

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the December 14th, 2022, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 a.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering and Tom Ford, Grand Forks County Planning. Via Zoom: George Palo, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Planning; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; and Steve Ember, East Grand Forks Engineering.

Absent: Brad Bail, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Nick West, Dale Bergman, Christian Danielson, Jason Peterson, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Kristen Sperry, FHWA-ND; Beth Kallestad, MnDOT; Becky Hanson, NDDOT; and Anna Pierce, MnDOT.

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 NOVEMBER 9, 2022, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Zacher pointed out that the time the meeting started shows 1:43 a.m., it should be 1:43 p.m.

MOVED BY KUHARNEKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 9TH, 2022, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE CORRECTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPLOYMENT PLAN**

Beth Kallestad, MnDOT Office of Sustainability And Public Health, was present for a brief presentation. She referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Kallestad commented that one of the main projects she works on is to help with implementation of the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan, specifically Minnesota's version of that, and she will share a little bit about the plan today, and then share what some of their next steps are and how this can impact the MPO here.

Kallestad referred to the first slide and commented that, for those that don't know, NEVI is the affectionate name for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program. She stated that it was authorized under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law back in November of 2021 and it is providing funds to all the States to help with the build-out of long-distance travel via electric vehicle. She said that this is helping to build out a system of Fast Chargers, or sometimes called Level 3 Charging Stations along designated corridors in each of the States, those are the alternative fuel corridors, and we will talk about them in a bit. She added that we can use the funds on other roads once those AFCs are built out as well.

Kallestad stated that the Minnesota side is getting around \$68 million dollars over the course of five federal years, Federal Years 2022 to 2026, and then there is a 20% match that is required as part of getting the project moving and the State's spending authorization.

Kallestad commented that all the states were required to submit plans, and Minnesota submitted theirs by the August 1st deadline, and they did actually get approval for it on September 14th, so that was great.

Kallestad stated that the plan itself; the main things to remember with this plan is that the dollars have to be spent on the alternative fuel corridors first, and the States get to help chose which ones those will be, and we can add new ones each year if we want to. She added that basically the charging infrastructure is the Fast Chargers, they need to be located about every 50 miles, it can be less, isn't supposed to be more although you can actually apply for exceptions to that. She said that they are located less than a mile from the alternative fuel corridor exists, and there are supposed to be four charging ports that can do 150 kilowatt fast charges at each site, and for Minnesota that would be on I-94 and I-35, which don't actually go through your MPO, but we will get to that in a bit.

Kallestad said that the Joint Office of Energy and Transportation laid out a bunch of requirements for what needs to be in the plan, and she won't go through all of them today, but you need to know that they were essentially provided in the guidance for what should be included.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

Kallestad stated that their plan had a pretty quick turn-around, the guidance came out in February, and they wanted that plans by August 1st, so they worked with the Transportation and Planning Consultant to help pull theirs together, and did a variety of stakeholder engagements and virtual and in-person meetings and activities. She said that they also decided not to add any Alternative Fuel Corridors in the first round, some States did go that route, but they decided to hold off and focus on the two they had to start with. She stated that they do anticipate probably adding at least I-90, if not some others in subsequent rounds.

Kallestad referred to a slide showing the Goals of the Plan, and explained that this is really just to kind of show that the goals of the infrastructure plan, they are trying to blend them into and support some of MnDOT's existing plan so they had an accelerating EV adoption strategy document, and they have a soon-to-be, if it isn't already finalized, Statewide Multi-Model Transportation Plan, and so how do they connect all of these together; but it is really about greenhouse gas reductions, facilitating statewide and interstate travel. She added that the Justice-40 Program with the Federal Government is a big part of this rule and trying to ensure that the benefits of having charging stations is shared across the various communities in Minnesota, and then also trying to advance electric vehicle adoption. She said that their hope is that they are going to get these first two interstates built out, and then to really look at potentially other roadways and alternative options.

Kallestad commented that the challenge is that if they designate all of the roadways as the alternative fuel corridors, then we would have to build them out to that standard she was talking about before with the four charging ports and building them a certain distance from the roadway; if we don't designate them then there is a little bit of flexibility, in terms of what we can do with the stations, in-fact there is no real guidance on what we can do, and so there could be some benefits to that in areas where maybe that type of structure isn't going to be the best fit, so we are definitely open to that.

Kallestad stated that what they came with for an overall network, and you will see on the slides, they have their two AFCs in green, and North Dakota's is on there as well; and actually South Dakota has Interstate 90 on there too, so those turquoise lines are coming from the other States, so want to make sure we are connecting to those, and how do we help facilitate that travel across those areas, how do we connect different parts of the State, both urban and rural, and also really trying to think about the current electric vehicle drivers, but also really to think about the future, and knowing that we may not need all of the infrastructure right away, but without it there is a lot of hesitancy around purchasing the vehicles and trying to make the trip, so how do we kind of balance that sort of thing.

Kallestad said that their current plan, they have these clusters of locations and potential exit areas off of our two fuel corridors right now. She added that the next steps will be to get more detail on this, but as you can see some of them are closer to 50 miles apart, but some aren't; they have a chunk in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, both heading north and south on I-35 as well, and so there is a pretty good distribution, and then they have to see where they can actually find third parties that are interested in doing this work. She said that a key part of this, for them, and she thinks for most of the States, is that the DOTs do not plan to own or operate these charging

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

stations, so they are looking to third party providers to do it, so it is a very different model than most of the projects they do, it is not a road construction project in the traditional sense in any way, and so there are just a logistics to try to figure out how they make it work within FHWA's funding mechanism and authorization.

Kallestad stated that, as she mentioned before, equity is a big piece of this and how do we think about, we know right now electric vehicles, in general, are not the average in cost or even who is owning them, and so trying to acknowledge that, but also acknowledge that as the market grows there will be different price points for vehicles, knowing that some of the benefits from this might be things like workforce development, might be better air quality, hopefully we will also be having a charging station relatively close-by that could be used for some fast charging opportunities, that sort of thing, so they are still trying to work on what this is going to look like, but it is an important part of the role.

Kallestad commented that the cost estimates, these are not cheap, there is a lot of power coming to these stations and so for planning purposes they were assuming about \$900,000 per location, because we don't know what sort of concrete work or other construction is going to be needed, what sort of electrical upgrades might be needed, she thinks that; recently Ohio had a million dollar estimate on theirs, so it won't be cheap, but there will be some good fast charging stations set up and folks will be able to get in and out pretty quickly, still probably fifteen to thirty minutes depending on what they need for a charge.

Kallestad stated that the next steps are; they actually have a consultant led interest proposal up right now trying to work on refining what we know about those potential areas so we can share that with potential applicants, and have it for ourselves as we go into some sort of a Request for Proposal process. She said that because it is federal dollars, we need to go through the NEPA Review for environmental documentation once we know what those sites are and then execute agreements.

Kallestad said that prior to all that there is still some back and forth over what the order of operations needs to be with federal authorization, but we know we need to get into the TIPs and STIP, and so if and when we get to the point of designating Highway 2 then they would be coming back here, but they also may be coming back to talk more about that maybe we aren't designating that road, but maybe it is an important non-AFC that we want to build out and what are some of the locations or places that we would like to see that happen, so we have the installation of this first round of stations but then also the on-going planning of what roadways do we add as AFCs, how do we do the build-out, and how do we talk with various communities about benefits and that sort of thing.

Kallestad referred to a slide and commented that if anyone is interested, they do have a website set up for this project with more information. The link to the website is: <https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/ev-infrastructure-plan.com> and there is a place on there that you can sign up for email updates so if this type of thing is something that you are interested in tracking please feel free to put something on there. She added that Anna Pierce is also helping their team a bit over the next year so she is a great contact for you as well if you can't reach her.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

Ford stated that he has a couple of questions. He asked if they had been receiving any 3rd party interest already in operating and taking care of these stations; and the second one is Governor Bergum is pretty interested in doing something similar along the interstate, so have you been speaking to anyone at the State of North Dakota. Kallestad responded that they are actually hearing a fair amount of interest, especially from the petroleum marketer association members. She added that she thinks our traditional travel stops at gas stations are very interested in how they can continue as close to their existing business model as possible, so there is definitely interest there, and then other entities, there are some utilities that have shown some interest in owning and operating stations, so we will see where it ends up going. She added that they did a Stakeholder workshop back in October and they had about 200 people participate in that, so it was a good turnout. She stated that she had actually reached out, she thinks it was Jennifer Turnbo. Zacher said that Becky Hanson from NDDOT is also on today and she was on our NEVI committee as well. Ford stated that she joined MnDOT in June, so kind of at the end of the plan being developed, but it sounds like there was a little bit of staff transition happening right now and Jen was the short-term contact, but they did touch base a bit on things and they definitely want to try to match up with their neighboring States so as we are finding those locations that are close to the borders, they can try to get the spacing in as best as they can. asked if Ms. Hanson had anything to add.

Hanson said that Jen had let the committee know that Ms. Ford would be presenting this at today's meeting, so that is why she is attending today. She added that she is guessing that the new contact probably will be Robin Rehborg, but she doesn't know that for sure because she is also in their Executive Office, so they have herself on the committee because she manages transit in North Dakota and then they also have their Director of the State Fleet and then they have two Executive Office members, but North Dakota, to answer kind of the group, North Dakota does have a plan and they are going through more or less the same process; their two corridors are I-94 and I-29 that will have to have charging stations on them, so they are kind of in the process doing a lot of that and working with their consultant and looking at the same thing, it appears, as Minnesota, and they aren't going to own these stations either. She added that they have their legislative session coming up and it will quite the topic at their session.

Information only.

**MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE UPDATE TO THE TRANSIT
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Kouba reported that the Transit Development Plan Update was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee last month and it has gone through the approval process, with the exception of the City of Grand Forks City Council's final approval. She stated that there have not been any changes or additions made to the plan, so staff is recommending approval of the plan, subject to the City of Grand Forks' approval. Brooks commented that he knows that the City of Grand Forks City Council will act on this at their meeting next Monday and he doesn't anticipate any problems.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY FORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE, SUBJECT TO GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Halford reported that nothing much has changed since we went through this document at our last meeting other than moving the Aerial Imagery from 2024 to 2023. She explained that originally, we had it in 2023 but then Wayne brought it to our attention that we usually did it every three years, so we moved it to 2024, and then we were informed that Grand Forks would like it done every two years. Zacher commented that he didn't actually have an issue with it being in 2023, it was more that it states that it is done every three years in the document, and it was previously done in 2021, thus it would normally be done again in 2024, so that is why he brought it up.

Kuharenko stated that the City of Grand Forks is hoping to get this scheduled on an every other year basis, then we would have the MPO getting an aerial image every other year, and then the off years the City of Grand Forks will pick up their own. He explained that they are growing so fast that it is advantageous for them to try to get it set up this way, and it can be kind of difficult if the City is on a two-year schedule and the MPO is on a three-year schedule, so if it isn't an issue and we can move it back to 2023 that would be desirable.

Kuharenko said that he has one question, and he wasn't at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, but he sees in the staff hours it appears you are showing an additional planner position, can you fill him in on that and walk us through that. Halford responded that the hope is that we will get another planner in at the beginning of next year; just with the workload and the grants and things that we are getting, and that we are getting invited to more meetings and to do more grant applications like the Safe Streets For All and the SMART Grant, and that we are hoping to do more of those types of things, it is really hard when it is just Teri and herself doing it all so we are hoping to be able to add another planner. She said that with the budget, and there were some concerns that came out of the Executive Policy Board, that in the past the budget was a concern and we had to previously let an employee go because we didn't have funding for the position, but in going through the numbers and working on the budget, she feels pretty comfortable that we can add another planner. She added that she also shows an additional position as well because, unfortunately, Peggy has let us know that she is planning on retiring in 2024, and we would like to have a person on board for a few months prior to that to allow them to work with her and be able to go through an audit and things like that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

Kuharenko said that the only other question he has on the Market/Office Manager position is that you are showing 650 hours at the bottom, but it also shows that it is an FTE of 1.0, is that accurate or does that need to be tweaked or is that person coming in the last four months of the year. Halford responded that they would be coming in the last four months or so of the year.

Zacher stated that he has one question, towards the end of the document it looks like you have the draft contract he sent included with page numbers; it doesn't need to be included in the UPWP because the UPWP is attached to it, so it should be removed so we aren't doubling up. He added that there are also some clauses included in the document that are part of the contract and should be removed as well.

Pierce said that she had flagged a couple of things in her December 1st comments she sent, and just to follow up in the 200.1 category, that you were thinking that things would be done by December of 2023, but then the same number of hours are shown in 2024, so she is just wondering if those got incorporated or revised. Halford responded that she feels we went through all of her comments and made the necessary corrections, as well as Wayne and Kristen's, and we are hoping we got all of them, but we did go through all the comments and made the adjustments. Pierce stated that she just hasn't seen the final version, but if Wayne is comfortable with it, she is as well.

Sperry stated that, and they still haven't heard whether or not Minot will be an MPO, but she is just wondering if it does become an MPO if the funding would go down, if that would have any impact on whether or not you are able to hire another planner. She said that she knows it is kind of theoretical, and hopefully, fingers crossed, we will hear from the Census Bureau by the end of the month, but she wasn't sure if that would have an impact or not. Halford responded that she thinks that is a better question for Wayne. Zacher asked if he can use the same response that Kristen gives him, "we'll see when we get to that point". He said that he isn't sure how they would go about doing that, they would likely have to do an amendment at some point anyway, so that might be the best time to take care of that, once they have a handle. He added that they haven't looked at the equation yet because they are waiting to hear; just a change in the equation may change something, it may not even necessarily need to be Minot. Halford said that it isn't something that they are jumping in and doing right in January or February, we might start putting a job description together in February, so she is hoping by then that we kind of know what is going on, and then with the two grants that we applied for still out there, she knows that we will be doing an amendment in the spring in hopes that we get at least one of them. She stated that this is what we would like to happen, but we know it is going to change.

Pierce commented that she would also add that the preliminary discussions they have had on the Minnesota side have also increased the portion they would be giving, as a base value, to Grand Forks-East Grand Forks. She said that she thinks the base discussion is that everyone will get at least \$50,000, so that would be an increase from what they are getting now, about \$30,000 more, and while it isn't a ton, but it is something, and everyone is very supportive of increase that base amount. Halford added that also across the board, on just the individual projects, she didn't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

stretch it to the max of what she thinks we would need, it is more of that plus a little bit more, so there is some wiggle room in a few places too. Sperry stated that this works for her.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO MOVING THE AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY FROM 2024 TO 2023, AND TO REMOVE THE DRAFT NDDOT CONTRACT AND FEDERAL CLAUSES FROM THE DOCUMENT.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 5310 GRANT APPLICATION

Halford reported that the 5310 program focuses on funding for the elderly and people with disabilities, so CAT is looking at submitting a request for \$67,184.00 for a Mobility Manager. She said that that person would serve as a Regional Transit Coordinator and would be responsible for planning, marketing, education, and outreach for the CAT system. She said that the \$67,184.00 would be federal funds, which would require a \$16,797.00 local match, and that would be paid out of the Grand Forks City Public Transportation budget. She stated that this has gone before both City Councils, and they both approved it as submitted.

Kuharenko asked how long the Mobility Manager position has been around. Kouba responded that she thinks it has been around seven or eight years. Kuharenko said, then, that this has been a long-standing position.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF 5310 GRANT APPLICATION FROM CAT AND GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

Halford reported that this is a federal aid program, and the City of Grand Forks is submitting an application for intersection improvements at the intersection of US 2/Gateway Drive and North Columbia Road. She added that the project would shift the south leg of the intersection about 275-feet south. She stated that this has been presented to both City Councils, and they have approved it and moved it forward.

MOVED BY PALO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) APPLICATION FROM THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, AND GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Halford reported that we have adopted the 2023-2026 T.I.P., of course, but with everything, things don't always go with the plan as we hope they will, and don't change, but numbers change, dates change; she tried to make this a little bit clearer than what you've seen in the past.

Halford referred to the staff report and pointed out that the first amendment is to update the 5339 Bus and Bust Facility Competitive Grant. She pointed out that the first one outlines what it was before and the next one shows what is being changed, so you can see the difference. She added that this really could have just been an administrative amendment, it didn't have to go through the Technical Advisory Committee, but since there were other things that did need to be seen by the Technical Advisory Committee, she included it in as a discussion point. She explained that if the cost change is less than 25% it can be approved administratively.

Halford stated that the next one is a new project, so it did need to come through as an amendment to the Technical Advisory Committee. She explained that we received money from the Urban Grant Program to do the South 5th Street and Belmont, also known as "confusion corner" project. She said that they are planning on having a round-about at that location, and the project needs to be amended into the T.I.P.

Halford said that the next one is changing the Sub-Target Project that we talked about when we amended the 2045 MTP, so it involves moving the Bygland/Rhinehart Round-About project later in the plan and moving some other projects forward to 2023.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

Halford stated that the next one is updating FTA 5307, which is a project that we already have in the TIP, and updating the numbers, so, again, the first one is what it currently is and the second one is what is being changed.

Halford said that the next one is a new Capital Purchase and then we also had some carry-over funding that needed to be included as well.

Mason stated that he likes being able to see what the project was and what had changed. He asked about the projects that are replacing the Byglund Road and Rhinehart project; just for confirmation for him, the intent is to list three separate projects in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. Halford responded that that is correct. Mason said that that is all good, but the third project listed there, where is it, it doesn't really have any detail about which road it is located on, and he is curious about if it still the DeMers section that was previously identified. Halford asked if he was talking about the Sub-Target Funding project. Mason responded it was. Halford asked if Mr. Emery could give some highlights on that project. Emery stated that that work is on DeMers Avenue, basically from 4th Street N.W., or Business Highway 2, all the way up to Highway 2, so along that corridor. Mason said that if this amendment has passed through the MPO, in the MnDOT side they should identify that roadway segment, maybe that could take place following this meeting. He added that we don't need to include too much detail in that we would potentially need to modify the T.I.P. again, but we really do need to identify the roadway segment that the project is on. Halford stated that she would make that change.

Kuharenko commented that last week the City of Grand Forks received notification that they were awarded funding for the Transportation Alternative project they applied for this past summer on South 48th Street, so that went to their Community of the Whole on Monday and will go to the City Council next Monday, so that will be something that will be coming through soon. Zacher stated that that is fine, you will have other T.I.P. amendments, but they also have a signed S.T.I.P. on the North Dakota side, so we need to go through and make sure that those projects are matching as well.

MOVED BY SANDERS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS SUBJECT TO ADDING A DESCRIPTION TO THE EAST GRAND FORKS SUB-TARGET PROJECT, AS DISCUSSED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE CITIES AREA TRANSIT (CAT) PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SAFETY PLAN (PTASP)**

Halford reported that the Cities Area Transit Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) is an element of the agency's responsibility on safety policies, identifies hazards, controls risk, allows for goal setting and planning, prioritizes resources, and measures performance. She stated that transit agencies are required to have this in place by the end of the year and really the goal is to increase safety and implement the four components: Safety Management Policy Safety Risk Management, Safety Assurance, and Safety Promotion.

Halford stated that this has been presented to both City Councils, and both approved it and moved it forward.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY FORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE CITIES AREA TRANSIT (CAT), PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SAFETY PLAN (PTASP), AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE CITIES AREA TRANSIT (CAT) TRANSIT ASSET
MANAGEMENT PLAN (TAMS)**

Halford reported that the Transit Asset Management (TAMS) Plan is created in compliance with the National Transit Asset Management System for Final Rule. She said that it is really just taking care of the agencies capital assessments, making sure that their equipment is working and that there is a schedule to follow for any replacement of equipment, and making sure they are working at a full level of performance that they need to be at.

Halford stated that this has been presented to both City Councils and they both approved it and moved it forward.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE CITIES AREA TRANSIT (CAT) TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN (TAMS), AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, Ford, and Sanders.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PM1 SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Kouba reported that these are performance targets that are adopted every year. She referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and commented that both North Dakota and Minnesota have adopted safety targets, and they are specifically safety targets for the highway system, so they fall under FHWA's requirements. She said that in the past we adopted previous years targets, and, again North Dakota and Minnesota both adopted their safety targets that are based on crash data, which the MPO gets as well, and then we roll the data into a five-year average.

Kouba referred to a slide with a table showing the five-year averages and explained that staff rolls the five-sets of five-year rolling averages and takes those numbers and used them as our proposed targets. She said that previously, as you can see, we kind of used the targets for 2020 but we are now proposed the new targets shown in the table. She added that in the past the Technical Advisory Committee has recommended different targets, and that is what we are open to discussing doing today.

Kuharenko commented that he knows that he has personally been critical of the targets in the past and has been the main driving force in keeping the old targets because of the uncertainty, but he wants to say that the way you ended up putting this together this year, laying out everything has been excellent, this is a huge change and he appreciates that; it brings forward a lot of the data he was hoping to see, and with that he would recommend approval based on the staff recommended targets.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT APPROVAL OF THE 2023 SAFETY TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.

Sanders said, then, that we are recommending our targets for the number of traffic fatalities go up from 1.8 to 2.4. Kouba responded that that is correct. Kouba added that she understands that that seems kind of crazy, but as you can see... Sanders said that he thinks they all should be zeros, and if they are higher than that is way too bad, but to sit here and say that we are going target 2.4 fatalities per year instead of 1.8 makes no sense to him as a towards zero death member or a vision zero person in North Dakota. Kouba stated that she knows that some places do that, she knows that the State of Florida has done that, it just means that all safety funding, because you are not meeting your target, obviously; all that safety funding will now have to go towards making sure there are no deaths, and in the past that safety funding has been able to be flexed into other projects. She stated that we are just trying to make targets that are reasonable so we can continue, but so we can also show that we are meeting funding for safety issues.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

Kouba commented that, as she was saying, we have had some hard years in the past four years, and it isn't all on the North Dakota side. Kuharenko stated that we definitely have had our share, and he knows they have been working on a number of projects with the help of the DOT; 32nd Avenue, that left turn lane alignment project has been huge, he is hoping that will help quite a bit, especially on these rolling five-year averages.

Fork said that you did answer one question he had, and you explained it pretty well, but another question he has is, the two States set their own goals and then the MPO sets its own goal or dare we going off what the States have identified. Kouba responded that we do take a look at what the States do, and we can choose to use their goals, but then we have to then do the additional work of actually figuring out our own portion of how we are contributing or how we are making a positive impact to those goals that are at a State level, which are much higher than going with our own goals, and you can see the numbers in the table; they are a lot higher, so we tend to being it down to our own MPO level and do the calculations that the States do as well. She stated that it is easier to show the States that we have our own goals in our own area, and we work towards those goals.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Mason, Palo, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Riesinger, Emery, and Ford.

Voting Nay: Sanders.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Bail, Peterson, Bergman, Danielson, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, West, and Magnuson.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021/2022 Annual Work Program Project Update

- 1) Transit Development Plan – Halford reported that, as Teri highlighted at the beginning of the meeting, transit is near the end, we just have to get approval from the Executive Policy Board tomorrow and from the Grand Forks City Council next Monday, and then we should be good to go.
- 2) Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update – Halford reported that this is also getting closer to the end as well. She stated that a lot of things have been happening with it the last couple of weeks, so we are still looking at February and March for the approval process.
- 3) Street and Highway Plan Element – Halford reported that a lot has been going on with this project, we had a public input meeting on November 3rd. She said that it wasn't as well attended as we had hoped, but the Stakeholder meeting we had earlier that morning was well attended, and it was a very diverse group. She said that, as she stated earlier, we all kind of use and look at our system differently, so to get those different views at the table is very helpful.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2022**

B. MPO Updates

- 1) Smart Grant Program – Halford reported that we did put in an application for the Smart Grant Program. She stated that we partnered with Upper Great Plains and the Fargo-Moorhead Council of Government on that, and it is for the I-29 Corridor. She said that we should get a response on the application in the beginning of 2023.
- 2) Bridge Update - Halford reported that things are kind of in flux on this item at this time, with a lot of conversations going on, so we will see what happens after the Joint City Council Meeting that will be scheduled. Brooks commented that he thinks that January 4th was the date they were looking at for the Joint City Council Meeting, but he isn't sure it has been set yet; he thinks Todd Feland was going to get in touch with Dave Murphy to get it set up.
- 3) January TAC Agenda Items – Halford stated that we are looking at some more performance measure discussions, the safety one is not the only one, we have a few others as well that we need to get adopted and talk about.

Zacher said that for the UPWP to go under contract it needs to go before the Executive Policy Board for approval, so after that goes through tomorrow then we can talk through the process, but basically the MPO will get the docu-sign first to assign the signers, and then it will go through the approval/signature process after that. He stated that he did want to note that the DOT has hired a new Deputy Director for Engineering, Matt Lindeman, who was the Materials and Research Director for a couple of years, he was in Engineering and Transportation Services for a while, and Jen Turnbo, who was their Deputy Director for Planning left as of last week, and so Chad Warren, who is the Director of Project Development is acting as the interim Deputy Director for Planning, so there are a number of changes going on at the DOT.

C. Agency Updates

- None

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 14TH, 2022 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:35 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager