

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 11th, 2021, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 2:03 p.m. (Technical problems caused delay of start of the meeting)

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineering; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit. The following members were present via Zoom: Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; and Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Absent: Brad Bail, Stephanie Halford, Jesse Kadrmas, David Kuharenko, Rich Sanders, Ryan Riesinger, Michael Johnson, Nick West, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Kristen Sperry, FHWA-North Dakota; Anna Pierce, MnDOT-Central Office; Tim Burkhardt, Alliant Engineering; and Mike Kondziolka, Alliant Engineering; and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

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 JULY 14TH MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JULY 14TH, 2021 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a copy of today's presentation, the new Tech Memo on the build options, and the Draft Purpose and Need memo. He then turned the screen over to Alliant for a brief update.

Burkhardt stated that this is update number six and the main topic will be a recap on the public open house that is still underway online; where we are with the documentation of Project Purpose and Need and then the real meat is, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, the traffic results for the build alternatives.

Burkhardt said that you are probably generally familiar with what they are up to, which is really to get engagement, sort of number one, a lot of information out in terms of this is why we are doing the study, and then sort of the base information that we call "no build"; and next time around will be input on the options and the comparison.

Burkhardt stated that where we are, or a recap, they did do some pretty decent advertising, and the core of the open house is the online site that is on the platform they call "Social Pinpoint", which hopefully you have visited. He said they also did a live online presentation on July 27th, and people were able to provide input via chat. He added that they did record that and it is available on the website.

Burkhardt commented that they do have some statistics on the open house participation, which he would like to share. He said that they are getting good online participation, but low participation in terms of that live online meeting, 13 participants, so that was not successful so would be interested in feedback on why and/or how we can do that better, there are probably lots of reason, including the usual ones.

Burkhardt stated that in terms of the online visits you can see the numbers here; total site visits, and then the unique users, which means people that are here for the first time as opposed to people coming back multiple times, so brand new users since they put up the public open house information, 1300 visits, that is all good; they do have a survey in there and a map that you can comment on specific to issues around the schools, but there are pretty low numbers on those as well, but he would say that the comments they are getting there are definitely useful and good.

Burkhardt commented that just to summarize what they are hearing at the live event; a very small number of people, and as we know, typically people that have more to say are going to show up and maybe have more concerns, so the number one discussion of question and comment type was about traffic on 32nd Avenue and traffic around the schools, in terms about increased traffic.

Burkhardt stated that the online comments, we do get some nice output so he would like to present this graph, but keep in mind this is a small sample size so don't take it to the bank. He said that we see, not surprisingly, if you just look at where the comment activity is on the topics, there are more comments about concerns like I'm worried about as opposed to hey this is great. He stated that they asked people on these topics; traffic volumes, safety, etc., and also other,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

which again was sort of back to neighborhood impacts, and that wasn't surprising, but certainly as we go forward there will be a challenge to make sure we are communicating well, responding to questions and to get people to see the facts as we see them as opposed to only their concern, both of which are valid.

Burkhardt stated that they asked people what they thought about their Purpose and Need Statement, and again not a lot of responses, but more in the strongly agree comment than elsewhere, which is good, and that is essentially more for information about how people are reacting to the messaging in his opinion, purpose and need is essentially a factual document. He said that they did ask people to provide comments, and so he thinks again, not surprising, but for him, as Project Manager, and thinking about our communications and messaging, sort of one side of the river versus the other, or one neighborhood versus the other, not surprising but something that he would like to try to focus more on the big picture on what the need is and how we can best accommodate it so that will be what we focus on as we go forward.

Burkhardt referred to a graphic of the Comment Map, specifically focused on school impacts, understanding that is sort of an overlap with the bridge study, and it can be useful for the study, and useful otherwise at individual school sites. He said that, again, there aren't a lot of comments here, but it is a useful tool; probably the most comments, shown in purple, were again about 32nd Avenue and again concerns about traffic increases. He said that he is glad to see some comments on the Elks Drive location, just in terms of people thinking about how that location works, and again if you go on the website, you can see these comments, and they will continue taking comments through August 15th.

Williams stated that she has one comment, it is actually further on in the study but you kind of touched on it so it might be wise to bring it up here. She said that on the last page of the memo, Page 4, it is about the socio and economic factors, and it has neighborhood quality of life, but then the summary says that it would support; now are you talking about the overall community is going to be okay, it is kind of confusing from the standpoint that if you are going to put more traffic into a neighborhood, she doesn't think that is improving their quality of life, but then if you are taking something away from another and balancing it out then that could be an improvement, so she thinks it is kind of a misnomer to call it "neighborhood quality", because the groups there look at themselves as entirely different entities, it may be more appropriate to call it "community". Burkhardt responded that he thinks that is an excellent comment as that was the intent, they are looking at tradeoffs and less traffic at one place and more somewhere else, but is it more balanced as an example. Williams agreed, adding that those are two different neighborhoods. Burkhardt responded that he was thinking in terms of, my neighborhood quality of life, and that feeds into one versus the other which he doesn't want to do, so he is very happy to make that change in that document.

Burkhardt referred to the Draft Purpose and Need slide and commented that there are a lot of words on here, so the comment period is open, as he said, through August 15th. He stated that this is a living document that evolves as understanding evolves through the comment period.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

Burkhardt stated that the next part of the slide is about something you are all familiar with; the study is identified as a Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) Study; the intent of which is to, as a project for Mr. Emery in the Environmental phase to be able to use the work we are doing now in the environmental document. He said that there are a lot of ins and outs to that, and technicalities, depending on lead agencies; Minnesota or North Dakota, complying with the federal process. He explained the summary that we have is for an informal PEL process, North Dakota does not have a formal PEL process and North Dakota is the lead agency when it comes to that issue; Minnesota does have a formal PEL process which goes well beyond the steps we are taking in this study so they have had conversations just to clarify what we are doing and how the study relates to those two states and their processes, and this has come up, in part related to the last bullet, which is where we are asking, as part of a formal PEL or NEPA process, there is an opportunity to ask and get input from all the ranges of environmental agencies and we are doing that and for those of you that have been advising on that he is about to send out that request, but then the question is how does that relate, what is the process that is feeding back into.

Williams pointed out that it says that NDDOT is the Lead Agency; who is the main contact person, is it the Lead Agency or is it going to be the Lead Agency. Zacher responded that NDDOT is the Lead Agency and since he is the MPO Coordinator, he would be the main contact person. He explained that it is a study, so it is still going through the MPO, but NDDOT is the Lead Agency for the Bi-State MPO. Williams asked if there might be somewhere in the document that we can summarize what the differences are between the two agencies so that the public and everyone will know what they are that we could cut and paste in the document, even if it is a chart that says yes and no and what the different things are that are covered. Haugen responded that there isn't anything that exists that compares North Dakota to Minnesota so that would have to be created. Williams asked what more do we need to do to make this okay for both agencies. Haugen responded that the short answer is that essentially North Dakota has to approve a formal PEL process, and we have discussed this internally with NDDOT, and we are where we are. Burkhardt added that they are doing as much as they possibly can to try to make this study compliant and therefore valuable and to not have to repeat the work if we were to go into the environmental process, but because it is not an official PEL process there is no sign-off that guarantees that and he thinks, unfortunately, that is the best we can do and this is not the only study or agency, it is an age old process with NEPA and the PEL process tries to improve on that and in the formal process it does but in the informal process it is better but there is still some risk of having to go back on some things in the NEPA process.

Mason said he had a question about the letters. He said that he knows MnDOT provided some revised sample language, and he is just curious if the letters being sent out will be including that language or what is the final plan for those. Burkhardt responded that they will, and added that Mr. Mason might have also answered his question which was does he bother you all who were in that loop with another review; he has a draft ready to go out so why doesn't he send that back out to the group to look at it again and make sure you are okay with how they addressed that.

Burkhardt commented that one thing he wanted to say as he reviews this and thinks back to that public involvement is, actually two things he wants to say; 1) as you may have noticed, while we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

have this information on how the different alternatives perform, what we don't have yet and haven't done yet is a really nice concise comparison or evaluation that summarizes no build versus Elks versus 32nd in terms of performance and some of the other criteria, so that is coming next so if you are wondering how does this compare, that is coming and he just wanted to share that; and 2) between the information that we have on the intersection level of service performance and the graphics is ultimately how we judge the performance from that engineering traffic professional perspective. He added that they also have a bunch of graphics that show the forecast change in traffic volumes. He said that they are very interesting, and the public will either like or dislike them depending on the answer they are interested in, but they are interesting. He stated that he does want to work on them a bit when we get to our public input phase because as you see 3,000 vehicles more or 1,500 less it is hard for people to know what that means and they assume that 3,000 is very bad and results in something negative, and it might for them personally, but again if you look at performance from a level of service perspective and how we intend for that street to operate those are different so he just wanted to preempt that as you look at those graphics, that is certainly something that comes up; which is more important and what does that mean so that is what they will be interpreting that when we do the comparison that is coming up. Williams asked if the actual numbers can be put in when the final report is done rather than over 3,000 or under 3,000, are we talking 10,000 or are we talking 3,001 type thing. Burkhardt responded that he thinks that that would be a good addition. He added that Mr. Kondziolka and himself had talked about that even the weighting of the lines, while kind of useful it is also a little bit, like in the case of that 3,001, it could exaggerate so they had a version of these with colors and not weights, and he thinks they will do a different version of these for the public, and yes, the numbers is another good thing.

Kondziolka stated that he is going to discuss the Future Build Alternative Traffic Operations Analysis. He added that this analysis is for the Elks Drive and 32nd Avenue bridge options, these are looking at the years 2030 and 2045, as the no build analysis also did. He said that they are looking at both segment and intersection performance in terms of traffic mobility, and then they also conducted warrants and analysis for traffic signal warrants and for all way stop control warrants with this analysis and then after concluding that looked at mitigation options for the different scenarios at locations that were expected to operate unacceptably.

Kondziolka said that, as Mr. Burkhardt just stated we are going to go through the volume changes, and we have an exhibit showing the difference for each of the Elks Drive and 32nd Avenue bridge options. He noted that these show the difference between the no build and the bridge alternative volumes for the same year, so this is 2030 no build versus the Elks Drive 2030 and then for the 2045 no build versus the 2045 bridge alternative.

Kondziolka stated that these graphics are really just showing what our anticipated differences in traffic volumes along this network are with each of the alternatives as compared to the no build option. He said that as you can see, and as expected traffic on the northern portion of the study area is anticipated to be reduced while we are increasing traffic around the bridge on the southern portion of the area, and so we can see some more significant reductions along DeMers and 4th and on Washington Street and then increases are taking place on the southern section so 32nd and 24th and then across the bridge.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

Kondziolka commented that these somewhat speak for themselves, so he won't go into too much detail on them but the big takeaway for all of them is kind of more so after we look at the difference between the Elks Bridge option and the 32nd Avenue Bridge option. He pointed out that the Elks Bridge option has a little bit more of a balance between 24th and 32nd and between Greenway and 190th, so given the location of the bridge being slightly further north than the 32nd Avenue Bridge there is a little bit more of a balance in terms of traffic volume draw whereas the 32nd Avenue Bridge option does concentrate more on the traffic that is shifted off the northern roadways to the more southern roadways so to 32nd and to 190th as compared to the Elks Drive Bridge option. He said that if you go to 2045 you will see a similar pattern.

Williams stated that she has one comment, and you kind of touched on it; but in your slide it says what the slides actually are, they are forecasted volumes and then the differences between them, and she but she doesn't think that really comes across on these slides; it says forecast volumes changes between no build and build for 2030 or 2045, depending upon, could you actually make the title of the slides say that. She explained that she asked somebody about this, and they said that they couldn't figure out what this was, just based on that title. Kondziolka responded that he can, just to further clarify that it is a comparison of forecasted volumes. Williams said that would clarify that you are comparing the no build and its volume changes and such.

Kondziolka referred to the 2030 Elks Drive Bridge option slide and stated that this is a similar presentation to the no build synopsis we went through previously. He said that in terms of, and he guesses these graphics more so, the graphics on the left are kind of summarizing everything we have found for the mobility and congestion analysis, but for the Elks Drive Bridge option we have in 2030 none of the roadway segments, which would be colored green to red are operating at an unacceptable level so the orange or red would be considered unacceptable, however there are multiple intersections that are expected to either fail at a Level of Service F or approach capacity so the orange or yellow intersections are approaching capacity and those that are red are expected to exceed capacity. He added that a big disclaimer for this analysis is that this is all done assuming just traffic growth but no changes to the traffic control, these are the existing conditions in terms of analyzing future volume with turn lanes and traffic control that is currently out there plus any programmed improvements, so similar to the no build scenario.

Kondziolka stated that, just a note on the Rhinehart and Bygland intersection they evaluated that as they did in the no build, with both with the existing traffic control and with the proposed round-about control. He said that it is shown with the hatch marks there because we have two different sets of results that are expected to operate acceptably with the round-about but would have issues without it.

Kondziolka said that looking at the 2045 Elks Drive Bridge option you will see similar results, you might have noticed the intersection at Bygland and Greenway had a star previously, but it went away here and that is because it was analyzed with the programmed traffic signal that is expected by the Year 2045. He stated that is the biggest change here; we see a little bit of yellow on Washington Street, so there are slightly degraded operations but still operating within what is considered acceptable, and then we have kind of a concentration of intersections that are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

operating above capacity or would be expected to operate above capacity near Elks Drive at Belmont and then 32nd at Cherry and Belmont as well.

Kondziolka said that moving on to the 32nd Avenue option, going through it similarly, again we don't have any roadway segments that are expected to exceed capacity of function, no orange or red for the roadway segments, however we do have a few intersections that are expected to exceed capacity; again at Cherry and 32nd, Belmont and 32nd, Greenway and Bygland, and at 4th and Belmont and Bygland and Rhinehart.

Kondziolka commented that in 2045 we see similar conditions; the same condition for Greenway, the traffic control was changed to a signal, so the traffic control issue goes away. He said that there is an additional intersection at Washington and 32nd that will be expected to reach Level of Service E and D at peak hours.

Williams stated that she thinks that maybe by actually putting the numbers on the streets, the volume numbers, it will make it clearer but it is showing that Belmont and 4th isn't improving above a Level of Service E with the new bridges, and she is sure that is based on some of the existing numbers and it just doesn't improve it enough, but she is wondering if even with the new bridge it will still be at that level because she thinks the neighborhood in that area is expecting to almost have all the traffic go away so she doesn't want them to get their hopes up that all their problems will be solved, so maybe just an explanation can be put in when you do the analysis you said you will be doing so they know that even though the traffic will be reduced it will still not bring it to an acceptable level of service. Kondziolka responded that that is accurate and this again is the unmitigated scenario, so without any changes, this is an all-way stop intersection, so without any changes, looking out to 2045, even with a new bridge, the traffic growth that is anticipated it would still result in failing operations at that intersection, so that would be a location where we would want to recommend some kind of intersection improvement no matter what the scenario is, that would be between the no build, the Elks Drive Bridge or the 32nd Avenue Bridge that intersection would require some type of improvement by 2045. Williams said that that would probably answer the questions the neighborhood might have. Burkhardt added that the point is that the all-way stop control can only do so much, so it is partly what you would like it to be, or what makes sense from an engineering standpoint, what that four way can actually do.

Kondziolka said that the next piece of this analysis was to look at, for each of the intersections that had unacceptable operations, or a Level of Service E or F, the did a warrants analysis, so this is looking at either warrants for installing a traffic signal or there are also warrants for installing an all-way intersection control if you are looking to move from a two-way stop or side street stop and going to an all-way stop control. There aren't specific warrants for a round-about because round-about can be considered anywhere regardless of volume conditions, round-about are considered as a potential mitigation option and there are not specific warrants. He said that in looking through this, really the primary information here is not whether warrants were met, so we are mostly summarizing here for the intersections that reach unacceptable levels by 2045 for each of the scenarios, what are the potential options that we should consider for mitigation, and for most of these we will see that both a signal or all-way stop control would be able to consider

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

based on traffic warrants; but at a couple of these intersections there were no warrants met, specifically the 4th and Belmont, as we were discussing under the Elks Bridge and 32nd Avenue Bridge alternatives, and that really is probably an important point relative to the previous comment, the volumes do change there, the volumes are reduced at that intersection however it is still expected to operate poorly and this kind of exemplifies that there are volume changes with those bridge scenarios but not enough to correct operations without additional mitigation.

Williams commented that, just a little information, you probably didn't gather these counts because of various different things that we have not been able to get really good counts, but Belmont and 4th does warrant a traffic signal if you use the school crossing, so it does meet a warrant. She added that she is sure they will look at that with the pedestrian thing and all that, but she can verify that it does meet that warrant. Kondziolka responded that that is probably an important point of verification, there are nine warrants that can be considered and for the purposes of this analysis some of them are more unique to particular applications, the volume based warrants are what was analyzed for this study here so this is looking at just turning movement volumes, that is warrants 1, 2, and 3, there is a slow base warrant and that may be met here as well. Williams asked if that also applies to Cherry and 32nd. Kondziolka responded it does.

Kondziolka stated that the Mitigation Analysis Methodology is just kind of an overview of what the process was to establish a hierarchy or process of looking at the mitigation in order to look at these consistently and in order to select an option consistently. He said that the outline of this process for identifying mitigation was to first look at just what the addition of turn lanes could do without a change in traffic control, so just adding turn lanes to improve conditions. He stated that the next would be if we are starting from a side street stop condition to convert to an all way stop control if all of the acceptable warrants are met and then to add just the minimum turn lane additions that would be required to reach acceptable operations. He said that if that wasn't enough to reach acceptable operations the next would be to convert to signalized control with minimum turn lane additions, and then finally converting to a single lane roundabout was the last step in the process, and these are really looking at what is the minimum amount of mitigation required in order to reach acceptable operations and to most cost effectively mitigate the intersection. He added that that is the general methodology, there were some additional considerations for locations near schools on 4th and Belmont and 32nd and Cherry where we know the pedestrian crossings are a priority and for crash issue intersections.

Kondziolka referred to the Mitigation Summary slide and commented that there is a lot going on so he will just kind of walk us through what they are showing in the table. He said that for each of the scenarios they are showing what, at each intersection that had unacceptable operations into the future, type of level of service and which warrants were met for that intersection. He added that there are a couple of columns for school adjacent and then for identified crash issues, which is what he was just discussing; those are locations where we took in additional considerations outside of the hierarchy in that step wise process where we are evaluating potential mitigation functions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

Kondziolka stated that the next column of acceptable mitigation control options, this is of those options that were warranted, which of them resolved the intersection to an acceptable operation, so only those that were able to be effective enough to reduce local service below a level E are shown in that column. He said that the last three columns; that last section, the assumed mitigated control option is the option that first satisfied the criteria in the hierarchy we discussed, so this would be the option that would effectively mitigate and would be the first to achieve acceptable operations on the list of four steps.

Williams commented that, in our transportation plan we have Level of Service C as the Level of Service we want to achieve. Haugen responded that that isn't correct. Williams asked if we are going for a Level of Service D in this study. Haugen responded that our transportation plan now has a Level of Service D as the level we want to achieve.

Burkhardt stated that that is it in terms in their presentation today, but again, next steps, in terms of their work will be that comparative evaluation really summarizing, there isn't a lot of new technical information on the traffic side but summarizing that so we can see it as a side by side comparison and then bringing in some of the other factors in terms of environmental issues. He added that they will also be creating some graphics illustrating these alternatives, in particular the crossing itself on the intersections, they will do those in a concept drawing and then a map that also summarizes the mitigation that would be needed that would go along with each of those options including the no build to make them whole to address any intersection or operation issues.

Williams said that she thinks we are all aware of this, but it is very confusing for some people; when we are talking about traffic and vehicles, we are only doing this for passenger type vehicles, right, this is not for trucks, or is it going to be for trucks. Haugen responded that for the bridge itself the concept has always been described as mimicking or mirroring the Point Bridge. Williams said that she actually had somebody ask her that question and they were getting all upset that there were going to be trucks running through there, so if we just iterate this at the beginning, that we are talking about passenger vehicles, she thinks that would cut out a lot of comments. Burkhardt suggested maybe calling it a local bridge with passenger vehicle traffic. Williams added that you might have to carry that over from one memo to the next, and repeat it, but she thinks it will sooth some ruffled feathers. Burkhardt agreed that we should repeat that everywhere. He added that he is hopeful that their illustrations of the bridge will help people see that it is like the Point Bridge and not like an interstate or multi-lane bridge.

Burkhardt asked if there was anything else that Mr. Haugen would like to add. Haugen commented that he thinks we need to establish some deadline for Technical Advisory Committee on Tech Memo 3C, it is in draft form, and we have had some comments today, and he would ask that any other comments you may have on it be submitted to staff by Friday, August 20th. He added that the Open House Comment period is open until August 15th, so at our next Technical Advisory Committee meeting we should have more or less a cleaned-up Tech Memo 3C and then the results of our initial public engagement process to report. He said that he isn't sure if Alliant has another work item to present as a draft to us then as well. Burkhardt responded that he can't quite answer that but he thinks we are at the point where, given where we are at the end

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

of year, and our next public engagement he want to move us on relatively quickly, at least from a technical standpoint now that we have the traffic information established to do the concept drawings and the evaluation, whether that will be ready in advance of next months meeting, probably not, but he will lay out the schedule to get to that detail. He added that we also have the next Ad Hoc meeting in there as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF FINAL FY2022-2025 T.I.P.

Haugen commented that we did advertise a public hearing for this time and date and we allowed people to provide written comments prior to it, there is no one in the audience today and we did not receive any oral or written comments prior to the deadline.

Haugen stated that included in your report is the full draft that was out for public comment. He said that since then we did have some comments from MnDOT and then also a couple things on the North Dakota side that we will cover in our discussion.

Haugen said that if you noticed, the T.I.P. looks considerably different than in the past, MnDOT and North Dakota provided a template for us to use to help improve the document, and we did the best we could to implement it. He added, though, that there are still a lot of comments on how we can improve it, there is, though, one specific comment as it relates to the actual T.I.P. tables themselves that MnDOT expressed we needed to address; a lot of them centered on transit on the Minnesota side. He said that he knows that Ms. Ellis and MnDOT were trying to have a conversation on this. Ellis responded that she hasn't heard anything from MnDOT yet.

Haugen stated that the difference that is going on, as you can see, is through the T.I.P. process there are several iterations of cost estimates that take place, and, he doesn't remember the exact date, but sometime in July he believes, the two transit operators finalized their cost allocation model that showed how they were splitting out costs between fixed route and demand response, that changed the numbers one more time, and so what was shown in the public document for review were the 2020 cost estimates from the Cities Area Transit showing primarily increased costs in demand response; if you would have seen these numbers last year you would have seen less dollars going into demand response than you would have fixed route, and then the out years are then taking this 2020 as a base and year of expenditure and inflating them out to 2025. He said that MnDOT is asking us to consider not using this cost allocation model, but he believes a reflection is more accurate using the current T.I.P. dollars, because if you look in 2023 and you see the numbers they have listed underneath, those are the numbers that are in the current T.I.P. document versus the numbers that we were deriving using the latest cost estimate. He added that he isn't sure there is an opportunity between now and the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday to iron out these differences.

Haugen commented that there were a couple of other projects; the first one on the Minnesota side is a project that they term ELLA, a MnDOT acronym for Early Let Late Encumbrance, so the project is actually taking place right now, physically out there you will see it in 2021, but the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

financing year is 2022; the numbers that we show are the numbers that were in the current T.I.P. document and we didn't convert them to the actual let amount and MnDOT has informed us what those amounts are.

Haugen stated that the next project is the Roundabout, and our current T.I.P. document, and the past three T.I.P. documents have shown this cost estimate which includes things other than construction and he believes MnDOT is asking us to just use construction costs.

Haugen said that those were the principal comments that MnDOT wants us to address in this document, they have a lot of other editorial improvements and suggestions that are under consideration as well.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side; you noticed in the Draft T.I.P. that was out, and last year we started to have grouped project listings for the right-of-way, preliminary engineering, utilities, in the draft that was out for public comment; those cost estimates are still blank although he believes North Dakota has the numbers calculated now, and will be sharing them with us soon but they were not available in time to meet the publication.

Haugen referred to a table and commented that this is the Fiscal Year 2022, and these are the four grouped project listing that you can see we have "x's" in the columns for now so we will have to amend the T.I.P. once those numbers do come in. He added that they are aware that there is a bit of a lag from when we adopt the T.I.P. this month and when we can first offer amendments to both States, and the Feds have to get funds transferred from this year's T.I.P./S.T.I.P. into next year's T.I.P./S.T.I.P. before they want to start adding in amendments, so it will be a couple of months, so shooting for November.

Haugen commented that the NDDOT also recently identified a project that wasn't previously known, it has to do with revamping the lights on the Interstate System and there is one system at the 32nd Avenue Interchange that is included in their Statewide, so we have that as a new listing and it will require more public involvement, so they will add that in as well in November, it is a total of \$10,000 with a 90/10 assumed split.

Haugen stated that the last project that North Dakota commented on is a high tension median cable guardrail on I-29, it is a total dollar amount, it isn't broken down into just our MPA area that he is aware of, but the previous cost estimate was \$4.1 million and that is now at about \$4.4 million. Zacher commented that he didn't calculate in the MPA area he just sent the overall project so we have to figure out and come up with a ratio what is in the MPA. He said he wanted to make Mr. Haugen aware of the project because it was listed from Fargo to Grand Forks at one time but they actually split it out into a number of projects. Haugen stated that the cost increase doesn't reach our threshold of requiring additional public comment so we can take action without needing additional public comment.

Haugen said that he isn't aware of any other comments particular to the T.I.P. listings themselves and he would like to thank everyone for getting their projects to the MPO. He stated that we do have this item before us of what, as a staff and Technical Advisory Committee would we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

recommend for the Minnesota T.I.P. tables regarding transit. Mason said he has a question on this; you mentioned that you have this question out here and you question that there is enough time to have it all ironed out before the Board meets, and he thinks you know a little bit about how MnDOT adopts its transit, it is more or less kind of the MnDOT face for the programming working with the transit operator and the MPO, so he is curious what you might need from him or maybe Anna Pierce or maybe specifically our Transit Office to resolve any questions lingering concerns. Haugen responded that his first reaction would be to ask why wouldn't we use the cost estimates that the two transit operators will be using for their cost, their contractual obligation, one towards the other and then inflate that for year of expenditure, and if Office of Transit is not willing to identify at this time any additional State Award that we would use the current State Awards that is in our current T.I.P. for those out years and just increase the local match and know that this is an annual update that at least the 2022 is reflecting what is identified as the best cost estimate between the two entities. He added that he isn't sure what else we can do on that end. Mason responded that it is sort of out of his wheelhouse with the demand response model and year of expenditure things that you guys have in to play; he would like to see this resolved, do we need to have another meeting with MnDOT's Office of Transit, the MPO, and Ms. Ellis. Haugen responded that, again, that has been asked for. Ellis commented that she did visit with Vonnie, her project manager, and based on the 2022 she was told that even though we are using our NTD cost per passenger for Dial-A-Ride, that was a five year estimate, and then based on our predicted ridership, at this point in time their applications were only accepting what our cost was, what was in the T.I.P. last year at a 2% increase, so that was what she was told as far as 2022, so she can't figure out why 2023 was less, or at a smaller amount, and that was what her questions are. She added that it looks like a 2% increase after that, but 2023 went down from 2022, which was less than what they asked for in their application to begin with, and then it shows no local match and so she is trying to flesh out where they got their numbers and why they are the way they are because when we do our reporting we have to report actuals so she doesn't understand why if we have to report actuals they aren't using actuals for our application. She added that she hasn't had a chance to catch up with Vonnie to discuss this yet.

Haugen referred to a slide and commented that he has blown it up to illustrate the difference between what the public comment T.I.P. was at and what MnDOT is requesting us to consider. He pointed out that for the fixed route there is just a difference of a decimal point or rounding factor, for the total cost there is no change in the federal or the other for fixed route; where it comes into play is on the demand response and you can see that it is a roughly \$25,000 difference, and then there is no number that tells is how, backing up here, on the Minnesota side federal funds aren't used on the demand response side, and so it is either funded using a split of state funds and local dollars and MnDOT is identifying one number and so it would be nice that if we are going to agree with the \$117,045 that we also agree to the \$108,000 and the \$10,000. Pierce stated that she can explain the one number; they only have one number in their A.T.I.P., and it is just listed as "other" and in your document you seem to break it out there with the local split and they don't have that in their document so she doesn't know what that would be and that is why she leaves it up to you to fill it out so whenever in any of these columns it says other and local and they are crossed out and there is one number underneath it is the total between those two so it is however your split is done. Haugen explained that to give a history of why this "other" is not under the State is because the District, awhile ago, wanted the State funds to only

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

reflect highway dollars and any other State funds were to be reflected under “other”, and then you see the note under remarks that it is transit.

Haugen pointed out that you will notice that the big difference comes in at about \$100,000 on the fixed route. He stated that this number is reflecting the new cost allocation in 2022 at \$550,000; in 2023 they are asking us to use a \$620,000 estimate, which is what the current T.I.P. has for 2023, but we are trying to use a new year of expenditure estimate based on the 2022 project cost. He stated that the demand response gets even less than it is in 2022. Ellis said that the question is that it gets a little confusing for her as to what she should be applying for, should she be applying for the numbers that you are putting in the T.I.P., or should she be applying for the numbers that they are actually getting in their cost allocation models because she is kind of at a loss. She added that there are ways that they can report differently to get their numbers closer to the demand response service in the T.I.P. and the fixed route, because right now she is splitting her salary between the two and she is splitting training and other items between the two so if their fixed is going to go up quite a bit more than that percentage, based on what their cost allocation model is, is this something that you want her to charge admin all to one and not the other, so there are just a lot of things that she doesn't know until she sees the numbers and then she kind of doesn't know where the numbers are coming from, not that she isn't okay with it, she is never going to say no to the numbers she is receiving because she doesn't want to say no to funding, she just doesn't know what she is supposed to do with the changes. Pierce responded that she apologizes, she doesn't know specifics on what you should be reporting or how you should be breaking out that funding that is a Vonnie and Office of Transit specific question and coordination; just when she spoke to Vonnie about the discrepancies between the T.I.P. and the Final A.T.I.P. numbers she had just said that even though you had applied for \$147,000, here, for the demand response you are only going to get \$115,000 so wouldn't it be better to show the lower number of whatever the lower number is and she said that she wasn't totally sure and then Vonnie said to put it in that way, so she said she would bring the issue up, but she thinks we can have a conversation in the next couple of days and she would hope we can get this ironed out so she would suggest Earl, Nancy, Vonnie and Jon and herself just sit down so we are all on the same page. Ellis responded that she understands how she got it, it is actually \$117,000, she understands how she got that she took the last T.I.P. amount and then took it times a 2% inflation, which is what they said they were looking at on the application, she still applied for what she think she needs, that is what you should always be applying for rather than just taking your last number and taking it times 2% because you really don't have a way to justify getting that number compared to what your actual statements are, that being said she gets where the number is but then she doesn't understand why then in 2023 it actually goes down \$2,000.00, and how you're getting that number, but then the fixed route is going up quite a bit, so those are where her questions are, it's not so much, she gets this is what we're giving you based on this answer for next year, its kind of the out years and how you're getting those numbers and how we're going to move from here, so she kinds of knows if we should be adding money to the local part of it or what we should be doing, that is where her confusion is. Pierce stated that she completely understands your confusion, because she honestly doesn't know so she will have to follow up with Vonnie on the specifics here. Ellis said that she is out next week, unfortunately, so if we are going to tackle this it would have to be by the end of this week or we may just have to have the Board approve it and then knowing that 2022 is what they are going to give me a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

contract for and look to change the out years after that November time period because she doesn't know if we are necessarily going to get an answer or change before next Wednesday. Pierce responded that she will send an e-mail out to see what peoples availability is for tomorrow and Friday.

Haugen commented that a recommended motion would be to approve the Draft T.I.P. as submitted with the North Dakota side cost for the tension guardrail increase from 4.1 to 4., to identify that some amendments are necessary for the group projects once the cost estimates are provided, and then also for the timeframe for the light project on 32nd Avenue Interchange to be amended; and on the Minnesota side to accept the ELLA actual let amounts, identify only the costs only for the roundabout, and to ask MnDOT, the Transit Operator, and MPO to work out the transit issues before the MPO Board meeting.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT FINAL FY2022-2025 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE COST FOR THE TENSION CARD INCREASE FROM 4.1 TO 4., TO IDENTIFY THAT SOME AMENDMENTS ARE NECESSARY FOR THE GROUP PROJECTS ONCE THE COST ESTIMATES ARE PROVIDED, AND THEN ALSO FOR THE TIMEFRAME FOR THE LIGHT PROJECT ON 32ND AVENUE INTERCHANGE TO BE AMENDED; AND ON THE MINNESOTA SIDE TO ACCEPT THE ELLA ACTUAL LET AMOUNTS, IDENTIFY ONLY THE COSTS ONLY FOR THE ROUNDABOUT, AND TO ASK MNDOT, THE TRANSIT OPERATOR, AND MPO TO WORK OUT THE TRANSIT ISSUES BEFORE THE MPO BOARD MEETING.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Mason, Zacher, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmaz, Brooks, Bail, Halford, Hopkins, Johnson, West, Magnuson, Kuharenko, Riesinger, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FTA 5310 ND SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECT

Kouba reported that prior to June the NDDOT had been receiving emergency funds through the CARES ACT and America Rescue Plan and various other COVID related bills and new funding sources, so they decided to, in June, put out a solicitation under the 5310 Program, which focuses on the elderly and individuals with disabilities. She said that there is a bit more focus on certain groups of people who need extra transportation so Cities Area Transit put in an application for the Mobility Manger position for those funds, they put in for both wages and benefits, and with these funds it would be 100% federally funded so there would be no local match required.

Kouba commented that the T.I.P. you just approved does show partial funding for this position with previous 5310 funds, so we would be looking at moving the actual spending year from FY 2022 to FY 2023. She added that the timing overlaps the adoption of the FY2022-2025 T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

and the actual award of this candidate project so if we are awarded the funds, we will need to do an amendment to the T.I.P. at a later time. Staff is looking for approval of the application.

Bergman stated that just as a reminder those previous funds we applied for were 2020 funding. Kouba added that it was an 80/20 split for the previous funds. Bergman said that after talking to the NDDOT, they had mentioned that the CRRSAA funds are ARP funds.

Haugen stated that we are recommending approval of the regular funding at 80/20 that is shown in the T.I.P. as having already been awarded to us and available, and we are taking action now on saying that this candidate project is meeting our local plans and is a priority, and it will go into the hopper and whatever award announcement is, if any, we will have to revisit our T.I.P. to show the new award and how it may or may not adjust this award, so today's action is purely on whether this is a candidate project that meets our plan and is a priority.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CITIES AREA TRANSIT FY2022-5310 MID-YEAR GRANT APPLICATION AS MEETING OUR PLANS, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Emery, Pierce (Proxy For Mason), Zacher, Williams, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bail, Brooks, Halford, Mason, Hopkins, Johnson, West, Magnuson, Kuharenko, Riesinger, and Christianson.

MATTER OF WORK PROGRAM DISCUSSION (POSSIBLE AMENDMENT TO 2022 WORK PROGRAM)

Haugen reported that this is an informational item. He stated that last month MnDOT announced that there was this August redistribution of funds, that if they weren't going to be used in Minnesota they would be turned back, so a request went out to all MPOs asking if they had any use for additional funding. He said that the original request was based on the original distribution formula for the planning funds in Minnesota so our initial award was around \$300.00. He added that originally the timeline was to have the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board vet this through our August timeframe, but due to the short timeframe it ended up that some of the Minnesota MPOs did not have as great a use or need for the funds so our amount ended up being closer to \$25,000 and the timeframe changed to the end of July so the MPO Executive Policy Board acted on this in July and so our work program has been amended and it is adding \$25,000 to the revenue. He added that to show the use of the funds in the easiest and quickest manner, that staff identified, we placed it all in increasing the consultant costs for the Bike/Ped Plan Update, and that action has been taken, submitted to the State DOTs, the work program amendment has been approved and the money has already been requested for transfer so that amendment process has all been taken care of. He said, then, that we have additional funds and we currently have it in the work program that it would go toward

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

consultant costs for the Bike/Ped Plan, however since then there has been some discussion on the Minnesota side whether we should take on another study on the transportation networks in the Industrial Park area, but to be fair, if there are any other studies that people would like us to consider, and again there is only \$25,000 so it won't go far unless someone wants to augment the funding with more local dollars, let us know as soon as possible. He added that if we don't hear by the end of this month, and East Grand Forks formally submits a request, then we know what we will be working with. He thanked MnDOT for the additional funding.

Zacher said, just to give an update on where this funding is at, his understanding is that it has gone from Minnesota Federal Highway and it is on its way to North Dakota Federal Highway, but they haven't been told that that money is there yet so that is where they are sitting at right now, waiting for verification from North Dakota Federal Highway that the funds are there. Haugen commented that we aren't going to be able to spend it until 2022 so there is time to get it to North Dakota.

Haugen explained that if we are going to do another study with these funds that will require another work program amendment process, so that takes 30 days, 60 days to process depending on the study involvement and everything else; so it isn't just let's do a study and we do it, we have to go through a formal amendment process to make it happen before we can start soliciting any responses to a study.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2021 Annual Work Program Project Update
- 1) East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update
 - 2) Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update
 - 3) Aerial Photo Update
 - 4) Pavement Management Update
 - 5) Transit Development Program Update

Haugen reported that we do have all the work program activities currently underway; we have a signed contract for the Transit Development Program Update and the consultant is scheduling some initial meetings soon. Kouba commented that she will be talking with the consultant this week to get together a list of people they want for staff for this project and then they will decide how they will move forward with the update.

Haugen stated that he would encourage those that can to take a look at the two websites for the Land Use Plan Updates, there is lots of good material on there.

Information only

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 11th, 2021**

B. 2020 Census Update

Haugen commented that, just as a side note, tomorrow the redistricting census data from 2020 is being released so we will be getting our first initial glance at what the Census says our population was in 2020 and compare that to our current estimates and our current forecasts in the Land Use Plans. He said that East Grand Forks is sort of centered on an annual increase of 0.75% per year and Grand Forks is looking at roughly 1% currently as annual growth out to 2050, but we will see what the 2020 Census identifies tomorrow.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 11TH,
2021 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:29 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager