

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the August 10th, 2022, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:41 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; Davie Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit. Via Zoom, Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer.

Absent: George Palo, Brad Bail, Ryan Riesinger, Jason Peterson, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Nick West, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Kristen Sperry, FHWA; Christian Danielson, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Tricia Lunski, Grand Forks City Councilmember; and Daba Gedafa, UND Professor.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Halford declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 13, 2022, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE THE JULY 13TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF GF-EGF MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

Kouba reported that we do this every year, it is part of our TIP document. She explained that the purpose of the self-certification is to have the MPOs and the State DOTs confirm to the USDOT

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

that the requirements imposed upon the metropolitan planning process are being fulfilled. The resolution contains the relevant section of US Cod and Federal Regulations being self-certified.

Kouba stated that staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee approves forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the Self-Certification as presented.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2022 GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Ellis, Emery, Mason, Zacher, Bergman, Kuharenko, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Palo, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Riesinger, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF 2023-2026 T.I.P.

Kouba reported that this is an annual document that we go through, and work with the NDDOT, MnDOT, the City of Grand Forks, the City of East Grand Forks, Grand Forks County and Polk County on any projects they may have in the MPO Study Area.

Kouba said that they were getting comments throughout the process. She added that we generally have a listing of projects that are happening within the 2023 to 2026 time period.

Kouba commented that, along with the staff report, she included a list of questions that she had given to the NDDOT, and she did receive some answers so those questions, which she will go over briefly.

Kouba referred to the tables included in the document, and went over them, as well as the questions and answers shown on each table, as follows:

- 1) Grand Forks Project #122001 – Kouba stated that this is a small project that was recently put into our 2022 STIP. She asked if it was still correct as she couldn't find anything specific. Zacher responded that he just changed the project description on there to match what the Draft STIP shows. Kouba said that she would make sure to make that change.
- 2) Grand Forks Project #121005 – Kouba stated that this is one that is split in the STIP, but they are keeping it.
- 3) Grand Forks Project #120008 – Kouba said that they are still looking for main street projects. She commented that the two main street projects don't show up in the STIP. She asked if they are still being funded and should they remain in the table? Zacher

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

responded that basically, those haven't gone through the committee yet so they allotted space, but they may not be in the Draft STIP but may show up in the Final STIP. Kuharenko asked if he has any idea when that selection committee might be meeting. Zacher responded that he isn't on it so he doesn't know when they will be meeting.

- 4) Grand Forks Project #121007 – Kouba said that in 2025, she did take out this project since we aren't finding anything about it yet. She asked if it is still being done. Zacher responded that this project still exists, it is structures, and it is in Grand Forks, but it is also shown in 2023. He said that at one point it says 2023 in the Draft STIP, but then when he pulls up his internal stuff it shows that it is in 2025, so he isn't sure which is correct. Kouba stated that she took it out for now since we aren't quite sure what is going on with this project. Zacher said that he did see them, so they are still around. Kuharenko asked what the project this is. Zacher responded that it is for Dynamic Speed Signs in the school zones. Zacher stated that there is a project out there, but it wasn't in the Urban Program area or the Draft STIP. Kouba said that she left that in.
- 5) Grand Forks Project #122004 – Kouba stated that she did take out the convert gravel path project since it is a transportation alternative and they basically took out all of those for 2024 and 2025 and re-released them so they will change most probably, so she took this project out of the TIP and we will wait to hear back on them. Zacher stated that that isn't the Transportation Alternative project that was moved forward into last year is it. Kuharenko responded that this is the one that we applied for last year, and then we received word that the project we submitted last fall were all scraped and then we had to resubmit them and the last one was just submitted about a month ago and it includes this segment, but it also extends the project up to 17th, so it pretty much doubles the length of the project. He asked if it would be beneficial to update this with what they submitted. Kouba responded that we don't know when that will get through their committee and if it will end up being in the final STIP or not. Halford added that it hasn't been awarded funding. Kuharenko stated that this project wasn't awarded any funding either when we originally included it though, either, so that is what he is trying to figure out, is it better to include it, kind of as in the past we had all these projects whether or not they were being programmed. Kouba responded that she thinks that for this particular one, since there is so much confusion, and they literally just eliminated all of the 2024 and 2025 TA projects, and had everyone resubmit them, and if others are changing what they have or what they do, then that is going to change this so we will wait in see.
- 6) Grand Forks Project #522008 – Kouba said that there is a joint expansion on the Sorlie Bridge in 2025 that is on the State STIP that she added as well.
- 7) Grand Forks Project #22007 – Kouba stated that in the new year she updated to include this project, but she isn't sure of the description, where did it come from. Zacher responded that this is the description they used on it, and currently it is still scheduled to be bid in 2025 and Mr. Johnson is working on the environmental document with the consultant. He said that at one point the City had talked about questioning if the City were to put, because the Campground out there was trying to get out of it, so the City was

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

questioning if they could buy it and then relocate it or something along those lines. Kuharenko added that as far as he is aware the City hasn't made any motion on this. Zacher said that he knows that they were questioning the "what if" type of a thing and trying to relocate it further into town, so that is kind of what he heard. He added that they had their first public meeting and had a decent turnout. Kuharenko commented that he sits in on some of the occasional meetings on this project, so we should be seeing some updated cost estimates and some alternatives hopefully at the end of August or early September so probably this fall when we go through and update this again with the new solicitations, we will probably be looking to update the cost estimates accordingly.

- 8) Grand Forks Project #22008 – Kouba reported that we are looking for this project to be in the Final STIP, the Point Bridge Rehabilitation Project. She stated that it is a painting and minor repairs project. Kuharenko commented that he can't recall exactly what was in the project scope but he believes there were some minor repairs, some painting, and there may have been some lighting work on there too. Kouba added that East Grand Forks will have the approach as well on their side, and that is already in the STIP.
- 9) Grand Forks Project #22003 and Project #22009 – Kouba stated that she took Project #22003 out but left Project #22009 in as we did receive information that it was approved but just not in the STIP. Zacher responded that it is a little goofy because for some reason HSIP projects tend not to make it into the Draft STIP but do make it into the Final STIP, and you've received notice that the project has been approved and funded, so you should keep it in.

Kouba commented that she just wanted to kind of go through all of those updates that were beyond what was provided to the public. She added that we do have a public hearing scheduled for today's meeting.

Kouba opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for comments. Kouba said they did advertise that people could e-mail comments until noon today, no comments were received.

Kouba closed the public hearing.

Kuharenko stated that he has a general comment for the group. He asked to go back to the South 48th Street project from DeMers Avenue to 11th Avenue and explained that this is a project that they put in for last year as kind of a heads up, it is likely that this upcoming fall they are probably going to try to accelerate this and will likely try to swap this project out with the Columbia Road project that is already programmed for 2025. He said that it probably won't be that segment of 48th, it will probably be a southern section of 48th that they will be looking at, so that is just a heads up and they will still have to run that through the appropriate process and get the proper vetting from their City Council as well, but that is just a heads up as to what they will likely do in the future.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

Kouba said that they did have the full document available on the website and a paper copy available in the office for the public to look through and comment on. She stated that she did have comments from our DOT partners on some of these things; most of it we've kind of left intact just because most of the information is the most current we have, especially with some of the performance measures that are mentioned in the document because we haven't adopted new performance measures for the new year that is coming up, we are still waiting for the States to finish that part and once we do that and we hit the new TIP for the 2024 year we will update everything then.

Kouba commented that this will probably be the last year you see the spreadsheet format like this, we will be updating that to make it easier to read hopefully, and definitely easier for staff to update and change. Zacher stated that he is still working on the lump sums. Kouba said that she changed them just to zero and they will probably have to update everything once the official STIP is done, which is what generally happens.

Mason stated that he missed a comment in the room on the expanded joint modification on the Sorlie Bridge project; is that going to be added into the MPO TIP and if so is there a Minnesota component to that project, it is kind of a new one to him. Kouba responded that she doesn't believe it is on the Minnesota side at all, she hasn't heard anything beyond that, but she saw it in the STIP. Mason said that if there is a Minnesota component to it it may need to be added to the Minnesota STIP as well, so if that is the case let him know if there is anything needed on their end. Kouba responded that as soon as she hears anything more on this she will keep him in the loop.

Sperry asked if Ms. Kouba was wanting Federal Highway and FTA comments after this has been updated, and then have a draft go out or when would you want comments from them. Kouba responded that because of the lateness and the fact that they are still working with the NDDOT we will look to see what kind of updates need to be done, but they can definitely have Federal Highway look at it, it wouldn't be the final final. Sperry stated that usually they have received, in the past, like this is our draft for Federal Highway and FTA review and they give us two weeks to review it, but she is just wanting to know if that is what you are going to do this year so she has her comments ready. Kouba responded that they are kind of fumbling through this process for the first time so any comments or suggestions are welcomed, so they will definitely get this out to FHWA and FTA for comments. Sperry said that she just wanted to make sure that she didn't miss her opportunity to comment.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL FY2023-2026 T.I.P. PROJECT LISTINGS, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Ellis, Emery, Mason, Zacher, Bergman, Kuharenko, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

Absent: Bail, Palo, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Riesinger, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF UND INTERN

Halford reported that this conversation started probably a good year ago, at least. She said that Daba Gedafa, UND Professor, is on the phone and he can probably fill in some things as we go over this.

Halford stated that this started probably around a year ago with Mr. Haugen and UND about a partnership for an Intern, but unfortunately these conversations were not shared with all the necessary parties during the process, so some of you probably saw this on the agenda and were a little bit surprised, and she knows that some of you have reached out and had some questions already, and we can definitely go through all of those today.

Halford said that she just wants to give a quick overview of kind of what the project is. She explained that the primary motivation for this study is to kind of look at filling some data gaps, analyzing effects of pedestrian safety, traffic speeds; again this is a great opportunity for the City, UND, and the MPO to come together and work on a partnership project, so she wants to really highlight that that is a good partnership and a good study to look at.

Halford stated that things that they will be looking at for the study is analyze traffic safety and speeding, they will be looking at tickets that were given out for speeding, determine some locations to see if any additional studies need to happen in those locations and determine effects of traffic calming techniques, recommend approaches to address traffic safety and concerns.

Halford referred to a slide and pointed out that what she has highlighted is the study area itself that is being looked at. She said that it is from 32nd to 55th and from Belmont to Washington.

Halford commented that it is being proposed to have a budget of \$30,000; and again we see this as a good relationship building with UND, with the City, a partnership, and she knows that some here have some questions and Daba with UND is on the phone so between the two of them they can definitely go through any questions or comments you might have.

Halford stated that to get things started, she did have a couple of questions; under Task 1 it talks about reviewing the plans and studies but there isn't any talk about reviewing local studies, so that would be a suggestion she would make to add in to have our local studies be reviewed and what has already been done, and then why this area of town was chosen, and she is sure that is a question that a lot of people have, and the progress reports, it has it as a quarterly check-in but she would have that changed to monthly.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

Daba commented that the literary review starts with what has been done in the past. He stated that when they submitted the proposal they already looked at the studies that have been done,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

especially the south side. He said that when they discussed this with Mr. Haugen the idea was that since the studies were mostly based on the area around Belmont and North of 32nd the idea was to extend it to 55th because of the expansion to the south side of the city. He stated that this is just the area they picked based on speeding indicated and also traffic safety, analysis of the area could be expanded, it doesn't mean it has to be just this study area.

Daba said that when it comes to the progress report, they can do it on a monthly basis, it can be a written report, or a meeting, it can be whatever means of communication you prefer, it would be fine with them. He added that this project will be done over a two-year period, it is about \$15,000 per year for one graduate student. He said that UND will cover tuition, which is about the same amount or more depending on the residency status of the student.

Daba stated that they did get feedback from the State level, Mr. Zacher, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Sperry, and they all felt this was a win-win partnership between UND and the MPO, and the recommended going forward with this.

Zacher said that they do feel this is a win-win for everybody involved. He stated that one question they had, the title, if they are able to revise the problem statement a little bit, the problem statement seems to focus on speed, but they are wondering if there is a way to focus more on the traffic calming because once you read the detail it almost seems like it is more of a traffic calming study versus a speed study, and maybe it is semantics on their end, what they think of a speed study versus what the study proposal thinks of a speed study but they almost look at it as more of a traffic calming study and if you are interested in what has been done in the past, MetroCog just completed one last year for the City of West Fargo so they have some historic record of what has been done in the past; just as kind of a reference, that was focused more on residential streets but he thinks it can be tailored for anything, as long as we don't start putting speed tables all over the place. Daba thanked him for the comments and said that they are open to your questions and comments and are willing to make any necessary changes to finalize this.

Williams said that she has some questions and some serious concerns on this. She stated that one thing you talk about is taking the in-street pedestrian signs and locating them at various spots to see if they make any difference in the adherence to yielding to a pedestrian, and according to the MUTCD if you do that that falls under experimentations and they have to have something from FHWA that recognizes that you are taking a standard traffic control device and using it in a method that deviates from the current MUTCD, so that is one of the issues.

Williams stated that another issue is, she thinks we need to hammer out what constitutes "yielding" for a vehicle to a pedestrian. She said that it kind of paraphrases the law of North Dakota but in doing so she thinks there were a couple of things combined, and vehicles are not required to stop and yield to a pedestrian if they are still on the side of the road and haven't stepped into the road and it isn't safe for them to stop, but also a pedestrian has the responsibility to not step out, so there are kind of semantics here as far as what a violation would be and wouldn't be, so she thinks this really needs to be worked on before we can approve anything like this; this partnership would be a great thing in order to gather some data and if we wanted to get

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

some speed data but the difficulty in this is that we have only had one pedestrian crash in this area in the last three years, and it was at 32nd and 10th and it was at night time and there were a couple of things going on, so we aren't really experiencing a pedestrian problem in this area whereas there are other areas in the city where we have a much higher incidence of pedestrian crashes, so currently the way it is worded, she just doesn't think it complies with MUTCD; so she concurs it is a really good opportunity but we just need to hammer out the details before we can move on. Daba thanked Ms. Williams for her comments and also for her willingness, if she remembers they communicated about the speed study, and while figuring out the areas she showed willingness to give them equipment in addition to the radar guns they already own, so he will follow up and they will make sure that whatever they do is in compliance with MUTCD.

Daba commented that, as he said before, this is not the only location, this is the area, but as he mentioned, based on speeding and the traffic safety analysis, we can focus more on other locations, so that is part of the plan, and that language is also included in the proposal. He said that for the definition of yielding they can make changes and include the responsibility and the accountability of the pedestrians as well.

Kuharenko asked if this is something the Technical Advisory Committee feels should be tabled for further refining and bring back next month so we can see the revisions then forward it on to the Executive Policy Board. Halford responded that she would like to recommend, and you can make it part of the motion if you want or not, that it might be good for a couple of members that are most interested in this study and what the revision would look like and create kind of a sub-committee and have one or two meetings, to work on some of these details and get something we all feel comfortable with and then bring it back to the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Kuharenko said that his worry was that the Executive Policy Board meets next week and he is off tomorrow and Friday, so that would narrow the window quite a bit, but if we want to table this until next month and have a sub-committee of interested parties and hammer out the details that would be good. Halford said that what she is hearing from everybody is that they feel that this is a win-win, a great partnership, but we just have to come to an agreement on what this needs to look like before approving it, so she would be more than willing to work with Daba and set something up over the next couple of weeks where we can sit down and hammer out some details and get something that we all feel comfortable with, if that works for everyone.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM FOR FURTHER REFINEMENT OF THE PROPOSED CONTRACT AND TO BRING IT BACK TO THE SEPTEMBER TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Ellis, Emery, Mason, Zacher, Bergman, Kuharenko, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Palo, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Riesinger, West, and Magnuson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

MATTER OF 20-YEAR STATE HIGHWAY INVESTMENT PLAN

Halford reported that Phillip Schaffner, MnDOT, is present for a brief presentation.

Schaffner stated that he is the Manager of Statewide Planning at the Minnesota Department of Transportation, and he would like to share a brief presentation with you. He said that it is great to be with you this afternoon to give an update on the 20-Year Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan, that they refer to as MnSHIP. He stated that they are very appreciative about the opportunity to connect with the MPO Technical Advisory Committee, recognizing this is a Bi-State Group, but North Dakota and Grand Forks being really important neighbors and partners on the transportation system they really welcome your thoughts and feedback today as well as the Minnesota members. He said that ultimately, they need your help and perspectives and wisdom because this is the public system and the Minnesota State System and they are planning for the future of your state highway system. He commented that later today he will be seeking some feedback using the tool Mentimeter, so have a device or laptop available.

Schaffner referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and gave a brief update on the Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan.

Presentation continued.

Schaffner concluded by asking “What else would you like to know?”. He stated that you can create your own approach, your own investment direction by going to: www.minnesotago.org/investment/. He explained that they created a budget tool and you can go in and start by either picking one of the six approaches shown or you can start with minimum levels in each of the categories, and it has 12 categories and you can make adjustments to them and it will show you what outcomes you are able to adjust to and also let you know how you are doing with the available budget.

Schaffner encourages everyone to take a minute if you’re interested to fill that out or to share that tool with your networks. He added that they will also be posting on social media and sharing MnSHIP posts and you can sign up for email updates as well.

Schaffner went over the timeline. He said that they are doing a 1st public engagement period now until the end of September and then this fall they will look at all the input and compiling a draft investment direction and will bring that out to you and others in the winter/early spring to get public comment and feedback and then to also talk about, what if we had more money, what if we had \$2 billion more or \$6 billion more than what they estimated, how would they invest that, because sometimes they do get more funding that they weren’t anticipating and they want to be prepared for that, and then next spring or early summer they will take all that information and compile a final draft plan and will put it out for review and comment so about this time next year they will be adopting a final plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

MATTER OF 2023-2024 UPWP/BUDGET DISCUSSION

Halford reported that this is just a discussion, so no action is required.

Halford stated that the purpose of this item is to really just give you a good picture of where we are at with our 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan timeline and what the next few years will look like. She said that she always like to look ahead and know where she is going with things, so there are a few items that will carry over into future years; the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan and the Street/Highway Plan are two that will carry over into the next two years so she just kind of did a “what if” scenario of the 2050 MTP Timeline and expanded it a little bit, because, as you can see it just keeps going all the way around.

Halford said that we are just finishing up the Transit Development Plan, and Ms. Kouba will expound on that more in a bit, but this is where we are sitting at on the timeline, and if we happen to get the Safety Action Plan grant, it will be done next year and into the following year and then we would start looking at the ITS Regional Architecture and the Land Use Plans again as they come back around.

Halford commented that this is just to start giving you an idea of where things are at because we will be looking at drafts of the work program as well as budgets in the near future, well you will only see the work program, but she wanted you to see where we are at in this process and where we are going. She said that the next step will be to submit a draft to our State and Federal Partners and let them review it and make comments, then she will bring it back to you for your input as well. Sperry suggested that if you want to send the draft to FHWA and FTA at the same time as you do to the NDDOT, to meet your 30-day review window, your federal review, that would work.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021/2022 Annual Work Program Project Update

Kouba referred to the Unified Work Program Project update included in the packet and commented that, as you can see we are getting close to finishing the 2022 year of our work program. She stated that we do have the final print of the Pavement Management Report that we accepted in July, so that will be a completed project.

- 1) Transit Development Plan Update – Kouba reported that where we are at with the Transit Development Plan Update is that we are looking at getting some information from people, finishing up some sections of the update; we’ve got capital and financials out for review to staff and will hopefully be getting that to our Steering Committee soon as well, we are looking at August 25th for a Steering Committee meeting.
- 2) Bike/Ped Plan Update – Kouba reported that she did attach a written update for our Bike and Ped Plan, but we are mostly just gathering information and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

putting the data together for the survey as well as our bike audit as well as any feedback we've gotten from the data we currently have and hopefully we will be getting some information out to people to start looking at and giving feedback on.

- 3) Street/Highway Plan Update – Kouba reported that we did give information to HDR late in July so they are looking at that data and they will be getting a website up soon.

Williams asked what the due date is for the Long Range Transportation Plan. Kouba responded that it has to be adopted by the end of December so we can get it to FHWA/FTA for their 30-day review, which will hopefully end at the end of January. Williams asked what year that would be. Kouba responded that it is December 2023 and January 2024.

Williams said that she had some concerns of trying to work and review everything with their schedule. Kuharenko commented that you said December of 2023 and January of 2024, and you show on the update table a completion date of February 2024. Kouba responded that everything will be completed by the end of February 2024, so the Final Document will be adopted at the end of December 2023, the 30-day FHWA/FTA review will be completed at the end of January 2024, and then any loose ends will be completed by the end of February 2024. Kuharenko stated that he was just curious because as you remember a couple of year ago we ran into the issue where we had our TIP frozen so he thinks what Ms. Williams is getting at is that we want to try to avoid that at all costs, so they are just making sure we know the timelines. Kouba responded that she understands, and added that they are keeping on everyone to ensure that they are within the timeline, and they are heavily reminding HDR that there is a drop dead date and there is no extending it. Kuharenko added that he supposes, especially with the Street and Highway element, he knows that last time around there were a number of things that was needed from the City, so if you can give them as much advance notice as possible with HDR on what you need, that will give them plenty of time to get it to you so they aren't scrambling at the last minute trying to find staff time. Kouba responded that they will try to do that as much as possible. She stated that she knows that they will probably be looking at some CPI information so if you can get that to them soon, the next month or so, they would definitely be needing that; where projects are, where projects have been in comparison to the last Street and Highway Plan.

B. Agency Updates

1) GF-EGF MPO

- a. Safe Streets For All (SS4A) – Halford reported that both City Councils have approved moving forward with the application. She stated that we have, so far, over ten letters of support in and we are expecting a few so she is thinking we will have a good dozen letters of support, so that is definitely positive. She said that the application is due September 15th, and they have started putting together a draft application and they hope to have it finalized sooner than later.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

Kuharenko said that he is just wracking his brain to see if there is anything else that we need; he got the narrative over to you; he got East Grand Forks' comments from their City Attorney on the MOU, so he will get those incorporated. He asked if we are looking forward with the MOU if and when we get the funding or are we looking at getting it moved through before or after we apply. Ellis responded that their City Council won't approve it until we get the funding, but we can certainly send them the draft that was reviewed and approved by council because they approve the MOU draft with those changes and then they will sign it if we get the grant. Kuharenko asked if Ms. Halford had any comments on the MOU. Halford responded that that was what she was going to mention, that we won't sign it until we get the funding because she knows there will be some changes required, there are some holes in it right now so she doesn't want to sign off on it yet.

- b. Bridge Update - Halford reported that the Selection Committee has met twice, they are revising the scope of work for the RFP, and they also did a little bit of prep work for interviews. She said that it was decided that all three of the firms that submitted the three proposals would be interviewed, but those dates haven't been set yet.
- c. Programming Update Workgroup – Kouba reported that she attached everything that was handed out to the Workgroup, and they put forward their recommendations for funding and how it should be split. She stated that they are now starting on the distribution of 2023 funding, which they are looking at publicly recommending doing a distribution of the 2023, so that looks like that will be available for Minnesota.

Kouba said that the next thing is the local bridge funding and what we are looking at for obligations and which way would be the best fit for the needs out there. She added that they are looking to be able to give the ATPs more flexibility with funding.

Mason commented that just to expound on Ms. Kouba's update, the first piece of that being distributing the new IJA funds out to the ATPs, so those are the funds that go to the cities and counties in Minnesota, and in our area, the Northwest, there are 11 counties and there is a process where the counties work together and the cities work together and based on the preliminary information we were provided, and based on the what we currently have for STIP targets, and what the new would be it is looking like we could see potentially about a about a 30% increase in the Surface Transportation Block Fund Grants that go to the Cities and Counties, so that is good news, about a \$1.3 million dollar bump; we are seeing a really big bump in the Transportation Alternatives Program,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

current targets under the old bill are around \$400,000 and they are saying we might be in about the million dollar range as far as transportation alternative projects that the ATP will review and prioritize and recommend; about a 30% increase in the Highway Safety Improvement Program funds, it is about \$200,000 per year, so it is a fair amount of funds that are coming to ATP and they have a meeting scheduled in September to keep track of this and of course the MPO is a voting member, and there are other voting members from the counties and the cities on that so they are doing some prep work for that right now, but they will ultimately be having a conversation at the ATP level on what is the best method to program this additional funding, and they have some options out there with existing projects potentially being under-programmed that could use a little bit more federal funding, or maybe move some projects up and create a bigger hole for more programming needs further out in the program, and a couple other options that they will take a look at, but overall it is good news, it is additional monies coming to the area.

Mason stated that, again, as you mentioned with the bridge program, MnDOT and MnDOT's State Aid Office working with the cities and counties to try to find a balance of how much money should go to the State DOT versus what is the most appropriate number that should go to the cities and counties for their local bridges.

Mason said that Off System Bridge set-aside, there might be some flexibility with that, it needs to be worked out with FHWA, but we could potentially convert that into a Statewide Service Transportation Block Grant Program and increase the spending flexibility which would be a win for the local agencies, so to be determined on that and then potential options as to how to actually select projects, whether that is direct distribution or a solicitation process.

Mason stated that the New Bridge Fund Program, there is another scenario where MnDOT and the locals are kind of discussing the options on the best way to approach the bridges, one would be the ATPs would be essentially allocated the funds and they spend it on the bridges, and another would be that there is some flexibility working with MnDOT that MnDOT would take more of the bridge fund specifics or the bridge funding that needs to be specifically funded on bridges and sort of free up flexibility for the local agencies. He said that they didn't really show what the impacts were for the State DOT on that or even what the impacts would be for the local agencies, what they would look like for them, so more to come on that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 10th, 2022**

Mason commented that in general they are spending most of the time talking about the local program up to this point, it sounds like they are going to start to make the transition into the MnDOT funding considerations on programs and what to do with the changing money as well as the potential additional money in different areas so moving forward their next big step is probably at the ATP local level on how to best allocate the additional funding that he motioned we are seeing an increase in.

Mason stated that their next meeting will be at the end of August so he will plan on sharing what he heard and try to keep everyone up-to-date on what is happening with the PUW.

2) OTHER AGENCIES

- a. NDDOT Update – Zacher reported that they will be holding an MPO Director’s meeting in early October. He stated that if anyone has any ideas that they want Ms. Halford to bring forward let her know.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 10TH,
2022 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:07 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager