

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Andrea Edwardson (Proxy for Ryan Brooks), Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; George Palo, NDDOT-Local District; and Jon Mason, MnDOT District 2.

Absent: Brad Bail, Troy Schroeder, Tom Ford, Ryan Riesinger, Rich Sanders, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Christian Danielson, Ryan Brooks, Nancy Ellis, and Jason Peterson.

Guest(s) present: Kristen Sperry, North Dakota FHWA; Erika Shepard, MnDOT; Carter Hunter, Grand Forks Engineering; Jason Carbee, HDR Engineering; Jeremy Williams, HDR Engineering, and Tim Finseth, NWRDC.

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 12, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JULY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT URBAN AREA BOUNDARY AND MPO STUDY AREA**

Kouba reported that last month she updated everybody on the map itself, showing the boundaries for our Urban Area as well as the MPO Study Area. She reiterated that the reason we had to extend the updated boundaries, such as those by the airport, was due to having to make sure that all of the City Limit Area is within the MPO Study Area, not necessarily urban but still. She said that we were very close to where this new urbanized area is located, so we wanted to make sure we bumped it out enough to make sure we include that. She stated that other than that nothing has changed since last month, we just increase to make sure that we can visually see that the census area, the area in green, is inside our proposed urban area, the purple area, as well as Minnesota wanted us to make sure that the section of Minnesota 220 was included in the urban area as well as a section in the southern end as well.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT URBAN AREA BOUNDARY AND MPO STUDY AREA, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, Zacher, Mason, Edwardson, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Schroeder, Brooks, Sanders, Ellis, Ford, Riesinger, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, and Magnuson.***

**MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF FY2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #6**

a. Public Hearing

Kouba opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Kouba closed the public hearing.

Kouba reported that they received no comments online from the public on this particular amendment either.

b. Committee Action

Kouba reported that apparently the signal installation for the University Avenue Railroad Crossing was not supposed to be in FY2024, it was supposed to be in FY2023, so that has been amended in the T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Kouba stated that there is also a new project, a surface rehabilitation project on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North in 2023 as well.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE FY2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #6, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, Zacher, Mason, Edwardson, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Schroeder, Brooks, Sanders, Ellis, Ford, Riesinger, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, and Magnuson.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2024-2027 T.I.P.**

a. Public Hearing

Kouba opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Kouba closed the public hearing.

Kouba reported that they received no comments online from the public on this particular amendment either.

b. Committee Action

Kouba reported that this is the final approval process, we did receive some very interesting comments from Facebook, but nothing earth-shattering, more along the lines of wanting to get rid of the slip lanes on Washington and DeMers, improve sidewalks along Washington, want better availability of paratransit, they want the cliff-note version of the T.I.P., and just things of that nature. She said that there were no e-mails, letters, or anything along that line submitted.

Kouba stated that Erika had mentioned something about transit operations. Shepard said that as they were going through the T.I.P. they noted some things that she didn't catch the first time they were sent the T.I.P. early on, but the work types that are listed, and she hasn't been able to get clarification on whether or not this is absolutely required, but it would great to have a little bit more consistency in the work types that are being listed so that they match the work types that are available in the MnDOT S.T.I.P., because they are categories that are dropped down so you can't just fill in whatever it is to match the work type that was listed in your T.I.P. so it is something she isn't clear on whether or not it can be worked on in the future to be more consistent, but she doesn't know if it is something that would hold up approval of this T.I.P., but she just wanted to flag it, that just having more consistent work types with the S.T.I.P. would be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

ideal for their geography process. Kouba responded that she can work on that, as well make it is sure it is changed, she just needs to know what work types are available, and she would mostly just do it for the Minnesota projects unless Wayne has an issue with how we write the type of work for North Dakota in which case we will change it for them too. Kouba said that she mostly was pulling from what was written in the Northwest Minnesota information, she doesn't know if that has changed or if there is something different that is being used, maybe Jon Mason can speak to that. Mason responded that he would have to check what they had for those work types, but like Erika said, he thinks they just glossed over them, they are very close, it isn't like one says reconstruction and one says preventative maintenance, it is isn't wildly off, it is just detail type things that from his perspective anybody reviewing it would say that they are the same projects, but that is just his opinion. Shepard stated that she totally agrees, but they had gotten some comments from their federal partners on making sure things are exactly consistent, but that one of the categories that she isn't exactly sure it needs to match letter for letter. Kouba said that we can definitely work on that, if we can't get confirmation on specific language, then we will work on it in the future. Shepard said that that sounds good.

Palo commented that he would like to address the Washington Street sidewalks. He stated that there are two projects that will address those issues, it is just taking a little while to work things out with the property owners, but those issues will be addressed.

Kouba said that she will include the comments into the final document and will send them out to the Technical Advisory Committee as well.

***MOVED BY PALO, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2024-2027 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, Zacher, Mason, Edwardson, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Schroeder, Brooks, Sanders, Ellis, Ford, Riesinger, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, and Magnuson.***

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF FY2024-2025 UPWP**

Halford reported that, as she stated at the last meeting, she wanted to give you something this month to basically chew on; there are still a lot of things that need to be updated in the report, but depending on how the conversation goes and what you decide here, it will need to be updated anyway. She referred to the report and pointed out that, for example, the study area map will need to be updated. Zacher commented that he would leave the current map in there for now since that is the approved map at this point, unless Kristen has other ideas, but Federal Highway needs to approve the proposed updated MPO Study Area map, then it can be replaced.

Halford stated that she should also back up and remind everyone just in case you weren't there for the conversation, we currently have a work program approved for 2023 and 2024, but we are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

moving towards doing our work programs in the same way we do our TIPs, where there will always be a revolving year in front of us so even though we have the 2023-2024 approved right now we are looking at a 2024-2025 one so then we always have that additional year that helps with looking forward on our projects, what we have coming down the pipeline as well as it being a good thing for our partners too so they always know what is coming and they can plan for it because we know finding staff time to fit things in can be hard, so this is kind of a more forward planning process.

Halford continued going through the report and commented that one thing she has highlighted here, is one of the things she hasn't touched from last year, is a graphic that needs to be changed.

Halford referred to Table 14 in the report and stated that this is one thing that she has been working on, and it highlights what we are looking at for 2024 projects as well as the proposed budget. She said that this table will change slightly but this gives a good idea of what we are thinking of proposing that we will be doing, and what kind of budget we will be looking at, so definitely more, what she heard from the last meeting she put into next year and the following year and did it as best we can at this time. She stated that we are definitely looking for a positive outcome, as you can see, she budgeted for a planner, we currently don't have a planner, we have a Senior Planner, but hopefully we can hire one soon so we can do all of this, if we don't then we will have to make some changes, but we are planning for it now.

Halford said that, as you know, we follow the City of Grand Forks' salary plan, and their positions as well, and their proposed salary plan did get preliminary approval, but it isn't final, but we just planned for the best case scenario, that what they are hoping will happen, and it is approved, that is what we put in the budget, so that is what we planned on as well as the increase for the following year of what those positions will go to, so we are planning for that as well in the budget.

Zacher stated that, also just to point out that their formula is changing, they added Minot as an MPO, Fargo is still being reviewed, and so with the formula changing it will mean that the dollar amounts will be changing. He said that they have preliminary ideas, but again, they haven't approved anything, but once the DOT approves it then they have to ask Federal Highway for their approval, and go through that process, so for those funds, again the funds will change, and he is hoping that they have an answer by the Director's meeting in September. Halford said that they are really trying to meet the deadline, she knows that that isn't something that has happened in the past, especially on the Minnesota side, they want it submitted by the end of September, isn't that correct Erika. Shepard responded that she thinks that September 15<sup>th</sup> is the deadline, but they can try to work with you to get it ready for the first submission. Halford said that that is why we are looking at it this month and then will have a more final polished draft next month, so we can try to meet that deadline, but they are more than fine making some changes, and we do know that things will change since, as she said, we don't know when we will get a planner, retirements, things like that, just that things can happen and we will just have to roll with the punches.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Kuharenko referred to Table 14 and commented that you are showing the Grand Valley Study in 2024 but are we still planning on starting that late this year. Halford responded that she is still planning on starting it this year, and then it will carry over into next year and finishing it early summer.

Emery referred to Table 2 and Table 3 lists the Technical Advisory Committee voting members and non-voting members and he is looking at East Grand Forks Engineering and it has him listed as the voting member and Brad Bail as a non-voting member, but in the event, he isn't here and Brad would attend, shouldn't he be a voting member. McNelis responded that the list has the main representative shown as the voting member and their alternate as the non-voting member in the event they are both present at a meeting, but if the voting member can't attend the non-voting member would be able to vote in their absence. Kuharenko said, then, that on that note you should probably change Christian Danielson to Carter Hunter. Sperry added that Sandy Zimmer should probably be changed to Pamela Todd. Mason said that Patrick Hopkins should be changed to Troy Schroeder as well.

Halford continued going over Table 14 projects briefly. She then referred to Table 15, 2025 Budget and Project list, and pointed out that it has projects that are just what we normally see, and then it has the Micro-Transit and the One-Way Pairs projects shown as well.

Kuharenko asked if they were still looking for a list of illustrative projects to put into a hopper, just as a heads up. Halford responded that she is, probably sooner than later, but this is a pretty beefy work program. Kuharenko said that one question that was brought up earlier with some internal communications has been looking back at our railroad crossings. He stated that a number of years ago there was a study done on the Mill Spur that looked at the railroad crossings, quiet zone, closing crossings; there was a Glasston Spur study that was done a number of years back, and any of the conversations that he has had with Alex Fiorini from BNSF seems to indicate there is an interest in looking at all the crossings as a whole and looking at, if we end up wanting to do crossings somewhere else as we continue to develop south, we need to be looking at other locations that we are considering closing the crossings at, so that would be a study that might be beneficial to take on at an MPO level, he doesn't know what East Grand Forks has for crossings, it would be relatively few, so he doesn't know if there would be an interest on their part as well. Kuharenko asked if East Grand Forks had converted their crossings to a quiet zone. Emery responded that they are in the process of doing that. Kuharenko said, then, that he would guess that East Grand Forks wouldn't be looking at closing any of those crossings. Emery responded that they are looking at one closure. Kuharenko said, again, that that might be something to think about doing a study on. Halford commented that they did highlight this study in the Safe Streets for All application, looking at the railroad crossings, so they could beef that part up a little bit when they put the RFP together, or do you want more than what they did in the study. Kuharenko stated that that might be a separate study, he knows it has been something that they talked about having pieces in either the Street and Highway Element, or the Bike/Ped Plan as we deal with those crossings. He said that there were issues with this in the past, so that might be something worthwhile to have its own focus. Halford said then, timeline wise, we might wait to see how Safe Streets For All shakes out and then go from there to see what is left. Kuharenko responded that he was looking at doing that in the future, not

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

necessarily in 2024 or 2025, it could easily be a more out there project, just something to keep in mind. Halford said that it would be a good one for the list and note that if it doesn't make it in the next two years that we should look at it in 2026 or 2027.

Halford commented that she has done work on the graphs and budgeting things, but the body of it, she fine tune it to make sure the hours and the budget align in all the sections as well as that the language is correct as well.

Halford stated that this would be brought back next month, she just wanted to make sure that you saw it so you know that she is going on the right road.

Kuharenko said, you are looking for a more detailed description for the Grand Valley Study, was that for this or was it for something else. Halford responded that it is for this as well as our Mid-Year Report. Kuharenko asked if what he sent over was sufficient enough. Halford said that she saw the email but hasn't been able to read it yet but thanked him for sending it.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE FY2024-2025 UPWP, SUBJECT TO ADJUSTMENTS/AMENDMENTS, AS NECESSARY.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, Zacher, Mason, Edwardson, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Schroeder, Brooks, Sanders, Ellis, Ford, Riesinger, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, and Magnuson.***

**NON-ACTION ITEMS:**

**MATTER OF STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE**

Kouba reported that we have been throwing around some alternatives and things of that nature, and talking funding, so Jason Carbee and Jeremy Williams from HDR Engineering, are here today to give an update and also to get some input from the Technical Advisory Committee on some of this information so we can ensure that we are continuing down the path and hopefully finish on time.

Carbee stated that Jeremy and himself will cover different parts of this update. He said that they have two big elements here, and once again they want to keep this track, but they have had some delays with the travel modeling, so they want to go through alternatives and then talk about the draft funding levels and then they will discuss next steps.

Carbee said that three weeks ago they sent out a draft set of alternatives, and he will talk a little bit about the alternatives, but in talking with MPO staff and some of you he thinks the idea was to maybe simplify the alternatives, really focus on the corridor level. He stated that they will,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

and need to focus on what are, also, what are maintenance and what are state of good repair requirements, what are we going to be able to fund between now and 2050, but at that same time let's also pull out that level of funding and then identify, from an operations and capacity and safety perspective, where do we need to, what are those corridors that we really need to focus on, what do those projects look like, so the pressure has really been to tear down that list and make it a little easier to interpret, and we can talk about some of these alternatives, you can tell that map that they provided has given kind of an overview of project types, the red are kind of the widened corridors, the light blues are kind of those new functionally classified corridors, and then the darker blues are kind of the one-mile paving roads and the pink dashed are the supporting collector system that might vary a little bit depending on development locations, and then there is the interchange and the potential options for where we might have new bridges, and so, again, trying to get it into some general categories, and then more details are provided on each of those alternatives. He added that they did have a chance to talk with David Kuharenko from the City of Grand Forks and get some refinements of those alternatives and those are reflected here.

Carbee stated that he thinks that what we really want to do is to really kind of lock down that we've got a list of alternatives, we've already got some alternatives and once we kind of lock down those alternatives they will share them with everyone. He said that they are ready to take all the goals and objectives they had earlier in the process and basically go through and come up with, not only the timing of growth but also the priorities in terms of how they match up with our safety and mobility, and kind of the range of those goals and objectives that we've gotten, kind of how to prioritize this list of alternatives and work with you all, whether it is in between Technical Advisory Committee meetings or individually, just kind of like how do these fit with that overall growth pattern, what do we see as immediate needs, what is our short term, what is our long-term. He said that rather than going through each project, he would like to see if there are any questions. He added that one of the other big philosophical things he left out before we go on, is that we started to identify some of these corridors, and you see that we have Columbia, Washington, Gateway, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, Highway 2 on the Minnesota side, and Bygland; those have been identified as operations and safety, and he thinks that is an acknowledgement that by 2050 we are going to run into probably some additional congestions levels and some potential safety issues, is that these corridors might need to be revisited, and he talked with David about how 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South just had some pretty significant improvements through there and what we are seeing is that probably the year 2050 we will start to see some probably congestion and maybe related safety issues pop up again say 20 years from now. He said that we don't think it is probably going to be to the extent where you would initially want to do a 6 lane divided section through there, but maybe there is a signal tweak needed, are there new timing plans, what can we do to get the most out of these corridors without radical widening and right-of-way impacts, and that is kind of what those green lines that you see, and they vary from corridor to corridor; you know 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South there's probably not a lot of physical geometric things to do even 20 to 25 years from not, it is probably more focusing on signals and things like that, whereas some of the corridors maybe we want to reconstruct intersections, add some medians and things like that for safety.



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Carbee asked if there have been any questions as you have reviewed this, this is a little bit updated set of alternatives from what was sent out mid-July, in terms of what the alternatives look like just based on their conversations with the City of Grand Forks.

Kuharenko said that you mentioned before that this doesn't include state of good repair, doesn't include the CPR reconstructions, when are we likely to see that list. Carbee responded that the idea was that they would, the idea was that you provided a list of anticipated projects, and they went through and associated costs with those, so the way they were going to approach this was, rather than where are we going to need a mill and overlay in the year 2045, let's make sure our financial plan accounts for it, we can share that with you but he was anticipating that they would work each of you to show those projects you anticipate needing to get programmed over the next five years, and then they would also show a level of cost associated with the projects further out, a lot of times it is kind of hard to know some of those projects beyond 2032 or whatever the backend of your short-term is going to be, so the idea was that they would work with you to show those short-term projects that might show up in the T.I.P. the next five years, but they want to have representative costs in there, to make sure we maintain fiscal constraint. Kuharenko said that that makes sense, his big concern was if we have one map that shows a lot of our expansion or spot repairs and not showing our mill and overlays or reconstructs and that sort of thing, but if that is going to be separate that is fine, it should be covered then. Carbee added that that stuff is kind of baked in, right, this is the stuff that they need that requires some decision making, and they understand that given fiscal constraint, everything that shows up on this list isn't going to be able to show up on the fiscally constrained plan, and also knowing full well that the 2045 plan was all state of good repair, and they are still working through crunching the numbers, but it is a big number for state of good repair, so we might have a similar situation, he thinks you want to have individual conversations with folks on that to see, kind of, here is what we've got for your list of projects, here is what the costs look like, are all of our reasonably anticipated federal funding going to go towards maintenance projects, and kind of get everybody engaged. Kouba added do we want our major reconstructs put in the list and have those mill and overlays, those preventative maintenance projects, or state of good repair, and kind of a kitty of funding sources and you guys chose which ones are going to be moving up and on. Carbee said that honestly right now, what they talked about with MPO staff, probably anything that isn't going to show up in the short-term, so anything that is not going to be in a TIP over the next five years, even if it is a major reconstruction in say the year 2037, that would probably be in that "kitty", that says hey, we have these major projects coming, we need to keep funding for them, but at the same time whether they are in 2037 or 2042, it is a way off and you can't really tell until you get closer, so the idea is that they would probably show, you know your short term ones that, again could get programmed in the next five years.

Kouba commented that she is also happy to hear the DOT's, as well as Federal Highway's point of, if we are going in a good direction or not with our ideas and our plans for showing fiscal constraint.

Emery said that he doesn't know how much it matters at this point, he is just looking at Project ID #60, 10<sup>th</sup> Street N.E., between 11<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>; basically, it just says to pave gravel, that roadway right now is concrete, but it is totally shot so it would have to be a total reconstruction. Carbee

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

stated that there are one or two projects that are in there that are basically reconstructs. He said that Jeremy and himself were talking that they think it is a good idea, he knows they had an initial conversation with East Grand Forks on what projects they thought would be in the industrial area, but they probably need to zoom in and give you a little bit more detail, but that segment is, and there another one in there that is the same, but it needs to be a reconstruction. He added that they have more detailed cost estimates they are working on that kind of reflects that and they are working with their partners at CPS on that, but good comment, that one is a little bit misclassified. Emery added that another one to look at is ID #59, where it says pave gravel, at best if you go east of 15<sup>th</sup>, once you get past any of the commercial properties there, at the best it is a farm road right now. Carbee said, again, Jeremy and himself are just sitting here chatting about this, when we have that follow-up conversation they will give you a more detailed map of that area, he knows it was an area of particular concern.

Carbee asked if everyone had had a chance to look through these alternatives over the last few weeks, and if not could you take a look through, and they can provide some more details on some of this, he knows the operations projects are a little bit uncertain, and you know that when you have a problem twenty years away, there is only so much you can do, and it isn't like, oh we need 50% more capacity, so some of these we will need to make assumptions on, and there may be long term issues, and they want to make sure they are reasonable assumptions, so some are geometric improvements potentially with like median and access management and things like that, and like he said some of the corridors are probably looking at signal timings and maybe some hardware here and there.

Mason asked if that level of detail will be included in the Street and Highway Plan or is that something that is available upon request. Carbee responded that that would be up to you, they have it, they will talk about what they think it is, and they are interested for your input on that, so what do you guys think, again you want these to be reasonable and publicly consumable, at the same time the recommendations in a street and highway plan at the 30,000 foot level for what is going to happen fifteen to twenty years from now where it might not be exactly right because things change and traffic patterns can change and things like that, so do you think in the plan itself we should be saying that, you know, on Washington we are assuming some geometric improvements, say north of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, and Bygland, is it just a couple of roundabouts, and things like that, but what do you think is the appropriate level. He added that this is hard assumptions that go into the cost estimates that they will share when you get your general first cut of what you think of these alternatives.

Emery said that in East Grand Forks, just along Bygland Road, he knows that in the past what they had in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. was a roundabout at Bygland Road and Rhinehart Drive, but he sees it isn't even on the list. Carbee responded that they see the potential with traffic growth the need to manage some intersections so actually with that operations that they do anticipate maybe some roundabouts or signals or whatever the preferred concept is, but yeah, right now, again a draft cost estimate that would show a couple of roundabouts on Bygland, so that is the kind of level we are at here, but again he has a spreadsheet that he is willing and able to share when they get some feedback from you on what is reasonable to put in there. He added that at the same time he knows that sometimes you don't want to derail a corridor study or make some

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

assumptions on a corridor that might cause some consternation with someone if it is something that is ten or fifteen years away, but that is kind of on a corridor by corridor basis and they can add as many details as you want to see.

Carbee said that hopefully this is becoming, again, a little bit more clear that the operations are kind of an intersection by intersection, they are not full reconstructions, where they have some initial assumptions, a lot of these have been in other corridor studies like on Gateway, we've got the 220 Corridor study so that Project 34 on Central Avenue, they are assuming that there are a couple roundabouts, he thinks three roundabouts total came out of that study, they kind of have those assumed in there so any of those detailed studies like the Skewed Intersection Study at 81 and 2, they have those recommendations from that study kind of plucked in and ready to go. He said that they just want to make sure that they have kind of the universe of potential capacity and safety type projects reflected here, and then really going down to the next level with assumptions on cost and what goes into that and what kind of priorities evolve.

Kouba asked Nick West if there is anything that is going on in the county that you can think of going on into the future, especially in the MPO area. West responded that eventually there will need to be an overlay on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue from the railroad tracks to County 5, will need an overlay in the near future, and that would probably be his quickest request, in the next three or four years or so, and he would ask that urban funds be used for that if possible, or a combination of funds, but obviously there will be a combination of funds, but if some urban funds could be used there and then about the only other thing he can think of right now is that someday if the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Overpass gets built over I-29, that some urban funds be used to build 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue out to County 5. He said that he thinks that that would be about it because the rest of the roads in the MPO area are in pretty good shape and have been overlaid recently so it would be just maintenance, maybe a chip seal here and there, that would be about it.

Kouba stated that we would want to work with you on getting an idea of the costs of those things, just on average. Carbee added that that would be great because, as he said they worked with CPS on looking at recent project costs and they kind of went in and took a pretty detailed approach to a lot of the projects, they just want to make sure that you all think they are reasonable.

West asked if a new bridge on County Road 6, across the Red River, be in the MPO's boundary, he is assuming it would. Kouba asked if it would be on Merrifield. West responded it would. Kouba said it would be within the MPO's boundary. Carbee added that even a place for an interchange, and kind of an intersection improvement, that would become more of a through corridor between the two states. He said that you can see they even did include the option for some upgrade separations with the railroad, as that southwest portion of the metro kind of grows, at least keep them on the list, they probably might not be the highest near-term priorities, but they are still showing the railroad grade separation potentially on 32<sup>nd</sup>, 47<sup>th</sup>, and then down on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. and County Road 6, Merrifield. West said that that would be cool.

Carbee commented that, again, not everything on here, clearly is going to make our fiscally constrained list, but if they are good ideas, part of this is to make sure it is in the plan so when

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

something happens down the line, and we start thinking about things that might become more of a reality as we get closer to 2050, we have them in the plan.

West stated that some other things, if you look at the County Road 5 corridor, south of the Airport, some intersection improvements are warranted, particularly at County 5 and Demers and County 5 and 32<sup>nd</sup>, those would probably be the two biggest ones. He said that he actually had a study done and there is traffic lanes and improvements warranted, they just haven't gone after anything because they are still functioning at a fair level. He added that if an interchange on I-29 is built on County 6 and a bridge across the Red River is built, he would imagine that whole loop from the Airport, south on County 5, over on 6<sup>th</sup> would get quite a bit busier so maybe the intersection on County 5 and County 6 would be an issue, so if you are really putting together a giant wish list, he would say that those three intersections could be added as something on the radar too, particularly DeMers and 32<sup>nd</sup>. Carbee stated that this came up at their stakeholder meeting in late June, the thought that Airport Road is busy, and we probably need to think to the future, and he heard you say that maybe we need to go all the way out to Merrifield as well, but they are anticipating we need some sort of intersection improvements on that road at some point in the future, so you are saying maybe sooner rather than later.

West referred to the map and asked if he was missing something here, US 2 is the green line, so wouldn't DeMers Avenue be one mile south. Carbee agreed it would be one mile south and pointed out where DeMers Avenue is on the map. West said that that is paved already, and then 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be the next one south, but he doesn't know if he ever sees that one paved, he doesn't envision that as it really doesn't connect up with much, but 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is paved all the way to County 5. Carbee said, then, that you might move 54 down to 32<sup>nd</sup>. West responded he would. Carbee stated that that is helpful, and you are saying that basically long term probably 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South as well. West said that if the I-29 Interchange gets built, he thinks that it would just about automatically trigger paving 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue out to County 5, he thinks the writing is on the wall with that because that township road would take a massive beating. Carbee agreed that that makes sense.

Carbee commented that maybe what we should do, if we could, would be to set up some follow-up meetings with East Grand Forks, and maybe what they will do is give you a little bit more zoomed in detail and with the City of Grand Forks maybe they can start sharing some of the assumptions on some of the details for the operations projects, and some costs there as well.

Emery stated that any of these alternatives, they have to be streets/highways, whatever is eligible for federal or state funding, correct, these can't be some local roads can they. Carbee responded that we are supposed to talk about regionally significant projects, even if they are locally funded, so for instance, with development collectors, a lot of times those might be more local or developer type projects, but we just want to make sure you have access out to the arterials. Kouba stated that that would be correct, other than the fact that most federal funds are used on just your functionally classified roads, your local roads don't necessarily qualify for federal funding, but it can be raised to a regionally significant project. She cited that at one point in time we had 5<sup>th</sup> and Gateway as an intersection improvement, but that isn't something we like to do, but that could be regionally significant, especially for the network, but without Gateway being

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

there it would be just a local road. Emery said that one road he is thinking about is in the industrial area, 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, that connects 10<sup>th</sup> Street to Highway 2. He said that he doesn't know how that one is functionally classified, but that is what triggered his question. Carbee stated that he believes they are collectors, but the frontage road might be local. Mason commented that along those same lines this would also cover #59 and #64, it is kind of where we are opening up additional access to Highway 2, which would result in potentially more crashes and mobility problems, so how does this all fit together when we are gaining more access and providing connections and on-and-on, challenges could be presented further. Carbee responded that he knows there has been efforts to improve safety into that corridor as well, but great point. He said that they are anticipating to add kind of a base system approach, kind of meeting the vision for access for you, where you are turning now, just talking about during project development, kind of what does a safe approach look like, but you are right, any time you can, especially if this continues to be kind of a higher speed corridor, anytime you start adding more access points there is a potential for high injury conflict points. Carbee reiterated that even though right now we are showing every potential idea, it doesn't mean that they are the only ideas, but it hits kind of the highest priorities, but again there is some development pressure in here, and one of the things we talked about was how do we get access there.

Carbee stated that he wanted to give you a high level of funding too and talk next steps. He said that he knows we spoke to both DOTs a few months back about anticipated funding levels, and they have kind of a draft document that they provided in the packet, and he is hoping you were able to take a look at that, and he will give you kind of a highlight really quick in this presentation. He said that, again, it is the basis for fiscal constraint, they look at local, state and federal funding, and you will notice when we get to some of the tables that there is a little bit of a blurry line between state and federal because a lot of them are federally sourced but they are kind of packaged and distributed by the state, so he thinks the big difference will be local versus the state and federal that they show there.

Carbee commented that they did include the BIL or the IIJA, PROTECT and Carbon Reduction Program funds, potentially, which are kind of new funding sources since the 2045 plan. He said that, again, they reviewed historic levels, talked with both DOTs about what is reasonable to anticipate going into the future, he thinks they reviewed the past T.I.P., and for local funds they looked at the budgets for the jurisdictions, and then they did two or three interviews on some of these just going through what is reasonable, and one of the things they talked about, and there are some assumptions in there for growth rates, and a lot of that they talked about with the DOTs, but they did organize the forecasted revenue into time-bands, and this is usually one of those things you want to talk about, and right now they are showing short, so the four time-bands were current T.I.P., so 2024-2027; short-term (2028-2030 but they could probably go from 2028-2032 and then split up the mid-term and long-term from there, the thought was that going from 2028-2032 would work because the plan is good for five years and you have five years of short-term projects that could be loaded into your T.I.P.s between today and 2028 when your next MTP is updated, so that is probably something that is changeable and they might update that when they do the next version of this report). He asked if there was a best practice anyone would like to see there, he is actually leaning towards turning it into a five year 2028-2032. Kuharenko responded that he would be in support of extending that short term just because you could run into a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

problem where if they are looking at something in the mid-term, trying to pull it into the short-term, we don't want to have to revise the street and highway element, so extending that short-term could definitely help us especially as we get to the tail end of the useful life of this before we go to the 2055. Carbee said that they will plan on making that change, and he thinks that what they are really focusing on is kind of analyzing the bottom lines at this point.

Carbee asked if Jeremy had anything he would add at this point, he said that he can kind of show the totals, and he thinks the more interesting thing is probably the comparison between this and 2045. Williams responded that he would add that what we are seeing here, in the draft funding plan, it will break out each one of these federal, state, and local into more detail so if you get a chance to review that you will get a little more context. Carbee added that there aren't enough federal funds that are directly allocated to the MPO, so really the federal and state pots are probably more of the federally sourced funds that the state's each allocate, so he thinks it might help if there is a slide that kind of shows by individual program, how much the total funding is, so you have your HSIP, your Interstate Maintenance, and again Interstate Maintenance is very much a State Discretionary so that one is probably not really critical for us to focus in on too much, but the HSIP for any safety projects, we are a little bit lower in 2050 versus 2045 on the North Dakota side, and we talked a lot about that when they talked to NDDOT. He said that Urban Local Roads and Urban Regional Roads, you can see those two comparisons, again, we are a bit lower in 2050 than we were in 2045, the county program.

Carbee commented that on the Minnesota side, in that district they are showing pretty big jumps in the district managed program, in the Minnesota State Aid Program, and that is something that they can have a follow-up conversation on if you get into that and have questions, but he thinks those are the levels they talked about during their talk with MnDOT a few weeks ago.

Carbee stated that there are two new programs, they took a stab at estimating how much the annual allocation was for each state and then what percentage of the population each of those areas were, and over 23 years neither of these programs are going to be huge, especially on the Minnesota side, but over those 23 years he thinks they will get about \$21,000,000 in North Dakota and just under a million for Minnesota and then for Carbon Reduction about \$12,000,000 for North Dakota and about \$34,000 for Minnesota.

Carbee commented that they have the pavement management reports that got done, and Teri did a great job of getting a really comprehensive list together from all of your agency partners on all of your state of good repair; including pavement repairs, whether they are mill and overlays or reconstructs and rehabs, but they have really been working off of that list for a lot of this. Kouba stated that she has to give props to all of the partners here because they gave her a lot of information and she just pulled it all together. Carbee said that this gave them a big advantage with anticipating projects, they started comparing that to the reports you wrapped up last year, and they will be sharing that information soon, and it will lead into the fiscal constraint portion and see what might be left for that universe of alternatives we were just looking at.

Carbee stated that they are hoping to get your feedback on the alternatives list, again; they got their thoughts on the refined elements of each of them and what the costs might be, so when they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

kind of get that “yes, this looks like a good list to start with”, they will spend some time over the next few weeks having some individual discussion with each of you, and then kind of finalize what that funding and maintenance looks like. He said that they are shooting for late September for an open house and on-line engagement opportunity, and he thinks that at our next Technical Advisory Committee meeting we want to talk through the details of the priorities, like which of these projects falls into the short-term, mid-term, and which ones are top tier priorities and which ones are a little further off. He added that they have been working on pieces of the draft document over the last several months, and they will have a draft later in October. He said that they had some delays with the travel model, they are hoping to get some of the alternative travel model results at the end of this month.

Kouba commented that, just to let you know, our September Technical Advisory Committee meeting is on September 13<sup>th</sup>. Carbee stated again that they anticipate checking in individually probably before then just to make sure we are good with all the elements that go into those alternatives and start talking about priorities at the September Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Kuharenko referred to Page 4, under the local revenue sources, the special assessment piece, one piece he does want to clarify in there is you’ve got in here that special assessment fees are determined by dividing the total cost of the construction improvement between all properties that will benefit; we are going to need to tweak that language a bit because when it comes to federal aid projects they don’t special assess those projects and a lot of times with their cost share they may only special assess 20%, so that is one piece that he wants to get clarified in there. Carbee asked if you assess up to the match on a typical 80/20 split, is that what you are saying. Kuharenko responded that that isn’t correct. He explained that when it comes to federal aid projects they do not special assess, zero, the match on that one is entirely local. He said that if they do special assess a project they have different cost share policies for different roadways, if it is local or classified and whether it is a brand-new roadway or a reconstruct they have different policies, and we can talk more on this later.

Kuharenko referred to Page 5 and stated that we have the various funding sources, and you mentioned that with the TA Program, how it hasn’t been included in the past, but you are looking at including it in this one, but he wants to be hesitant on that because that is typically geared more towards shared-use paths, that sort of thing, and he doesn’t want that funding to be misconstrued with street funding. Carbee agreed that he was right. He said that they can leave it out if that is the consensus, there are some elements you can blend into street projects, again the Complete Streets approach, but you are right, so he thinks it would be okay to leave it out.

Kuharenko said that the other question he has is on that same table where you have the Urban Local Road Program, the Regional Primary Program, and the dollar amounts on that, is that just the federal funding or is that federal, state and local funding going into each of those categories. Carbee responded that he believes it is the federal portion of those funds. Kuharenko said that the reason he asked that is because he wants to make sure that if there are local funds involved that we aren’t double counting local funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Kuharenko said that last piece he has has to do with the revenue sources, and there are some more details that we can talk about later, but he knows that with a lot of their Highway Users and Sales Tax, particularly the Highway Users, they do end up also funding a large portion of their Street Department, and so even though they may have like \$2.7 million to \$3 million dollars coming in, about \$2 million has to go to the Street Department and he wants to make sure we aren't over-counting our revenue on that. Carbee stated that that is a very good note because one of the requirements of MTPs is to account for those operation costs as well.

Kuharenko said that the last question he is asking is just on the Carbon Reduction Program and PROTECT Program. He stated that it sounds like you got those numbers from the DOT. Carbee responded that it is based on the methodology they discussed with the DOT. Kuharenko said that he doesn't think they have seen that program yet, and he doesn't want to count the chickens before they hatch. Carbee agreed, adding that again these are all discretionary programs, and that is one thing they really need to emphasize, it isn't like, this is what we anticipate showing up every year, it is like, there may be two projects between now and 2050, so how much funding is reasonable to anticipate because we are competing with Bismarck, Fargo and Minot. Kuharenko added that when it comes to the PROTECT Program too, we've got a flood protection system that a lot of other cities don't have.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

A. 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update

- 1) Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update: Halford said that we just got signed resolutions from both cities, so we are buttoning that up and are just working with the consultant getting all of the data and the edible documents so we can have those in the future.
- 2) Street/Highway Element Update: Halford said that we went over, she thinks pretty well where we are at with the Street and Highway Plan.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Kouba reported that we have the imagery, and she is working on getting it to Josh in Grand Forks and to Steve and Corey in East Grand Forks. She said that if there is anyone she missed on sending the information to please let her know so that she can add them to the list.

B. MPO Updates

- 1) Safe Streets For All – Halford reported that they are working on the MOU with the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and they will start drafting the document and get it ready to sign and then they will put an RFP together and start running with it, so that will be exciting.



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

- 2) September TAC Agenda Items – Halford reported that so far, as we mentioned earlier, the Work Program will be coming back, usually we always have T.I.P. amendments but so far, we haven't heard of any at this time, possibly Street and Highway updates, but there could be more coming over the next week or two.

C. Agency Updates

- 1) Kuharenko said, on T.I.P. amendments for the next cycle, he can't remember, was the design engineering for the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange in the S.T.I.P. Zacher responded that Mike Johnson asked him that question the other day, and there was a T.I.P. amendment that was made in February, and he wasn't sure if that was the next step or not, but that is what he told Mike, that it was shown in February. Kuharenko said that that might be something to keep an eye out for. Zacher stated that it was probably in February of the existing document, the amendment that added 47<sup>th</sup>. Kouba commented that she knows it was in the T.I.P. already. Kuharenko stated that we don't necessarily have to address it right now, it is more of a general comment.
- 2) Palo reported that on the North Dakota side, just to help get the word out, starting August 1<sup>st</sup> North Dakota now has a Primary Enforceable Seatbelt Violation law that states everyone must wear a seatbelt, and traffic in a circle or roundabout must indicate when they want to leave it. Kouba said that they practiced that down in the Cities when they were there last weekend.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY EMERY, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 9<sup>TH</sup>,  
2023 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:59 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager