Legislature for a six-month deadline this year due to the pandemic and other issues, so they expect to have a draft available for public comment in January 2022.

Schaffer gave a brief summary on previous updates; explaining that the engagement for the 2017 update was more innovative and included traditional engagement opportunities like those in the 2012 plan, but it also included information kiosks, popup events, on-demand presentation requests and social media and targeted on-line ads. He stated that through all those engagement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

efforts they received more than 12,000 responses over eight months, and that brings us to this third update that we are working on now; and because the previous plans were broader in focus they wanted to go deeper and more targeted in the 2022 plan, so they want to explore more areas where they know more now than they did during previous SMTP updates, and this will set them up for an update of the Minnesota Go Vision and Guiding Principles for the next planning cycle.

Schaffer reported that two questions that were asked of the 12,000 respondents were: 1) How important is it for MnDOT to plan for different areas of change, and 2) Which specific trends are most important for MnDOT to plan for.

Schaffer referred to a slide and pointed out that it lists the top five priorities they found when they looked at responses overall: 1) Aging Infrastructure; 2) Urban and Rural Population Trends; 3) Climate Change; 4) Environmental Quality; and 5) Transportation Behavior. He went over these findings briefly.

Schaffer asked how this information reflects what you are hearing today. Haugen responded that something we probably don't hear much about up here would be the need for climate change, probably more skepticism about that issue up here. Schaffer said, then that would probably fall lower on the priority list, not in the top five then. Haugen agreed that may be the case.

Schaffer commented that they notice the if you pull apart the demographic data that different patterns emerge; in terms of what is the top priority, so they wanted to do some analysis on the longer open ended questions that they had asked, and because different groups ranked differently they did an analysis of what they heard in 2016 and dug into the open ended responses to see what they would have heard if they had really had equity in mind. He stated that what that means for the update they are working on is that they really want to ask about a couple of things; they want to ask people about access to jobs and services and other important destination they have, the way people are getting around, transportation options that people wish they had, and the experiences they have had using different transportation options, and public input opportunities to allow people to have their voice heard in the transportation decision making process.

Schaffer said that they are using this update process to understand where there are gaps, where they need to hear and understand more to fill in their gaps; where they need to dig deeper to have a more meaningful impact, and to understand where the conversations changed or where we know more now than they did five years ago so they are going to be selecting some focus areas to help answer those questions. He added that they do have a process for identifying those focus areas and went over that process briefly.

Schaffer then went over the project timeline, stating that once it is completed in the spring of 2022, they will work to implement it until the start of the next planning cycle.

Schaffer stated that their next steps are to collect comments for the Public Participation Plan, and to ask public and partners which transportation topics are of greatest concern, what topics do you want to see in those four to six focus areas, they have two surveys available for public comment,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

one is more fun and visual for the public and the other is a more typical survey, but both are available for you to complete and to share with your communities. He said that there are several advisory committees guiding this effort and most will meet for the first time in early 2021 when they will need to finalize the background information and context, and that includes the about 30 trends that they are updating.

Schaffer commented that www.minnesotago.org has more information and Hally Turner is the project lead for this plan update.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee should have received a Constant Contact e-mail from the MPO that include the link survey and the public participation plans, so you should have that in your e-mail inbox so if you haven't opened it please do so and please participate. He added that Ms. Kouba will be serving on one of the advisory committees, he thinks it is the Equity Committee.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2021 SAFETY TARGETS

Haugen reported that this item was tabled at our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting; part of the discussion we had then was what were the options available to Bi-State MPOs on setting targets, and interestingly enough that lead to the question going all the way to headquarters of Federal Highway to help clarify the slight nuances that are in the regulations, so attached at the end of the staff report is a table format that MnDOT put together to circulate among its MPOs, so if you are in to X, Y, and Z you can understand what options are available.

Haugen stated that in asking the questions he put it into a more familiar format, perhaps, for this particular MPO, and that is that there are essentially three options; the first two options, A and B, aren't really where the questions are, it is in option C where, under some targets there is the ability to have an MPO Target specific to one State but have a State Target in the other metropolitan area, and whether Safety or PM1 allows this option, and to what extent does PM 2 and PM 3 allow this option; so essentially in PM1 the option C or the third option is not available, so if you decide to adopt a State Target on one side of your Bi-State MPO you automatically have to adopt the State Target for the other side as well, and so there are five targets for Safety, so you go through that exercise for each of the five targets; or you can adopt an MPO Target that is for the whole metropolitan area.

Haugen commented that the subtle difference is under the PM 2 and PM 3, which are the Conditions and Reliability Targets, you do have more of a variety of options; in this instance we still have Option B, but in this we can adopt an MPO Target in one of the States of the Bi-States, and adopt a State Target for the other area of the Bi-State, and obviously you can do vice versa from the graphic that is shown. He said that PM 1 does not allow this.

Haugen stated that unique to this there is also a possibility, although he can't fathom quite why someone would go through all of the gyrations to determine this, but you could have an MPO

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

specific Target in one State and a different MPO specific Target in the other State, so that is under PM 2 and PM 3 another nuance option for them, but for Safety it is basically we adopt both State Targets for that target or we adopt an MPO Target for that target. He hopes this answers the questions that were raised last month.

Haugen said, then, back to the data in the staff report that was presented last month, crunching through the MPO specific data, MPO staff is recommending the adoption of MPO Targets for all five of these performance measures. He pointed out that they are identified in the red box, and are all showing a declining number, so our trend is going in the right direction from a safety point of view. He stated that one thing that we have wrestled with in the past is whether on, particularly the fatalities and the fatalities and number of serious injuries for non-motorized, we use any decimal point or go with whole numbers; we have our past three years identified, the first two years we went with whole numbers but last year for fatalities we did go with a decimal point, so that would be something the Technical Advisory Committee can determine if they wish.

Haugen commented that we also indicate what our Target was for 2019, and what the actual data crunch was for that specific five-year rolling data number, and you can see that we essentially did meet or exceed our Target with the one exception of fatalities for vehicle miles traveled, they are a little higher.

Kuharenko stated that on the number of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled, he noticed that the table a couple of pages ahead, it looks like looking at the crash per 100 million vehicle miles traveled and the fatalities that we have been seeing in North Dakota, the next five year timeframe of 2016 to 2020, and so unless vehicle miles traveled increases dramatically he would anticipate that that number will probably stay around that same amount, and yet in the proposed targets for that item we are showing a target of 4.538, and he is just worried that we are setting ourselves for failure by setting a target that we will most likely exceed just in the data we already have in the previous four years. Haugen responded that just looking at this our target in 2018 was 6.73 based off of the data shown here, then we went to .599 to .574 but now the data shows that it is .538, and he asked if Mr. Kuharenko is identifying that he thinks that because there have been more fatalities in 2020 that will change. Kuharenko responded that he thinks that between the greater than zero fatalities in 2020 that unless vehicle miles traveled goes up substantially to drop that ratio, he is thinking we are setting ourselves up for failure just by lowering that target. He said that if you look over the past three years that we have in that category we seem to be rising instead of decreasing and yet our targets have been decreasing over the past three years. Haugen responded that that is because it is five years of rolling data, so we have two years here in 2017 and 2018 we had unfortunate fatalities, and in 2018 and 2019 on both sides of the river, which is unusual.

Haugen commented that he isn't sure about the statement that we are setting ourselves up for failure, we are identifying targets based on the data crunch; we do this annually and, again, the MPO itself is not subject to any sanctions or penalties, it is at the State level where those things occur. Kuharenko said, then, that if we didn't meet our goal for the number of fatalities for our non-vehicle miles traveled, and we are reducing the target even though we are probably not going to attain it, what is the purpose of decreasing it, if it is not realistic. Haugen responded that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

the methodology is the data crunch, we are using past crash histories, and we are looking at not just the past five years but a rolling five year of five year data to get these high years more level with the low years, so that is the methodology we have been using to set the targets, and so he isn't sure if we are anticipating that we will have more fatalities in the future, because if we are then we should probably work on understanding what is causing those fatalities and direct improvements to address those causes. He asked what Mr. Kuharenko would suggest as an alternative way to identify a target for fatalities. Kuharenko responded that in general, if we need to review these targets annually, and if us setting targets isn't necessarily having any impact on either State; if memory serves, it only becomes an issue if the individual States don't meet their targets, is that correct. Haugen responded that the penalties are there for individual Statewide, but what we are doing by setting our own MPO targets is forcing the States to more actively work with us on programming projects to address these targets. He stated that this has caused, on the Minnesota side, a revamping that is still on-going as to how the HSIP Program is being managed in the State of Minnesota so that has been one of the positive effects of setting an MPO Target instead of just defaulting to the Statewide Target. He explained that it led to a finding in the Minnesota S.T.I.P. document report pushed out by Minnesota Federal Highway, and now follow-up work being done, that it isn't a one day or a one-year fix of the HSIP Program, it is being implemented over a little bit of a timeframe, but that is the positive side of having a metropolitan target.

Kuharenko asked if we just have to review these targets annually, we don't necessarily have to change them annually. Haugen responded that they do not have to be changed, we can adopt the same targets as 2019. He explained that the methodology is supposedly driven by what the data is crunching out to be, but that is just a consideration, it doesn't have to just blindly march in what the number crunch is, we are just presenting what the number crunch values will be, and that is the methodology we have used in the past. He said that we have used a different value, a slightly higher one, for the non-motorized traffic in the past, and haven't used the exact number crunch.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE KEEP THE 2020 TARGETS FOR 2021, AND MOVING FORWARD REVIEW THIS ANNUALLY, AND CONSIDER REVISING THE TARGETS ONCE EVERY TWO TO THREE YEARS TO COINCIDE WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE.

Halford asked if the Technical Advisory Committee would make that decision or would you have like a small working group to decide when to change the targets. Kuharenko agreed that that is a good point. He said that he is assuming that we probably wouldn't need to get the whole Technical Advisory Committee involved with being shown the whole data crunch you were talking about, would it be more beneficial to have that done by a subcommittee; probably representatives from the DOT, City, and County. Haugen responded that that in essence is a lot of the Technical Advisory Committee members already. Kuharenko agreed that that is true. Zacher commented that he thought we had to take a look at these annually anyway. Haugen responded that we are doing it annually; what he understands the motion to be is that instead of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

automatically adopting a new target annually, we are limiting ourselves to only adopting new targets every other year or every third year, so if he understands this motion, this time next year we would be tying the hands of the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO to not adopting a new target but just reviewing what the target is, what the numbers are, but this motion would limit the ability to actually adopt a new target for 2022. Halford said, just have it as an agenda item to ask the Technical Advisory Committee if it should be changed or kept the same, and then that is the agenda item that comes every year as part of the update. Zacher commented that from the DOTs North Dakota side they have to ask the question every year, so whether we update it or adopt it, we have to ask the question every year, from his understanding. Kuharenko asked if that is for just reviewing the data or is that changing the targets. Zacher responded that they have the ability to change the targets if they see a need to, otherwise they can keep them status quo. Kuharenko said then, that from Mr. Zacher's point of view it would be better to just maintain the targets for 2020 and then bring it up next year for consideration of revisions of necessary. Zacher responded that he previously sent Mr. Haugen the targets that they were looking at setting, and if they chose to adopt those or not, or the MPO chooses to create their own, that is their decision, but he just needs to know and report back if the MPO is going to adopt what the State sets or are they going to adopt their own, that is really what he needs to report back. Haugen added that each year the data changes, therefore each State has adjusted their targets based on the data crunch, and so we are following that methodology, but just using MPO data instead of Statewide data.

Haugen reiterated that the motion made would be to not adopt a new target, to continue with our 2020 targets, and then he isn't sure if the mover and second still want to limit the ability to adopt a target next year if the data shows it or do they still want to maintain the motion as stated.

Kuharenko asked, again, if the only piece that Mr. Zacher needs to know is whether or not we have an MPO Target or are following the States targets, so he would be fine with leaving it with allowing for revisions every two or three years. Zacher stated that the thing to note, though, is that if the MPO chooses to set their own targets then the onus for the data collection and everything else, from his understanding, falls to the MPO to report back; if they adopt the States target then the State runs everything. He added that he shouldn't say just the data collection, it's the whole methodology and how the number was developed and that type of stuff, it is more than just picking a number out of the sky. Kuharenko said, then, with that in mind he would suppose that, if he is understanding what Mr. Zacher is saying is correct, if we end up having MPO specific targets that puts a lot more work on the MPO staff, what are the MPO staff's thoughts on that. Haugen responded that it actually doesn't, the State is still required to give us the data specific to the MPO area, so we get the data to the MPO specific area already, so it isn't that big of an onus.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, West, Bergman, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, Johnson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen reported that Mr. Bergman has another meeting he has to go to so he has requested that the two FTA Items from the next agenda item be discussed at this time, therefore if there are no objections, he would like to suspend the agenda to do discuss those two items.

MATTER OF 2022-2025 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

- g. FTA 5310
- h. FTA 5339

Kouba reported that this is an annual solicitation for 2022 FTA Funds, so we are looking at our Transportation Development Plan for the schedule that we have for various items for capital purchases.

Kouba stated that the funding request from CAT for 5339 funds includes the following projects in priority order of:

- 1) Scheduling and Dispatching Software
- 2) Bus Shelter Replacement
- 3) Data Management System

Kouba said that the funding request from CAT for 5310 funds includes the following projects in priority order of:

- 1) Mobility Manager
- 2) Replacement of ADA Minivan

Kouba commented that for the 5310, that is what we had in our T.I.P.; for the 5339 we do have the bus shelter project in the T.I.P., but we also have buses, which, according to CAT's Transit Asset Management they have all the buses they need at this time, due to some of the other mid-year NDDOT solicitations from previous years.

Kouba stated that staff recommends forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the FTA 5339 and FTA 5310 Project Request in the priority given.

Bergman added, so everyone is clear on these requests, a month ago they ended up getting some capital funds, which was funding for strictly vehicles only on the bus side; they applied for the one bus that they did need a replacement for, but all the rest of the buses are fairly new and in fact they won't need any until 2022 or 2023, so these 5339 Funds are going to replace their Fare Transit Software that has been in service for ten years, the cost of it has increased outrageously, at an average of about 7% a year, and they found two other companies that have similar software and very little change would be needed to implement and our cost would drop about \$50,000 a year, and that does not include the annual fees going down as well. He stated that the Data Management Software, there are two different companies that offer it, and they take everything

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

that is separated out in excel spreadsheets, financials, fare collections numbers and they combine it all into a cash savings allowing us to have a much better way of tracking our routes, our ridership, and all the new targets we have to meet, they can provide it all on one dashboard.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR THE 5339 AND 5310 PROGRAMS IN THE PRIORITY ORDER PRESENTED AND ADDRESS CAPITAL INVESTMENT SCHEDULE DURING NEXT YEAR'S TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, West, Bergman, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, Johnson, Magnuson, and Sanders.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF PROPOSED 2021 T.I.P. AMENDMENT – ND SIDE

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the information received from the City of Grand Forks regarding their Urban Grant Project on North 3rd Street. He pointed out that it shows that the bids came in substantially higher than the cost estimate in the T.I.P. document, and it is over the 25% threshold, so because of that there is a need to do a T.I.P. amendment.

a. Public Hearing

Haugen said that they did advertise that a public hearing allowing the public the opportunity to provide comments on the amendment was posted in the local paper, as well as on the MPO website and social media; we did not receive any comments.

b. Committee Consideration

Haugen stated that this amendment does not affect the federal portion of the project; the cost increase is being resolved with additional local dollars provided to the project, so we went from a \$3.46 million to a \$4.72 million dollar project, but the federal amount stayed the same.

Kuharenko commented that the only thing he would mention is that this is the City's estimate, and the Consultant's Engineers final estimate is what this was based on.

Haugen stated that they did ask about how this affects fiscal constraint, and the City assures us that all the current T.I.P. projects are not affected by this \$1.some million dollars of added funds to this project; so the recommended action is for the Technical Advisory Committee forward a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

recommendation to the Executive Policy Board that they approve this proposed FY2021 T.I.P. amendment.

MOVED BY PETERSON, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT ATHEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED FY2021 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Zacher stated that he would just suggest adding the PCN number, 22515, to the project.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2022-2025 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. CONDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen commented that the new T.I.P. cycle has started. He said that prior to discussing 2022 through 2025; both States have just received approval of, and released their S.T.I.P. documents for 2021 through 2024, so now we are going through the process of comparing and contrasting the T.I.P. versus the S.T.I.P., so possibly in the next month you will see some actions needed to reconcile the two documents, but the focus today is on the next T.I.P., FY 2022 to FY 2025 essential years.

Haugen stated that, as we do every year, we have to remind ourselves what the MPO responsibility is; it is to ensure that projects are consistent with our plan, that the financial planning remains constrained, and then we also prioritize the projects. He referred to a map and pointed out that the areas in dark brown and light brown need to have projects submitted to us to go through this process.

Haugen said that the projects are any project that involve the decision of Federal Highway, Federal Transit, or any federally funded project that impacts transportation, and then eventually regional significant projects. He stated that the purpose today is to get the candidate projects for the federal funds, which is a continuous 12-month process.

Haugen reported that FAST was extended one year, so we are still doing this T.I.P. review under FAST but as FAST expires and reauthorization or continuation happens, just to let you know what we do today may be subject to change because of the reaction we would have to do with change in federal law.

Haugen stated that funding levels, we are under a continuing resolution that ends Friday, so we are hoping that Congress does appropriate funds for the rest of the year; and we are assuming that they will be following the authorization levels that existed in the past. He added that we are looking at North Dakota projects this month, next month most of our review will be on the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

Minnesota side, but the following are the programs as noted in the Technical Advisory Committee agenda; each one is covering one of those 2022 to 2025 years.

Haugen commented that there were instructions released out on the North Dakota side for the Urban Roads and Regional Roads Program. He explained that there is a checklist and a set of instructions to try to help guide people submitting candidate projects as to what the expectations are with those projects. He gave a brief overview on the instructions and the guidelines that were provided.

a. Regional Roads

Haugen reported that, again, they are asking that if there have been any projects that have had some change to scope and/or costs, they be identified, but no new projects. He stated that there was one project that was being submitted with an updated scope of work and project cost; that is the Traffic Signal Rehabilitation on the Regional Road Network. He said that, as noted, it is currently programmed in 2024 as a pending project, so if funds are not actually available in 2024 it will automatically be funded in 2025, so that is why we can show it as being funded, that it will be programmed in the subsequent year.

Haugen commented that the scope of work changed, principally because when initially scoped it out there were still some other projects that weren't programmed yet, such as the HSIP project on 32nd Avenue; all the signals on 32nd were included in the original scope but they are now being done with the HSIP project so they are being removed from this project, and because this project has been pushed from the original request date out to 2024 or 2025, the year of expenditure needed to be updated, so the change in the scope and the cost estimate go from \$6.2 million to \$6.7, the federal amount from \$4.96 to \$5.33 million. He added that because this is pending, and we haven't fully programmed out 2025, it is still considered to be within fiscal constraint.

Haugen stated that there were three new projects submitted; again, the instructions were to not submit new projects as they don't meet the fiscal constraint and, therefore they aren't consistent with our Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). He said that he did highlight what those three projects were; the first one was in 2023 to do some concrete panel replacement and a micro-seal on 32nd Avenue between I-29 and South Washington; the second was to seek funds for what is likely a new interchange at 47th Avenue South, in response to a NEPA project that is occurring in 2021, at a cost of \$51 million; and the third was a submittal for 2024 for the same project that was submitted last year, but not funded for 2024 and that is the reconstruction of South Washington from Hammerling to DeMers Avenue.

Haugen said that there was one project submitted for the new T.I.P. cycle year, 2025; it is on Gateway Drive, and when we look at our MTP table for the fiscally constrained projects, we do notice that we have split the project into two segments, but we also notice that there is an error in the table. He pointed out that the first two projects identified are on Gateway Drive between I-29 and Columbia Road and Columbia Road to the Red River; and they have kind of the same description, but then we also have the same segments shown a second time with similar

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

descriptions and cost estimates, so there must be an error in our listing of projects, we wouldn't have in the short term these projects done twice within that short timeframe.

Haugen stated that the project that was submitted did not split into two segments, it covered the whole I-29 to the Red River corridor. He added that there is a difference in the cost estimates; in our MTP when we combined the two segments, we get roughly a \$1.6 million cost estimate, the request is roughly \$4.5 million, so they aren't sure why there is this significant cost difference. He said that they also note that, based on some of our past studies, it does acknowledge Access Management potential, but he isn't seeing much information as far as the North Washington Skewed Intersection Study results, and particularly there was some great bike/ped improvements that were highlighted at those intersections, so we would make note of that.

Haugen said that on the North Dakota side we always ask, what might be your project in say 2026, and what was submitted was a North Washington reconstruction between 1st Avenue North and 8th Avenue. He added that we won't spend much time on this one because we aren't formally asked to comment on it, but we do note, and as their documentation shows, this is something that is identified in the mid-range and we are still operating in the T.I.P. cycles in the short-range.

Haugen summarized there is essentially an update to one project being done, there is a submittal of new candidate projects to consider that has some significant differences in the cost estimates for fiscal constraint concerns, and then we have three new projects that are being submitted during the years that we have no funds to commit to projects, so therefore those projects aren't consistent with our MTP.

Kuharenko stated that he has the MTP pulled up and with the discussion regarding the differences in cost estimates and having doubled up projects on Gateway Drive; one of the things, if you end up looking, he thinks it is actually just below where you have the table snipped, it actually splits U.S.#2 into east bound and west bound, so it is likely that those pairs of projects are east bound/west bound. Haugen pulled up the table Mr. Kuharenko was referring to and Kuharenko pointed out that REP 2-3 and REP 3-6, and said that those two are split into east bound and west bound, and so he is guessing that those pairs that are closer to the top of the table are likely east bound and west bound as well, but it just wasn't explained in the description. Haugen agreed that that could be the case, but when he looks back at the original table, this is basically how it was provided to us from the District; they actually included a specific year that they would do these projects, and so they didn't have it split by lane direction, but they did have this as the short range project, and then obviously there would be a need during a long range transportation process to also go back and redo this stretch at a later year, and so these are identified, in the original table, as long range projects; so it appears it is just an error in the document, and the second pair should actually be labeled as long range, and then we would have to make the adjustments for the cost estimates to reflect long range year of expenditure, so he understands where Mr. Kuharenko is coming from with trying to identify east bound and west bound, but the base data that we got didn't identify them by direction. He added that he also believes you will find that we don't have a follow-up pavement rehab on Gateway Drive in the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

long range, which normally we would go in short range and then around 15 years we would program a follow-up project, based on a pavement maintenance cycle.

Haugen reported that included in the packet were just the projects that we felt were still consistent with the MTP, although the 2025 project does have a question on cost differences. He said that they didn't include all the information for the new projects for the years we weren't soliciting for; and then just to make sure all the loose ends were tied up, the City did submit a 2021 project, but that is already programmed, and we are only focusing on 2022 through 2025, possibly 2026; so, he didn't include the 2021 project.

Haugen said that we need to make a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board as to are the project submitted consistent with the MTP and if so, how do we prioritize them. He stated that from a staff point of view we have one project that is being updated that is consistent; we have another project for the new T.I.P. year that, based on fiscal constraint, may or may not be consistent with our fiscal constraints.

Kuharenko commented from their side of things they have worked with the Local District putting this list of projects together, and they are looking forward to having them submitted to the DOT. He said that they are aware that the projects that they submitted, outside the solicitation, may or may not be selected, but that was a process that they worked on with the Local District so they would be interested in seeing that move forward.

Peterson asked what the process would be to try to get the MTP to match the current project request. Haugen responded that the short answer would be to amend the MTP; the hard answer would be is there funds reasonably available to include these projects into the MTP. He said that the smaller dollar value ones, maybe; the \$50 million dollar on possibly not. He added that typically we would be assuming normal processes that there isn't any new money available to consider new projects into the timebands, then would have to figure out a one for one slot, basically; take a project that is prioritized, that is of similar cost, and push that one out to bring a new project into its place, and we aren't aware of, nor has any State identified for us, that there is new funds available to program those projects.

Haugen reported that from a staff point of view it is challenging to say that these are consistent with our planning documents. He said that in hearing that the City and the Local District wish to move these forward, then, perhaps identifying them as illustrative projects would be the route to take.

Kuharenko asked if they list these as illustrative projects, how does that impact the possibility of these projects being funded. Zacher responded that he would have to go back and check everything. He added that it just seems that when you have a mid-term project that you are trying to leap-frog over a short-term project it isn't going to work well, and it is going to call into question the whole MTP, so he isn't sure how to answer this question.

Haugen stated that a motion, something to the effect that the Technical Advisory Committee recommends that the Regional Signal Rehab project as being consistent and acknowledge the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

new scope of work and cost estimate; include the 2025 requested project as being consistent; and have the other three projects submitted as illustrative projects.

Kuharenko asked, for clarification, which one was listed in the mid-range again. Haugen responded that you were pointing out the mid-range projects for the west of I-29 as a way to maybe explain why there are two projects, but in this particular table there is no mid-range, there is a mid-range project identified for 32nd Avenue instead of a concrete panel replacement and micro-seal, there is a mid-range project for that segment of 32nd Avenue Reconstruction. He added that the 2024 project was not funded in 2024, typically we would see that as being a new candidate project for the next go around instead of trying to resubmit it in a year that it was not already programmed for, and then he would guess that knowing that the one signal rehab is already a pending project, meaning that it could easily move out of 2024; the cost has increased so it is going in the wrong direction as far as being fiscally constrained, you are adding more dollars to a project that is already pending in 2024. He said that another thing would be to have Fiscal Year 2024 changed to 2025 for the South Washington project between Hammerling and DeMers, and make that the project instead of the Gateway Drive one, for fiscal constraint we couldn't have two, but that would be another consideration.

Kuharenko asked Mr. Peterson if he would have any thoughts or concerns if they made those projects illustrative, from the 2022-2024 projects. Peterson said that, again, the term illustrative, is it in line with the pending terminology, remind him again what that means as far as that year and the term illustrative. Haugen responded that the distinction is pending means that if they aren't funded in a year they are automatically funded the following year; illustrative means that there are no known funds available and if they do get programmed we would have to go through a T.I.P. amendment process, and in this case if two of them get programmed we would also have to do a plan amendment. Peterson stated that he would like to visit a little bit with Mr. Noehre on this. He said that Mr. Noehre and himself had a little bit of conversation early but as far as getting them identified as illustrative didn't come up.

Kuharenko commented that one concept would be that we could always put forward a motion; and then would it be worthwhile for Mr. Peterson and Mr. Noehre to have conversation to what is agreeable and get that information to the MPO Executive Policy Board. Peterson responded that that would be fine.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN REGIONAL ROAD CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING AS ASSIGNED; SUBJECT TO FURTHER INPUT FROM THE LOCAL DOT DISTRICT ON THEIR DESIRE AS TO HOW TO SUBMIT THE THREE NEW PROJECTS, AS IS OR ILLUSTRATIVE.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

Haugen commented, then, that with this motion the Technical Advisory Committee is giving sole discretion to the Local District as to how to address three projects as being consistent with the plan, or being illustrative.

Zacher asked if once the District decides does that mean they are taking it to the Policy Board, or how does that work. Haugen responded that they would be communicating that to the MPO Staff, and we would ask them to have that decision made by noon Friday so it can be included in the Staff Report; so there will likely be two different motions presented to the MPO Board, what the Technical Advisory Committee and resulting District desire is and then staff would still suggest that the three projects be submitted as illustrative projects. He added that, again, our responsibility is to consider whether they are consisting with the MTP, and that includes the fiscal constraint component. He said that it is hard to understand how we can consider them to be consistent from a fiscal constraint point of view.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, West, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Zacher.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

b. Urban Roads

Haugen reported that, again, there are no new projects for 2022 through 2024, and while there weren't any new projects submitted if you have a project that needs to be updated because of a scope change and/or cost increase, that should be submitted.

Haugen said that the City did submit one project update, that is also on their Traffic Signal Rehab project. He stated that, again, some projects have been already programmed with other federal funds that had originally included signals, and the rehab ones can now be removed. He added that also the intent was to have these projects kind of paired one year after the next, with the Regional Projects being pushed out to 2024. He said that the City is also updating the cost estimate, but also is requesting that instead of being funded in the current 2022, it be moved to 2023, so again the concept of doing the local signals one year and following up with the regional signals the second year, can be done.

Haugen commented that the cost estimate, because of these changes and updating the scope, it went from \$3.1 million to \$3.33 million; the federal amount went from 2.28 to 3.36, so fiscal constraint is probably still there, and it is still in the short-term.

Haugen said that a thing to discuss on this project is the knowing that the 2024 project is pending, and we just increased the cost, and not knowing if there are any more funds on 2024, if it gets pushed to 2025, do we think we would also be requesting this project then gets pushed to 2024. Kuharenko responded that that is a possibility.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

Haugen stated that there weren't any other projects submitted during the current T.I.P. years; for the new T.I.P. year cycle there was one project submitted. He said that again, when we look at the MTP, we do note that North Columbia Road is identified as needing to have reconstruction and during the MTP process we prioritized the northern half of Columbia Road between 8th Avenue and Gateway Drive as a high priority and placed it in the short-term; the City is requesting that the mid-range project between University and 8th Avenue be moved ahead of the Northern segment project. He stated that we don't have any information as to why this switch is being requested, the application does show the MTP table with the mid-range project being highlighted but there is no mention of the one above it as being a short-range project. He added that we do note that the dollar values in the application and what is in the MTP is different as well, so it does have an impact on our fiscal constraint; probably in this project it might be leaving dollars on the table, we aren't quite sure. Kuharenko responded that, as the Technical Advisory Committee may know, these two projects are right next to each other in the MTP, and in addition since they are right next to each other as well and they are currently working on plans for the Southern segment of Columbia from the Overpass to University, it made more sense to bring this one forward. He added that in addition, there is actually a traffic signal at the intersection of 6th and Columbia, and if this project moves forward and receives funding, that signal could be pulled out of the Signal Rehabilitation Project because it would most likely be rehabilitated as part of this project, so it doesn't make sense to rehab a signal and then replace it a few years later.

Kuharenko stated that he knows that in general they ended up submitting this, as well as the other packets of information to the MPO on November 17th; he was hoping to kind of get these comments taken care of prior to the Technical Advisory Committee meeting which is part of the reason why they ended up submitting them so early, so it would have been beneficial to have gotten that information, or to have been able to answer these questions prior to the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Haugen responded that in that conversation that we did have about these projects are that these are basically your marching orders, so would there wouldn't be much discussion on what information has changed, so that is where we are at on it.

Haugen reiterated that we do have two projects submitted; one is just a rehab of an existing programmed project, it is being asked to update the cost but also move it back a year, and we did discuss that there is a potential possibility that what happens on the regional side might affect this again. He added that there is another candidate project that is on North Columbia, and we do have two segments in the MTP, previously we prioritized the northern half versus the southern half, and there really isn't much of a prioritization from that point of view but it does make a difference in the fiscal constraint, so that is a concern.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN ROAD CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY202-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND IN THE PRIORITY ORDER SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Zacher.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, West, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

c. Urban Grant

Haugen reported that, just to remind you, the Urban Grant Program is part of the Governor's Main Street Initiative; it focuses essentially on the downtown areas, and it was crafted out a couple of T.I.P. cycles ago taking federal funds away from the Regional Road, Urban Road, and some other programs to focus on Main Street areas, downtowns part of the Governor's overall revitalization of downtowns.

Haugen commented that during an MTP process, since this is a reasonably forecasted funding source, we try to identify what projects would be eligible for the funds. He stated that it was a new program, so we had no history of what level of funding to expect, we did nonetheless put together a table of projects identifying what we thought were the priority areas of roadways that need to be done. He said that we did successfully get several of our projects that were identified in the MTP already programmed, in fact our North 3rd Street, we had originally divided it into three segments and all three were funded in one shot. He added that we also, then, had one of our North 4th Street segments funded, as well, so in the new candidate year, this is not going out for a full T.I.P. funding cycle, sort of like the Transportation Alternative Cycle which is on any specific year in the T.I.P., for this program it is actually 2023.

Haugen stated that the City of Grand Forks did submit a candidate project; to do a mill and overlay of a variety of streets in the eligible area. He said that it is hard to discern that we are doing anything that is identified within the table that is in the MTP. He added that there is a segment on Kittson, and we have gone through both the Downtown Action Plan and the Downtown Transportation Study of multimodal facilities on Kittson, the proposal was to just do a mill and overlay of what is there, so that is the one candidate project that was submitted to the MPO. He added that, for the benefit of some of our newer Technical Advisory Committee members, the downtown area highlighted in yellow was established when this program was initially crafted out three or so years ago and is the area in which this program could fund projects to help revitalize the downtown area of Grand Forks.

Kuharenko commented that one of the reasons the City ended up submitting this project was that with the amount of reconstruction going on downtown between DeMers, 3rd Street, 4th Street, a mill and overlay on University; one of the things they have been hearing from local businesses is how all the construction that has been going on in the downtown has impacted them, and now how COVID has impacted them as well so one of the reasons why they ended up submitting this mill and overlay project was to get a project to rehabilitate existing streets as well as update the ADA Ramps to try to revitalize the area a little bit better while still having a relatively short-term impact on those local downtown business. He said that they also have a fair amount of redevelopment going on on South 4th Street, just south of DeMers Avenue, which has impacted a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

number of those businesses as well, so that is some of the reasons why they ended up looking at this mill and overlay project in the downtown area.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN GRANT CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, Zacher, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, West, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

d. Transportation Alternative

Haugen reported that actually two years are being solicited, FY2023 and 2024. He stated that one application was submitted for FY2024 so there isn't anything for FY2023.

Haugen commented that the FY2024 project is similar to what was submitted last year that was not funded and that is highlighted in green and is located along 32nd Avenue South west of the interchange, which is now being identified as being done with local funds only and will be done in FY2023.

Haugen stated that the application for the FY2024 project is to fund the conversion of roughly two-thirds of the gravel multi-use path along South 48th Street between 32nd Avenue South and 17th Avenue South, and is shown highlighted in red. He added that there is a cap on the North Dakota side for any individual TA project and that is at \$290,000.

Haugen reported that last year we noted that we really didn't address these gravel paths in our MTP; we did identify other segments priority and fiscally constrained, and we also discussed that we should do an amendment to our MTP Bike and Ped element to address these; with this project not getting funded the spark to go through that amendment process waned and we didn't follow up on it so, just as last year, if this project is forwarded and submitted and does get awarded, and even if it doesn't get awarded, we should probably consider going through that process of addressing how to treat these gravel paths in our MTP; and there is more than one throughout Grand Forks that perhaps might be something that is a higher priority than the projects that are already identified.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED; AND COMMIT TO DOING A PLAN AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS THE BIKE/PED ELEMENT FOR GRAVEL PATHS.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, Zacher, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, West, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

e. H.S.I.P

Haugen reported that, again, with our MTP we do identify projects, most of them are coming directly from the Grand Forks Local Road Safety Program Document, but we also, during the MTP, try to identify some additional potential safety projects to program. He said that we do note in our MTP that there aren't a lot of projects for the outer years identified, and that perhaps a lot of the projects that were in the Local Road Safety Program Document were already being addressed in the current T.I.P., or past T.I.P.s.

Haugen stated that two applications were submitted; the first is to do a road safety review of the Intersection of DeMers and Washington, we do have a lot of studies on this and it is continuing to show up as a crash location of concern. He added that typically a lot of the H.S.I.P. dollars are going towards actual concrete instead of planning, however H.S.I.P. funds have been used in the past, particularly the 32nd Avenue Corridor had a safety review done on it and that precipitated the H.S.I.P. project that is about to be awarded. He said that we do have some projects yet to be implemented at this particular intersection from the Local Road Safety Program Document, however the request is to look at it to see if there are more low hanging fruit or low cost or interim short-term improvements to address the crash issues. He said that we do have bigger long-term investment recommendations/alternatives identified; a continuous flow intersection, which was also a part of the Washington Street Corridor Study, so that is one of the requests.

Haugen commented that the other request is, as part of the continued support of School Safety in and around schools, we do have a request to install five speed minder signs. He said that included in the staff report is an example of what a speed minder sign is and a map that shows the proposed locations of the five signs.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE H.S.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, Zacher, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, West, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

f. Railroad Crossings

Haugen reported that there is some uniqueness to this item in that there is no formal application needed to be filled out, rather there is sort of a request for typical information to be identified, so we don't have a formal application to show you, but we do have what was submitted. He stated that the request is to install railroad crossing signals at University Avenue and the Mill Spur. He said that they have the Mill Spur Railroad Crossing Study, where in addition to adding the basic traffic signals there are some other improvements that were identified. He stated that part of the request from the State was to identify near school or Safe Routes To School, and this crossing is also on two Safe Route To Schools with Valley Middle School being to the west and Wilder Elementary School being the school for students that have to safely cross the tracks to get to and from school, so with that that is the request.

Kuharenko commented that one of the main issues of this crossing was the existing driveway on the north side of University Avenue, the City has recently purchased that property of 1002 University Avenue in anticipation of this project.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE H.S.I.P. RAILROAD CROSSING CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, Zacher, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Noehre, Bail, Brooks, Emery, Christianson, Hopkins, West, Johnson, Magnuson, Bergman, and Sanders.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that Friday morning they are interviewing for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan; four proposals were received, so we still hope to be presenting to the December Executive Policy Board a potential contract and final scope of work.

Haugen stated that the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan is progressing; if you haven't visited the website, we encourage you to do so.

Haugen said that the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study RFP was released, the deadline for that is December 30th, so in January we hope to have a contract for that project as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 9th, 2020**

Haugen reported that last month we finalized the Downtown Transportation Study

b. NDDOT Transportation Connection Update

Haugen reported that the NDDOT requested this month not to do a presentation as they have some internal meetings, and with the holidays, they felt that it would be better to not do a presentation but did want to note that next month they may have a draft document for your consideration of the Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan for North Dakota.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 9TH,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:31 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager